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Summary Paragraph
Previously listed in the National Register as the Civil War Fort Sites (Defenses of Washington), the Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District is a discontiguous historic district that encompasses land associated with the Civil War Defenses of Washington and with the development of the Fort Circle Parks and the proposed Fort Drive. The 1,524-acre historic district is located primarily in the District of Columbia, with a few sections situated in Prince George’s County, Maryland, and in Fairfax County and Arlington County, Virginia. Nearly all of the land is under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service (NPS).¹ The district generally comprises a string of contiguous and discontiguous parkland situated along a ridge that encircles downtown Washington, D.C., forming a partial ring of green space around the city. Residential neighborhoods, commercial districts, highways, or other parks surround the parks in the historic district. The 121 resources in the district include 38 previously listed contributing resources, 56 newly identified contributing resources, and 27 non-contributing resources. Most of the

¹ Two areas within the historic district are not under NPS jurisdiction. The site of the Fort Lincoln Battery, which was included in the 1978 boundary expansion for the historic district, is jointly owned by the U.S. and D.C. governments. Because it is not managed by the National Park Service, it was not evaluated as part of this update to the nomination. A 0.2-acre area within George Washington Memorial Parkway (GWMP) near Fort Marcy is owned by Arlington County, Virginia, and used as a fishing access point.
non-contributing resources are either unrelated to the historic district’s areas of significance, or were constructed outside the period of significance. Given the inherent threats to the survival of unused or decommissioned historic earthworks, many of the individual earthworks in the district retain a high degree of integrity. As a collection of resources, the earthworks have sufficient integrity to convey the history and design of the Defenses of Washington, despite the loss of most elements of their historic setting. The Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District also retains sufficient integrity to illustrate its importance in local Civil War commemorations and in park planning in the nation’s capital. As a system of parks, the district retains key character-defining features such as land use, spatial organization, and recreational resources.
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INTRODUCTION

This nomination updates the National Register listing for the Civil War Fort Sites (Defenses of Washington), increases the district boundary, and renames it the Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District. In the original 1974 nomination, the historic district was a discontiguous district composed of seventeen forts owned by the National Park Service (NPS); Fort Foote and Fort Marcy were added to the district in 1978. In addition to expanding the boundary, the current update incorporates research and documentation collected on the fort sites since 1978, and clarifies the resource category for the previously listed forts and batteries.

The boundary increase adds several resources associated with the Civil War Defenses of Washington, including batteries, rifle trenches, road traces, and archeological sites that have been identified since 1978, as well as Battleground National Cemetery, which was listed in the National Register in 1980 (updated 2010) and is associated with the Defenses of Washington as the burial place for Union soldiers who died at the Battle of Fort Stevens (July 1864).² The expanded historic district boundary also encompasses the NPS parks surrounding the Civil War Defenses of Washington sites, as well as land that the federal government acquired to create a ring of park land connecting these fortifications. The Senate Park Commission laid out plans for this park system in 1902 as part of a broader plan to improve parks and public spaces in the national capital.³ The federal government acquired most of the land for the fort parks between the 1920s and 1960s, and most of the recreational facilities in the parks were constructed during this period as well.

The revised name of the historic district – the Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District – reflects the addition of land and resources associated with the development of this system of parks linking the remnants of the Defenses of Washington. Like the original historic district, the expanded historic district boundary only includes lands owned and managed by the National Park Service; related properties that are owned or managed by other entities are excluded, but may be eligible for the National Register on their own or as components of a district. (See Other Resources, p. 29.)

This nomination also provides more detailed mapping and descriptions of the Civil War earthworks within the district. The new information on the Defenses of Washington resources is based primarily on GIS analysis and fieldwork conducted by historian David Lowe of the NPS Cultural Resources GIS program. Using historic map overlays and GPS data, Lowe identified previously undocumented features of existing fortifications, remnants of fortifications, and road traces from the Civil War era.

This updated nomination incorporates information contained in the numerous studies that NPS has initiated on the Fort Circle Parks and related topics since the last National Register update in 1978. In

³ For more information on the Senate Park Commission’s 1902 plan and the place of the fort parks within that plan, see Section 8, pp. 80-81 and 110-113.
addition to the GIS analysis and fieldwork, Historic Resource Studies have been prepared for the Civil War Defenses of Washington as a whole, as well as for individual fort parks. Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) documentation of the work of the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) in NPS National Capital Region includes valuable information on CCC activities in the Fort Circle Parks. Archeological studies, cultural landscape reports, and National Register documentation for Rock Creek Park identified new resources and provided historical and contextual information. Finally, NPS National Capital Region is currently engaged in an ongoing project to prepare Cultural Landscapes Inventories (CLIs) for the forts and parks within the district. The completed CLIs are summarized in this nomination. All of the relevant studies are listed in Section 9: Major Bibliographical References (see p. 142).

Previous National Register Listings

Of the nineteen forts and batteries that were previously listed as contributing resources in the Civil War Fort Sites (Defenses of Washington) Historic District (NRHP, 1974, updated 1978), eighteen contribute to the updated and expanded Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District. The 1978 update notes that at that time, there were “no historic remains” of Fort Reno (ROCR). Further investigations and map analysis since 1978 have confirmed that there are no aboveground remnants of the fort. Archeological investigations of Fort Reno Park thus far have not located concentrations of artifacts from the Civil War within NPS boundaries. Although the park contains no contributing resources related to the Defenses of Washington, it is included in the updated and expanded historic district for its association with the development of the fort sites as federally owned parks.

The earlier nominations describe Fort Slocum Park (ROCR) as retaining no visible remnants of the earthworks, but recent investigations of the site using GPS readings and map overlays revealed a trace of a rifle trench. The rifle trench is counted in this nomination as a contributing and previously listed site related to the Civil War.

The 1978 National Register nomination for the Civil War Defenses of Washington includes traces of a battery associated with Fort Lincoln, located within a one-acre area on the DC/Maryland line. Although the battery is counted among the previously listed contributing resources in the historic district, it was not evaluated as part of this update because the National Park Service no longer manages the land. Aerial photographs indicate that most of this area is undeveloped, suggesting that above-ground traces of the battery or archeological resources may remain intact.

Battleground National Cemetery (ROCR) was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1980. A 2010 update to the nomination provided additional detail on the cemetery’s history and resources, revised the period of significance, and linked it to the Civil War Era National Cemetery MPS. Twenty of

4 CLIs have been completed for Fort Dupont, Fort Foote, and Fort Mahan in National Capital Parks – East, and for Battleground National Cemetery, Fort Stevens, and Fort DeRussy in the Rock Creek Park administrative unit.
5 The 1978 nomination refers to this resource as Fort Lincoln, but describes it as containing a trace of a battery associated with the fort. Fort Lincoln Park, which is owned and operated by the District of Columbia government, occupies the site of the main fort, which was significantly altered, if not completely destroyed, by the construction of the Boys’ Training School in the late 19th century and Fort Lincoln Park in the 1970s. On Fort Lincoln Park, see The Cultural Landscape Foundation, “Fort Lincoln Park,” What’s Out There? [database], The Cultural Landscape Foundation, n.d., http://tclf.org/landscapes/fort-lincoln-park (accessed December 10, 2014).
the resources that contribute to the Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District were previously listed in the National Register as part of the Battleground National Cemetery listing.\(^6\)

**Abbreviations and Glossary**

The parks in the district are currently administered by three different administrative units of the National Park Service: the George Washington Memorial Parkway (GWMP), National Capital Parks – East (NACE), and Rock Creek Park (ROCR). Since the inventory of resources (pp. 52-69) is organized by administrative unit, the four-letter abbreviation for the unit is included after park names in the narrative description in order to help locate these resources in the inventory. Where applicable, the inventory also provides the List of Classified Structures (LCS) and Cultural Landscape Inventory (CLI) numbers assigned to the resources by the NPS, as well as the relevant State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) resource or site numbers.

Properties mentioned in the text that are listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) separately from the Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District are noted in a parenthetical with “NRHP” and the date of listing.

A glossary of fortification terms is included to assist readers who are unfamiliar with the terminology associated with earthen fortifications (see p. 70).

**DISTRICT DESCRIPTION**

**Location and Setting**

The Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District is composed of contiguous and discontinuous U.S. Reservations in the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia. Most of the district is located in the northwest, northeast, and southeast quadrants of Washington, D.C., near the district’s border with Maryland. One park – Fort Foote Park (NACE)\(^7\) – is located in Prince George’s County, Maryland, southeast of the city. Portions of the George Washington Memorial Parkway (GWMP) in Fairfax and Arlington Counties in Virginia are also included in the district. (See Map #1 – Overall Map of Historic District.)

Urban or suburban residential development surrounds most of the historic district. Schools, parks and recreational facilities owned and operated by the local government are adjacent to many of the parks within the District of Columbia, reflecting the transfer of administrative jurisdiction over some National Park Service lands to the District in the late 20\(^{th}\) and early 21\(^{st}\) centuries. A few resources are located within larger parks, notably Rock Creek Park (NRHP, 1991, updated 2015), a large urban park in the

---

\(^6\) Dayton and Trieschmann. In the 2010 updated and expanded National Register nomination for Battleground National Cemetery, there is a discrepancy between the total number of resources given in Section 5: Classification and the number of resources listed in the inventory in Section 7: Description. Section 5 (p. 2) lists sixteen previously listed resources, plus two additional non-contributing resources for a total of eighteen. However, the inventory in Section 7 (p. 11) lists twenty-two resources (20 contributing and 2 non-contributing).
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Land Use

The historic district is composed almost entirely of parks that are used primarily for recreational purposes. Some sections of the district have no constructed recreational facilities and function as urban forests. Community gardens are located in Fort Dupont Park (NACE), Reservation 499 near Fort Stevens (ROCR, Map #13.2, Photo #2), Reservation 494 between 8th and 9th Streets NW (ROCR), and Reservation 497 (ROCR) west of New Hampshire Avenue NE. With the exception of the garden at Fort Dupont, all are sites where local residents planted Victory Gardens during World War II to prevent wartime food shortages.8

There is one documented cemetery in the district: Battleground National Cemetery. Initially established as the final resting place for Union soldiers killed at the Battle of Fort Stevens (July 1864), it also includes the grave of one veteran of the battle, as well as the graves of the family members of a cemetery superintendent. It is no longer accepting new burials.9

A few non-contributing resources in Fort Dupont Park (NACE) and in Shepherd Parkway (NACE) are used for administrative and maintenance purposes by the NPS and the U.S. Park Police (USPP).

Topography

The topography is a character-defining feature of the historic district because it played a key role in the district’s historical use as defensive fortifications and its development as park land in the 20th century. The parks within the district are typically located along ridges or high points around the perimeter of Washington, D.C. These elevated vantage points provided views of the surrounding area, including roads, waterways, and bridges that had strategic importance during the Civil War. In the early 20th century, the fort sites and adjacent land attracted the attention of park planners because their location along the high ground offered picturesque views of the surrounding area. (See “Views and Vistas,” below, and Figures 8-9 and 8-10.) Currently, the topography contributes to the feeling of being in a natural setting, despite being in close proximity to dense urban and suburban development. Because the elevation of the parks is higher than much of the surrounding area, nearby buildings are not always visible through the vegetation, enhancing the feeling of separation from the city. (Photos #11-12, 16, 20)

8 National Park Service, Fort Circle Parks Master Plan (Washington, DC: National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, 1968), p. 62. The location of the community garden near Fort Stevens is marked on Map #13.2. The community garden in Fort Dupont Park is located at the intersection of Fort Davis Drive and Fort Dupont Drive (see Map #17.2). The community garden in Reservation 494 lies at the northeast corner of 9th Street NW and Peabody Street NW, and the one in Reservation 497 occupies most of the block bounded by McDonald Place NE, North Capitol Street NE, Oglethorpe Street NW, and New Hampshire Avenue NE (see Map #13).

9 McMillen, CLI: Battleground National Cemetery. A cemetery existed at Fort Foote from the early 1870s until 1910, when the remains of six soldiers and one civilian were removed to Arlington National Cemetery. National Park Service, Fort Foote CRGIS GPS Survey (2014), p. 6; Garrison, CLI: Fort Foote, p. 18.

10 Fort Dupont is a documented cultural landscape. See Margaret Lester (University of Pennsylvania), Cultural Landscapes Inventory (CLI): Fort Dupont, National Capital Parks-East – Fort Circle Park-East (prepared for National Park Service, National Capital Region, 2013) [hereafter cited as Lester, CLI: Fort Dupont].
Military leaders selected the sites for fortifications to defend Washington, D.C. during the Civil War in part based on the views and vistas. The forts, batteries, and rifle trenches were placed in locations where soldiers could observe enemy troops moving along the waterways, roadways, and bridges that led into the city. Soldiers and hired laborers cleared all trees and other vegetation in front of the earthworks in order to create unobstructed views of approaches to the city. (See Figure 8-5.)

The scenic value of the views and vistas in the historic district also contributed to their appeal as recreational sites. Many of the fortifications and the parks surrounding and connecting them offered views into the monumental core of Washington, D.C., as well as views of the Potomac and Anacostia River valleys. When viewed from central Washington, D.C., the parks form a ring of green space along the ridge surrounding the city, providing a visual record of the system of outlying parks proposed by the Senate Park Commission in 1902.

Currently, many of the views looking out from the parks in the historic district are partially or completely obscured by vegetation. In addition, urban and suburban development since the 1860s has radically altered the content of most of the views from the forts and parks.
Despite these alterations, the views from several of the forts and parks continue to illustrate their topographical relationship to the surrounding area, which was key to their role as defensive fortifications, and convey the scenic value that contributed to their development as parks. For example, Fort Mahan Park (NACE)\(^{11}\) provides a view down Benning Road SE, one of the routes it defended during the Civil War. The Gulf Branch Rifle Trench (GWMP) and the Reservoir Battery # 2 Earthworks Site (ROCR) retain views of the Potomac River. Though altered by later development, the views of the surrounding area from Fort Stanton Park (NACE) and Fort Bunker Hill (ROCR) reflect their historic appeal as vantage points for scenic views of Washington, D.C. (See Figure 7-1.)

**Spatial Organization**

Within the historic district, parks containing Civil War fort sites are connected by smaller forested parks and grassy areas along existing roadways. The largest breaks in this ring of parkland are located at Fort Lincoln New Town, St. Elizabeths Hospital, and along Nebraska Avenue NW. (See Map #1.)

As components of an interconnected system of defensive earthworks, the Civil War forts were placed to defend all approaches into the city. (See Figure 7-2.) As a result, many of the fort parks are located in close proximity to the Potomac River or to roads that offered potential invasion routes. Some of these historic routes continue to be important transportation arteries. For instance, Fort Marcy (GWMP) was one of two fortifications that defended approaches to Chain Bridge over the Potomac, including present-day Chain Bridge Road (Virginia Route 123, Maps #2 and #2.1). Fort Stevens (ROCR)\(^{12}\) guarded the Seventh Street Turnpike (now Georgia Avenue NW), which was one of the major thoroughfares into the city from the north (Map #13.2). Fort DeRussy (Rock Creek Park, ROCR) overlooked Milkhouse Ford Road, an important east-west thoroughfare in the mid-19\(^{th}\) century, as well as Milkhouse Ford, a strategically important crossing point over Rock Creek (Map #12.1).\(^{13}\)

The spatial relationship among the parks in the historic district also reflects plans for an integrated system of parks and parkway connecting the forts. This effort began in 1902 as a component of the Senate Park Commission Plan (also known as the McMillan Plan) for the nation’s capital (Figure 7-3), but the character of this proposed system of parks and parkway evolved over the 20\(^{th}\) century. Through all these changes, the spatial pattern of a system of larger parks connected by narrower strips of green space surrounding Washington, D.C.’s monumental core remained consistent. The connecting parks

---

\(^{11}\) Fort Mahan is a documented cultural landscape. See Margaret Lester (University of Pennsylvania), *Cultural Landscapes Inventory [CLI]: Fort Mahan, National Capital Parks-East – Fort Circle Park-East* (prepared for National Park Service, National Capital Region, 2013) [hereafter cited as Lester, *CLI: Fort Mahan*].


between the forts also help convey the historic spatial relationship among the Civil War forts by fostering the sense that fortifications were part of a system of defenses.

Figure 7-2: Modern map of the Civil War Defenses of Washington showing the locations of major forts and batteries. Source: National Park Service.
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Name of Property: Fort Bayard Park (ROCR), Fort Bunker Hill Park (ROCR), Fort Foote Park (NACE), Fort Marcy Park (GWMP), and the Battle of Fort Stevens Archeological Site (ROCR) lie outside of the ring of parks connected by land acquired for Fort Drive, but are historically associated with the Defenses of Washington. (See Map #1 and Archeology Map #7.) Battleground National Cemetery (ROCR) is not adjacent to the nearby Fort Circle Parks, but is located less than one-half mile north of Fort Stevens Park (ROCR). (See Map #13.)

Circulation Networks

Inter-Park Circulation Networks

The circulation network that links the discontiguous elements of the historic district comprises hiking and biking trails, designed roadways, and city streets. This network retains a few vestiges of the military roads constructed to serve the Civil War Defenses of Washington; however, most of the circulation network is related to urban and park development in the late 19th and 20th centuries.

Urban and suburban development in the one hundred and fifty years since the Civil War obliterated most of the military roads that linked the forts in the Defenses of Washington. As a result, only scattered elements of the historic district’s present circulation networks are associated with the Civil War era. The least disturbed remnants of these roads are generally located in isolated areas and, for the most part, are not integrated into the district’s present circulation network. (See Military Resources: Communications and Supply, p. 27 for descriptions of these resources.) Other abandoned Civil War roads became hiking and biking trails within the parks; examples include the Fort DeRussy Trail (Rock Creek Park, ROCR, Map #12.1) and portions of the road traces near Fort Marcy (GWMP, Map #2.1, Photo #14). Within Rock Creek Park, Military Road NW and Joyce Road NW follow the routes of Civil War military roads just south of Fort DeRussy (Maps #12 and #12.1; Archeology Map #6). However, there is currently little or no visual connection between these modern roadways and the nearby fortifications sites they once linked.

Twentieth-century roads and trails located within and adjacent to the historic district make up the primary inter-park circulation network. The pattern of roads and trails and their relationships to the parks reflect the historical development of the park system and the proposed Fort Drive, which was intended to serve as a pleasure drive or parkway connecting the sites of the Civil War Defenses of Washington. East of the Anacostia River, plans developed in the 1930s called for substantial sections of new road to be built for Fort Drive within federally owned parks. As a result, this part of the historic

14 Fort Foote is a documented cultural landscape. See Garrison, CLI: Fort Foote.
15 Battleground National Cemetery is a documented cultural landscape. See McMillen, CLI: Battleground National Cemetery.
16 Fort Foote and Fort DeRussy are documented cultural landscapes. See Garrison, CLI: Fort Foote and Garrison, CLI: Fort DeRussy.
District contains the highest concentration of historic roads and trails that are located within parks and that connect the parks to each other. For instance, Fort Davis Drive SE (NACE, Map #17) passes through federal park land to connect Fort Davis Park and Fort Dupont Park. Built in at least two phases between 1935 and 1963, this road constitutes the longest stretch of the proposed Fort Drive that was actually constructed. (See Photo #17.) The Fort Circle Park Hiker-Biker Trail (NACE, Map #17.1), the first segment of which was completed in 1971, follows a similar circulation pattern, connecting Fort Mahan Park and Fort Stanton Park via the intervening fort parks (see Photo #22). North of Fort Mahan Park and south of Fort Stanton Park, city streets adjacent to the land within the historic district provide circulation among the parks.

![Figure 7-3: Senate Park Commission Plan for the Fort Drive and Fort Parks (shown in red line), 1902. Source: U.S. Congress, The Improvement of the Park System of the District of Columbia, Figure D-288.](image_url)

---

18 Numerous historic roads and trails exist within Rock Creek Park west of the Anacostia River, but the vast majority of these routes are not associated with the Fort Drive project or the Fort Circle Parks.

19 Fort Mahan is a documented cultural landscape. See Lester, CLI: Fort Mahan.
West of the Anacostia River, the circulation pattern among the parks in the historic district more often follows adjacent city streets rather than being located within the parks. In the 1920s and 1930s, when the federal government acquired most of the land for Fort Drive and the fort parks, the northeast and northwest fringes of the District of Columbia had a more extensive and well-established street layout and more dense commercial and residential development than did the eastern part of D.C. As a result, the federal government found it more difficult to acquire long swaths of land for the fort parks and segments of the proposed Fort Drive that were located west of the Anacostia River. In response to these challenges, plans for the Fort Drive in this part of the city incorporated many existing streets into the proposed roadway, and the federal government acquired small strips and triangles of land in order to beautify and widen existing streets for use as part of Fort Drive. The route between Rock Creek Park and Fort Slocum Park is a particularly coherent example of a Fort Drive route that follows existing city streets (Photos #1-2, Map #13). Fort Drive NW south of Fort Reno Park (ROCR) is an example of a segment of the proposed Fort Drive that was built as an urban boulevard adjacent to an existing city street (Photo #18, Map #10.1).

City streets that are located outside the Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District also form part of the circulation network among the discontiguous parks. Some of these streets connected the forts during the Civil War, since the U.S. military made use of existing roads in order to move troops and supplies among the forts. For example, portions of Alabama Avenue SE (Map #17), 36th Street NW (Map #10), Broad Branch Road NW (Map #10), and Fort Totten Drive NE (Map #13) were used as military roads; today, these mark the boundaries of fort parks and link them with other parks in the historic district.

Park Circulation Networks

Circulation patterns within the parks of the historic district vary in character. Most of the connecting parks have no formal circulation pattern or only a single hiking and biking trail. Some of the parks and sites have no internal circulation network, generally because they are small, have dense vegetation, or are centered around a grassy area that is readily accessible from adjacent roads. Examples include the Reservoir Battery #2 Site (ROCR), Fort Stanton Park (NACE), Fort Carroll Park (Shepherd Parkway, NACE), and Fort Greble Park (Shepherd Parkway, NACE). (See Figure 7-4.)

Among the parks in the historic district that do have internal circulation patterns, the most common paths are walking trails that lead to the historic fortifications or to other recreational facilities within the park. Most of these trails were laid out in the 20th century, including several at Fort Bunker Hill Park (ROCR) that the Civilian Conservation Corps built in the 1930s (Map #14.1). A small number of trails follow the route of roads that provided access to the fortification during the Civil War; examples include the trail at Fort Foote Park (NACE, Map #20.1) that leads from the earthworks to the wharf site, and the path leading through the sally port at Fort DeRussy (Rock Creek Park, ROCR, Map #12.1). Fort Dupont

---

20 Located in the Rock Creek Park administrative unit (ROCR), this section of the district includes Reservations 499 (Fort Drive – Rock Creek Park to Fort Stevens Park), 494 (Fort Drive – Fort Stevens Park to Fort Slocum Park), and Fort Stevens Park (ROCR). Only Fort Stevens Park is included in the inventory because it is the only reservation in this section that contains counted resources.

21 Garrison, CLI: Fort Foote, pp. 55-57; Garrison, CLI: Fort DeRussy, pp. 50-51. See also Map #2.1, which shows trails utilizing Civil War-era road traces near the fort.
Park (NACE, Map 17.2)\(^{22}\) and Barnard Hill Park (ROCR, Map #14) are among the parks that contain roads associated with early and mid-20th-century plans for the fort park system. The internal circulation system at Fort Dupont Park is the most extensive in the district, encompassing a 19th-century farm road, several roads constructed by the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), and roads and trails that the NPS added after 1945. (See Map #17.2 and #17.4.)

### Vegetation

During the construction of the Civil War Defenses of Washington, much of the vegetation surrounding the earthen fortifications was cleared in order to open up vistas and to provide wood for construction and firewood. Between 1865, when the federal government returned most of the earthworks sites to the original owners, and the beginning of park development in the early 20th century, some areas were returned to agricultural use, others left to grow wild, and still others cleared for development.

Currently, the vegetation in the historic district is consistent with its primary use as urban parkland, and includes wooded areas with dense understory, wooded areas with leaf cover, and open, grassy areas. In some parks, the patterns of vegetation convey historic land use. For instance, a clearing at Fort Mahan Park (NACE, Map #16.2) likely marks the location of a picnic area built by the CCC (Photo #20), and swaths of grassy lawn at Fort Dupont Park (NACE, Map #17.3) constitute the remnants of the golf course.

\(^{22}\) Fort Dupont is a documented cultural landscape. See Lester, *CLI: Fort Dupont*.

---

*Figure 7-4:* View of Fort Greble Park (Shepherd Parkway, NACE), an example of a park in the historic district that has no internal circulation networks, is readily accessible via adjacent city streets, and is mostly grassy. *Source: Evelyn D. Causey, May 2013.*
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that opened there in 1948.23 (See Figure 8-16.) The parade ground at Fort Foote (NACE, Map #20.1) is also evident primarily in the patterns of vegetation.24

The open spaces within the historic district that border city streets are typically grassy with scattered trees (Photos #1-2, 18). Battleground National Cemetery (ROCR, Map #13.1) is the only park within the district that retains substantial elements of formal plantings.25

Small-Scale Features

Much of the land within the historic district is unimproved and contains no small-scale features. The small-scale features in the historic district are generally located in the parks that are associated with the Civil War Defenses of Washington. Most of the contributing small-scale features reflect recreational development from the 1930s through the 1960s. These include culverts, stone gutters along roadways, and stone fireplaces installed by the CCC in the 1930s (see Figures 7-5 and 8-14). Several light posts and a few water fountains may date to the CCC era as well. These features are concentrated in Fort Bunker Hill Park (ROCR), Fort Mahan Park (NACE), Fort Dupont Park (NACE), and Fort Davis Park (NACE).26 Most of the water fountains follow designs created for the National Park Service’s Mission 66 initiative and contribute to the district.

Eight cannons within the historic district are contributing small-scale features. The two 15-inch smoothbore Rodman Columbiad Model 1861 cannons at Fort Foote Park (NACE, Map #20.2)27 are the only ones that are original to the Defenses of Washington. The cannons were placed at Fort Foote in 1863-1864 and abandoned in place when the fort closed in 1878. After being recovered from a ditch at the fort in 1984, they were remounted within the historic earthworks on reproduction carriages. (See Photo #7.)

The remaining six cannons are not historically associated with the Civil War

\[\text{Figure 7-5: Stone fireplace from CCC era in Ridge Picnic Area, Fort Dupont Park (NACE). Source: Evelyn D. Causey, Feb. 2014.}\]

23 Lester, CLI: Fort Mahan, p. 45; Robinson & Associates, Inc. Fort Dupont Park Historic Resources Study (prepared for National Park Service, National Capital Region, 2004), pp. 122-130. The golf course is not part of the documented cultural landscape at Fort Dupont.
24 Garrison, CLI: Fort Foote, p. 60.
25 Battleground National Cemetery is a documented cultural landscape. See McMillen, CLI: Battleground National Cemetery. The cultural landscape documentation and the National Register nomination provide more detailed information about circulation networks within the cemetery.
26 Fort Mahan Park and Fort Dupont Park are documented cultural landscapes. See Lester, CLI: Fort Mahan and CLI: Fort Dupont.
27 Fort Foote is a documented cultural landscape. See Garrison, CLI: Fort Foote.
Defenses of Washington but contribute to the commemorative landscape in the district. The two Civil War-era cannons at Battleground National Cemetery (ROCR, Map #13.1) were installed in 1904 and are integral parts of the entrance to the cemetery.\(^{28}\) The cannons at Fort Marcy Park and Fort Stevens Park reflect the development of the forts as historic sites in the 1960s. The two Model 1841 twelve-pounder Howitzers at Fort Marcy Park (GWMP, Map #2.2) were fabricated between 1834 and 1847 and moved to the park in 1963 (Photos #4-5). This type of cannon was commonly used by the Union Army during the Civil War, but these particular pieces of armament are not associated with the Defenses of Washington. The two cannons at Fort Stevens Park (ROCR, Map #13.2)\(^{29}\) are reproductions that were fabricated and installed in 1966 (Photo #3).

The most prevalent non-contributing small-scale features in the historic district are interpretive markers, waysides, picnic tables, benches, and equipment associated with athletic fields and playgrounds.

**CONTRIBUTING RESOURCES**

Military and commemorative resources associated with the Civil War Defenses of Washington make up the majority of the 94 contributing resources in the historic district.\(^{30}\) In addition to earthen fortifications and other military sites and structures, the historic district includes monuments and memorials that commemorate the Defenses of Washington and the Union soldiers who died at the Battle of Fort Stevens (1864). Contributing resources associated with the development of the Fort Circle Parks and Fort Drive include a section of Fort Drive, a picnic area and amphitheater constructed by the Civilian Conservation Corps, a golf course and clubhouse, and comfort stations.

The descriptions of contributing resources are organized in order to group resources that share common historical and design contexts or that are physically similar. The five sections are divided into three thematic sections and two resource type sections.

**Thematic:**
- Military Resources, 1861-1878 (p. 20)
- Commemorative Resources, 1863-1965 (p. 31)
- Park Development, 1920-1972 (p. 33)

**Resource Types:**
- Archeological Resources (p. 39)
- Cultural Landscapes (p. 43)

The contributing archeological sites and components of the cultural landscapes are noted in the three thematic sections, but because they are distinctive resource types, they are also summarized separately in the Archeology and Cultural Landscapes sections below.

---

\(^{28}\) The cannons at Battleground National Cemetery were counted as contributing objects in the individual nomination for the cemetery. See Dayton and Trieschmann, p. 11. Battleground National Cemetery is a documented cultural landscape. See McMillen, *CLI: Battleground National Cemetery*.

\(^{29}\) Fort Stevens is a documented cultural landscape. See McMillen, *CLI: Fort Stevens*.

\(^{30}\) The total number of contributing resources given here includes the 37 previously listed resources.
Military Resources, 1861-1878

Forty-eight contributing resources primarily relate to the military period in the history of the Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District, which begins with the start of the Civil War in 1861 and ends with the closure of Fort Foote (NACE) as a military post in 1878. The majority of the military resources in the district are associated with the Civil War Defenses of Washington; others are associated with post-war military use of Fort Foote. The military resources are concentrated in the fort parks, but a few are located in isolated areas or within larger parks such as Rock Creek Park (ROCR) and the George Washington Memorial Parkway (GWMP).

Although the U.S. military used portions of Fort Foote and Fort Dupont Park during World Wars I and II, no physical resources remain at the parks from these eras. Archeological potential for these periods has not been assessed for National Register eligibility (see Archeological Resources, p. 39).

The narrative description of the military resources is organized into four categories:

- Fortifications (forts, batteries, rifle trenches, and masonry structures),
- Communications and Supply,
- Support Buildings and Soldier Life, and
- Battlefields and Encampments.

All of the military resources in the historic district are potential archeological sites, but most have not been professionally evaluated or delineated. Those archeological sites that are associated with the historic district’s military history and that have been identified, documented, and entered in state and NPS archeological databases are mentioned in the discussion of military resources and described more fully beginning on page 38.

A glossary of terms used to describe military earthworks is included at the end of Section 7 (p. 70), after the district inventory. Terms that appear in the glossary are noted in SMALL CAPS.

Note on Classification
The EARTHWORKS that are classified as structures retain enough definition to be easily recognizable as defensive structures. Partial earthworks are considered structures as long as the remaining elements are able to convey their historic use.

The earthworks in the historic district that are classified as sites contain earthen features or ruins that can only be identified as remnants of military structures with the assistance of maps and specialized knowledge of Civil War earthworks and buildings. The earthworks sites generally contain mounds or depressions in the ground that correspond to elements of historic fortifications, buildings, or structures.

31 The cultural landscapes that include earthen fortifications are not included in the total of military resources because these landscapes generally retain few elements of their Civil War appearance. See Section 7, pp. 41-45.

32 For several resources at Fort Foote, it is unclear whether they were constructed during the Civil War or soon after; as a result, an exact number of resources associated with Fort Foote’s post-war use is not provided.
Masonry structures that are associated with the earthworks’ military function and have intact interiors are counted as individual structures. While brick MAGAZINES are counted separately as structures, the earthen magazines and BOMBPROOFS are classified as features of the associated fortifications. After the forts were abandoned, the interiors of earthen magazines and bombproofs collapsed when the lumber supporting them deteriorated or was removed; as a result, they generally survive as mounds of earth.

Fortifications

Forts

The FORTS in the Civil War Defenses of Washington were the largest defensive structures in the system and were garrisoned throughout the war. Most were enclosed EARTHWORKS; the most common type was the multi-sided REDOUBT, but BASTIONED and LUNETTE forts are represented as well. Forts Foote, Stanton, Carroll, and Mahan incorporated BASTIONS, bastionets, \(^{33}\) or DEMI-BASTIONS. Fort Ricketts is the only lunette fort in the district. Its unenclosed design is similar to that of a BATTERY, but military records consistently refer to it as a fort, and it was garrisoned during the war. \(^{34}\)

Twelve of the earthen FORTS in the district are classified as structures, and two are classified as sites. In addition to DITCHES and PARAPETS, the fort structures include various combinations of other features, such as wells, roads, SALLY PORTS, GLACIS, TRAVERSES, artillery EMBRASURES, artillery PLATFORMS, artillery RAMPS, BOMBPROOFS, and MAGAZINES. (See Figure 7-6.) The specific features associated with each fort are listed in the inventory.


\(^{34}\) National Park Service, Fort Ricketts CRGIS GPS Report (2013).
Fort Stevens (ROCR, Map #13.2)\textsuperscript{35} is the only FORTIFICATION in the district that has been partially reconstructed. (See Photo #3.) Built in 1861 as a roughly square-shaped REDOUBT named Fort Massachusetts, the fort was enlarged in 1862 to create an IRREGULAR, multi-sided redoubt. In 1863, the expanded fortification was renamed Fort Stevens. Most of the fort was razed in the decades after the war. When the federal government began acquiring the property in 1925, the northwest section of the 1862 expansion remained but suffered from erosion. Between 1936 and 1938, workers from the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) reconstructed the fort’s west, northwest, and north PARAPETS.\textsuperscript{36} (See also pp. 36 and 128.)

At six forts in the historic district, the entire perimeter of the original fortification is visible and is generally defined by a PARAPET and DITCH. The most well-preserved forts – Fort Marcy, Fort DeRussy, and Fort Foote – exhibit a large number and variety of well-defined features such as artillery emplacements (Photo #5),\textsuperscript{37} SALLY PORTS, MAGAZINES, BOMBPROOFS, and TRAVERSES. Fort Marcy (GWMP, Map #2.1) was constructed between 1861 and 1862; it is a multi-sided REDOUBT that is generally triangular in shape. (See Figure 8-2.) Notable features inside the fort include the outlines of a four-room bombproof and a road trace with remnants of stone cobbles and curbing (Photo #4). Of the Civil War forts in the historic district, Fort Marcy retains the most extensive system of outworks, including three BATTERIES, RIFLE TRENCHES, and a large magazine that is located between the main fort and the eight-gun battery to its southwest. Constructed in 1861, Fort DeRussy (Rock Creek Park, ROCR, Map #12.1)\textsuperscript{38} is a trapezoidal REDOUBT that also retains some of its associated outworks as well as a COVERED WAY (Photo #6). (See Figure 8-3.) In addition to RIFLE TRENCHES, the surviving outworks include Battery Rock Creek and the Battery Kingsbury site (see pp. 24-25).

The IRREGULAR, enclosed earthworks at Fort Foote (NACE, Map #20.2)\textsuperscript{39} were constructed between 1863 and 1865 as part of the Potomac River defenses. Described by John G. Barnard, the chief engineer of the Defenses of Washington, as a “model” fortification, Fort Foote comprises a straight-sided river battery and two DEMI-BASTIONS for land defense. (See Photo #7.) Because it faced possible naval bombardment, the riverside PARAPET was thicker than those found at other forts in the Defenses of Washington. The BANQUETTE, COUNTERSCARP gallery, and CAPONIÈRE on the river side of the earthworks are unique among the surviving forts from the Defenses of Washington; these elements provided additional protected firing positions for soldiers in the event of attack. The larger guns required for river defense necessitated the construction of granite and concrete artillery PLATFORMS, two of which remain intact from the Civil War era. It is the only fortification to retain original ordnance: two 15-inch Rodman cannons that were placed in the fort in 1864.\textsuperscript{40}

Fort Foote is also the only fort in the historic district that includes post-Civil War military resources. Surviving features that reflect the post-war military use of the fort include three of the five granite

\textsuperscript{35} Fort Stevens is a documented cultural landscape. See McMillen, CLI: Fort Stevens.
\textsuperscript{36} McMillen, CLI: Fort Stevens, pp. 23-61; Cooling and Owen, pp. 172-179.
\textsuperscript{37} The term “emplacement” is used here to refer to a prepared position for a gun within a fort or battery and includes the EMBRASURE, PLATFORM, and RAMP.
\textsuperscript{38} Fort DeRussy is a documented cultural landscape. See Garrison, CLI: Fort DeRussy.
\textsuperscript{39} Fort Foote is a documented cultural landscape. See Garrison, CLI: Fort Foote.
\textsuperscript{40} National Park Service, Fort Foote CRGIS GPS Report, pp. 5-8; Garrison, CLI: Fort Foote, pp. 27-29.
artillery emplacements\textsuperscript{41} and the King’s Depression Carriage Mount, which was built in 1869-1871 to support one of the Rodman cannons. Designed by U.S. Army Major W.K. King, this experimental mount employed a counterweight to raise the mount from a position below the parapet to firing position. The design was a predecessor to disappearing and hydraulic recoil carriages.\textsuperscript{42} The masonry structures -- the south magazine (1863; altered 1870s), the postern (circa 1870), and the north magazine and traverse (1872-1874) -- are described more fully below under the Masonry Structures heading (p. 25). The earthworks lie within the Fort Foote Archeological Site (see p. 41).

Like Forts Marcy, DeRussy and Foote, the extant earthworks at Fort Davis, Fort Dupont, and Fort Totten retain parapets or ditches around the entire perimeter of the fortification. Fort Davis (NACE, Map #17.5) and Fort Totten (ROCR, Map #13.4) are both seven-sided redoubts, and Fort Dupont (NACE, Map #17.4)\textsuperscript{43} is an enclosed, hexagonal fortification. Construction on all three began in 1861, but Forts Dupont and Totten were not completed until the following year. Although the perimeters of these forts remain intact, their earthen features are less defined than at Forts Marcy, DeRussy, and Foote. The parapets and ditches tend to be lower and shallower, and the slopes less steep. Associated features are less prominent as well and difficult to identify due to dense vegetation. (See Photo #9).

At five of the forts, sections of the original earthworks are missing, but the remaining sections are intact and the features are well-defined. Fort Chaplin (NACE, Map #16.3) was built in 1864 as an irregular, enclosed redoubt. A section of parapet at the western edge of the fort has been destroyed, but the ditch remains visible around the entire perimeter of the original fort. The surviving eastern section features elements of nine artillery emplacements,\textsuperscript{44} as well as a bombproof, magazine, sally port, and glacis. At Fort Ricketts (NACE, Map #18.1), which was constructed in 1861 as a four-faced lunette battery that is open at the rear, the west parapet and a ditch around the perimeter of the fort remain; the east parapet was removed in the late 19\textsuperscript{th} or early 20\textsuperscript{th} century.

Only one or two bastions survive at Fort Mahan, Fort Stanton, and Fort Carroll. Fort Mahan (NACE, Map #16.2)\textsuperscript{45} was constructed in 1861 as a rectangular redoubt with three bastions. Originally constructed as square redoubts, Fort Stanton (NACE, Map #18.1) and Fort Carroll (Shepherd Parkway, NACE, Map #19.1) were expanded in 1863 and 1863-1864, respectively, by the addition of bastions or bastionets\textsuperscript{46} at each of their four corners. Despite the loss of much of these forts, the distinctive shape of their surviving bastions, combined with well-defined parapets, ditches, and other features, enable these resources to be easily identified as historic military earthworks.

\textsuperscript{41} The term “emplacement” is used here to refer to a prepared position for a gun within a fort or battery and includes the embrasure, platform, and ramp.
\textsuperscript{43} Fort Dupont is a documented cultural landscape. See Lester, \textit{CLI: Fort Dupont}.
\textsuperscript{44} The term “emplacement” is used here to refer to a prepared position for a gun within a fort or battery and includes the embrasure, platform, and ramp.
\textsuperscript{45} Fort Mahan is a documented cultural landscape. See Lester, \textit{CLI: Fort Mahan}.
The two forts in the historic district that are classified as sites contain shallow, fragmentary traces of Civil War earthworks. The Fort Greble Site (Shepherd Parkway, NACE, Map #19.2) is a grassy area with scattered trees. Much of the 1861 octagonal fort was leveled by the late 19th century, when the area was occupied by a farm and dwelling. Low mounds of earth mark the locations of the BOMBPROOF (possibly added or expanded in 1863-1864) and the PARAPETS at the northwest and southwest ANGLES. The most prominent and recognizable remnant is a short but deep DITCH at the location of the fort’s south angle; a longer but shallower ditch marks the eastern edge of the original fortification. (See Figure 7-4.) Located at the top of a hill, the Fort Bunker Hill Site (ROCR, Map #14.1) offers views of the surrounding area. In addition to the topography, a shallow trace of the fort’s outer ditch, a parapet remnant, and the SALLY PORT indicate the former presence of the fort, which was constructed in 1861-1862 as an elongated, seven-sided REDOUBT.

**Batteries**

The BATTERIES in the Civil War Defenses of Washington were typically unenclosed earthworks with artillery emplacements; they were constructed between or in front of FORTS as an additional line of defense. The historic district contains five batteries that were located between forts and are counted as separate resources. Four batteries within the district are situated in the immediate vicinity of surviving forts (three at Fort Marcy and one at Fort Mahan) and were unnamed during the war; these are counted as features of the associated earthworks.

Three of the batteries in the district retain enough of their original configuration to be classified as structures. Constructed in 1862 as an auxiliary battery to prevent an enemy approach along Broad Branch and the road that ran alongside the waterway, Battery Broad Branch (ROCR, Map #11) is an angled battery with a well-defined PARAPET, DITCH, and GLACIS; three artillery PLATFORMS are evident in the west parapet (Photo #10). It was unmanned throughout the war. Approximately half of Battery Kemble (ROCR, Map #7.1), which was built in 1861, remains intact. After the war, the re-opening of Chain Bridge Road destroyed the battery’s northern FLANK, but the surviving southern flank features a parapet and deep ditch. Ross Drive in Rock Creek Park cuts through the remaining sections of Battery Rock Creek (Rock Creek Park, ROCR, Map #12 and Archeology Map #6), which was built in 1864 to guard a bridge over Rock Creek. The left wing of the battery has a rear ditch and a parapet with six well-defined artillery EMBRASURES (Photo #11); a fragment of the battery’s right wing is visible on the east side of Ross Drive. Like Battery Broad Branch, it was unmanned.

The remnants of two batteries, Battery Kingsbury and Reservoir Battery #2, are classified as sites. Located with Rock Creek Park, the Battery Kingsbury site (Fort DeRussy, Rock Creek Park, ROCR, Map #12.1) consists of a shallow mound and depression that represent the remnants of the southeastern end of the battery, which was constructed in 1863 as part of the outworks of Fort with views to the southwest and southeast. The site of the circa 1864 battery contains an oval-shaped mound of earth with a long, low slope towards the river; this formation is all that remains of the

---

47 The term “emplacement” is used here to refer to a prepared position for a gun within a fort or battery and includes the embrasure, platform, and ramp.

48 Cooling and Owen, p. 257.

49 Battery Kingsbury is a component feature of the Fort DeRussy cultural landscape. See Garrison, CLI: Fort DeRussy.
DeRussy. The **Reservoir Battery #2 Earthworks Site**[^50] (ROCR, Map #6) overlooks the Potomac River, battery’s **parapet**. The edges of the parapet and the southwest **angle** are rounded and not well-defined due to erosion.

Documented archeological sites related to these Civil War batteries exist at Battery Broad Branch, Battery Rock Creek, and Reservoir Battery #2 (see pp. 42-43).

**Rifle Trenches**

In the Civil War Defenses of Washington, a system of **rifle trenches** provided a first line of defense against attack, as well as secure lines of communication and transportation among the **forts** and **batteries**. Rifle trenches in the historic district that are adjacent to **fortifications** are included as features of the associated **earthworks** (Forts Marcy (GWMP), Greble (NACE), Mahan (NACE), DeRussy (ROCR), and Totten (ROCR)). Three rifle trenches in the historic district that are not adjacent to extant fortifications and are counted as separate contributing resources.

Three segments of the **Gulf Branch Rifle Trench** (GWMP, Map #4) remain at the mouth of Gulf Branch, where it empties into the Potomac River. The segment immediately southwest of the George Washington Memorial Parkway overpass is the most intact, with a well-defined **parapet** and **ditch**. The segment of parapet located northeast of the overpass is lower and more rounded (Photo #12), and the segment to the far southwest is barely visible due to erosion. Constructed in 1861-1862 as part of the connecting works between Forts Marcy and Ethan Allan, the rifle trench’s location presents clear views of Gulf Branch and the Potomac River, reflecting its historic use for military defense.

The **Spout Run Rifle Trench Site** (GWMP, Map #5) is situated on high ground above Spout Run, a tributary of the Potomac River, and encompasses remnants of the outworks constructed in 1861 to support Fort Strong (razed; not on NPS land). Due to erosion, the **parapet** and the north **angle** have little definition. The **Fort Slocum Rifle Trench Site** (ROCR, Map #13.3) also occupies an elevated location and contains a shallow depression marking the location of a rifle trench that was part of the outworks of Fort Slocum (razed; not on NPS land), which was constructed in 1861.

**Masonry Structures**

The **magazine** at **Fort Stanton Park** (NACE, Map #18.1) is the only Civil War-era masonry magazine in the district. Built in 1864, the stone magazine is covered with earth and features an arched opening and an intact interior with a vaulted brick ceiling.[^51]

[^50]: The archeological site associated with Reservoir Battery #2 is referred to as the Urban Ecology Center Site in the 2008 archeological report that identified this site and in ASMIS (the National Park Service’s database of archeological properties). For clarity and consistency, this nomination uses the historic name of the earthworks to identify both the visible and archeological resource. See John Bedell, Stuart Fiedel, and Charles LeeDecker, “**Bold, Rocky, and Picturesque**: Archeological Identification and Evaluation Study of Rock Creek Park, District of Columbia” (Washington, DC: National Capital Region, National Park Service, 2008), pp. 2:160, 162-163.

The masonry structures related to military use at Fort Foote (NACE, Map #20.2) were altered or constructed after the end of the Civil War in 1865. The south magazine was built as an earthen magazine with wooden supports during the Civil War. In the early 1870s, it was reinforced with masonry and appears currently as a vaulted brick magazine with a stuccoed interior (Photo #13). The north magazine and traverse were constructed in the 1870s as part of a larger plan to rebuild and expand the Civil War traverses, magazines, and bombproofs. One of the two vaulted concrete magazines in this complex remains intact. Although the roofs of the traverse and one of the magazines have partially or completely collapsed, the concrete walls and roofing that remain allow the magazines and traverse to be recognizable as below-ground military structures (Figure 7-7).

Several posterns, or tunnels, were located within Fort Foote during the Civil War, but the surviving postern was likely constructed after 1866. Located near the center of the fort’s southwest river face, the vaulted brick postern passes from the interior of the fort, through the parapet, to the ditch. Although subsequent military construction covered the interior entrance, the exterior entrance remains visible and the interior is intact.

Figure 7-7: North magazine and traverse at Fort Foote. Source: Evelyn D. Causey, Nov. 2014.

52 Fort Foote is a documented cultural landscape. See Garrison, CLI: Fort Foote.
53 The Historic Structures Report (HSR) on Forts Stanton, Ricketts, and Foote makes no mention of any masonry magazines at Fort Foote during the Civil War; all of the wartime magazines appear to have been constructed of earth with timber supports. Both the HSR and the Cultural Landscape Inventory (CLI) for Fort Foote note that one of the Civil War-era magazines was restored during the early 1870s. This suggests that the masonry present in the south magazine was added in the 1870s to reinforce an existing – and deteriorating – earthen structure. See Brown, pp. 76-78; Garrison, CLI: Fort Foote, p. 36.
54 Garrison, CLI: Fort Foote, p. 36; National Park Service, Fort Foote CRGIS GPS, p. 2.
Communications and Supply

Military resources in the historic district that are related to communications and supply routes include road traces, a bridge abutment, a wharf site, and covered ways. The Civil War road traces within the district appear as flattened areas approximately eight feet wide, often with a low mound of earth along one or both sides. Within Fort Marcy Park (GWMP, Map #2.1) are at least nine distinct road traces that make up the largest known collection of military road traces within the district (Photo #14). Another road trace is located in Fort Chaplin Park (NACE, Map #16.3), west of the earthworks. The Pimmit Run Bridge Abutment and Military Road (GWMP, Map #3) in Arlington County, Virginia, is associated with the military road that led from Fort Marcy to the Chain Bridge over the Potomac River, one of only a few crossing points between Virginia and Washington, D.C. during the Civil War. (Military roads that have been converted to trails or modern roads are described as part of the district’s circulation networks; see pp. 14-16.)

Situated approximately four miles south of the nearest fort and on the east side of the Potomac River, Fort Foote’s (NACE) primary link to the rest of the earthworks was the Potomac River. During the war, ships and boats docked at Fort Foote’s wharf, which the military replaced in 1872. Remnants of the 1872 wharf include wood pilings on the shore and in the river, as well as several tenoned timbers on the shore that are visible at low tide (Photo #8). The road leading from the wharf to the fort has been converted to a hiking trail. (See Map #20.1.)

In field fortifications, covered ways – roads or walkways that were shielded from the enemy’s view by a parapet – provided secure routes for the movement of troops and supplies to the front lines, and sometimes incorporated supply caches. The covered way and supply cache in Rock Creek Park (ROCR, Archeology Map #6) is the only such structure in the historic district (Photo #15). The depth of this zigzag excavation ranges from approximately 10 feet to 20 feet; two berms at the southwest end mark the location of the supply caches. Remnants of a covered way associated with Fort Carroll (Shepherd Parkway, NACE, Archeology Map #9) are located to the northwest of the extant fortifications and are also a documented archeological site (see p. 42)

In permanent fortifications, the term covered way refers to a protected route along the outer edge of the fort. A covered way of this type is located along the perimeter of Fort DeRussy (Rock Creek Park, ROCR, Map #12.1) and is included in the district as a contributing feature of that fort.

Support Buildings and Soldier Life

During the Civil War, the military constructed a variety of buildings to the rear of garrisoned forts within the Defenses of Washington, including barracks, officers’ quarters, mess houses, privies, guard houses, and headquarters. Nearly all of these buildings were dismantled or sold soon after the war, erasing the above-ground resources associated with soldiers’ daily life in the Defenses of Washington.

Two of the documented archeological sites in the historic district have the potential to reveal information about the life and work of soldiers at the forts during the Civil War. Archeological testing at

55 Fort Foote is a documented cultural landscape. See Garrison, CLI: Fort Foote.
56 Fort DeRussy is a documented cultural landscape. See Garrison, CLI: Fort DeRussy.
the site of the barracks at Fort Totten (ROCR, Archeology Map #8) indicated the presence of architectural remains and artifacts related to soldier life and housing. Investigations of the Civil War-era dump site at Fort DeRussy (Rock Creek Park, ROCR, Archeology Map #5) also revealed military artifacts associated with regiments that served at the fort during the war. See Archeological Resources, pp. 39-43 for additional information on these sites.

The icehouse at Fort Foote (NACE, Archeology Map #10) is the only Civil War-era structure or building in the historic district that remains intact. This cylindrical brick structure extends about five feet below grade and has a beehive roof. A portion of the front wall has collapsed and the door is missing, but overall, the structure retains integrity. The circular, brick well along the wharf road at Fort Foote may date to the Civil War period as well (Map #20.2).

Fort Foote Park contains several resources associated with soldier life at the fort during its post-war military use (1866-1878). In the late 1860s or early 1870s, the army replaced deteriorating wartime buildings and added several new buildings and structures. Intact resources dating to this period include the engineers’ storehouse (Photo #8) and a concrete horse trough. A site to the north of the fort contains remnants of the foundations of several of the support buildings, including barracks, a hospital, and laundresses’ quarters; another foundation in this area may relate to the officers’ quarters, or to an early 20th-century camping pavilion. Remnants of a bathhouse are located near the park entrance. (See Figure 7-8.)

Battlefields and Encampments

The Battle of Fort Stevens Archeological Site (Rock Creek Park, ROCR, Archeology Map #7) is associated with a skirmish that took place north of Fort DeRussy on July 12, 1864. Searching for a weak point in Washington, D.C.’s defenses, Confederate troops under the command of Lt. Gen. Jubal A. Early took a position along a ridge north of Fort DeRussy. In the afternoon of July 12th, Union Colonel John Marble of the 151st Ohio Infantry ordered a Veterans Reserve brigade to advance on the Confederates. With supporting fire from Fort DeRussy, the Veterans Reserve soldiers successfully pushed the Confederates back to the next ridge to the north. Archeologists have identified the location of this skirmish and recovered bullets and artillery fragments from the battlefield. For additional information on the archeological site, see Archeological Resources, pp. 39-43.

---


58 Fort Foote is a documented cultural landscape. See Garrison, CLI: Fort Foote.

59 In NPS’s archeological database, ASMIS, this site is named after its location – East of Parking Area 10. However, the Louis Berger Group’s 2008 report (Bedell, et al., “Bold, Rocky, and Picturesque,”), which first identified and described the site, refers to it as the Battle of Fort Stevens site; this more descriptive name is used in this nomination.

60 Bedell, et al., “Bold, Rocky, and Picturesque,” pp. 1:58-67; John Bedell and Stephen Potter, “‘The Sensation of This Week’: Archaeology and the Battle of Fort Stevens,” in From These Honored Dead: Historical Archaeology of
An **encampment site** (Rock Creek Park, ROCR, Archeology Map #6) is located in the vicinity of Battery Rock Creek in Rock Creek Park. Four depressions with entrance areas and scattered stones associated with chimneys mark the location of field huts. A road trace, a bunker that is more typical of field fortifications, and an unidentified excavation are present as well. This site may be associated with the VI Corps of the Union Army encampment during the Battle of Fort Stevens, or with the first camp location of the 10th Rhode Island Infantry, which arrived at Fort DeRussy in 1862. Further research and an archeological evaluation could confirm the site’s association with a specific encampment.\(^1\)

**Other Resources Related to the Civil War Defenses of Washington**

There are a number of resources that relate to the Civil War Defenses of Washington but are not included in this update and expansion of the Fort Circle Parks /Civil War Defenses of Washington Historic District. Many of these are potentially eligible for inclusion in the historic district.

In 2013, NPS staff identified a Civil War-era road trace extending more than 500 feet along a ridge above Spout Run in the George Washington Memorial Parkway. The road trace comprises a well-defined platform with a berm along the ridge line, and appears to retain sufficient integrity to contribute to the

---


---

*Figure 7-8: Map of Fort Foote, 1872. Source: National Archives: Geography and Map Division.*
The road is not included in the historic district because a significant portion of the road lies on privately owned land on which the NPS has only an easement. However, the road is a potentially contributing resource in the historic district.

There are other locations on NPS land where earthworks associated with the Defenses of Washington once stood, but no aboveground remnants exist and the archeological potential has not been formally evaluated. These include the sites of Battery Sill in Rock Creek Park (Washington, D.C.) and Fort Jackson in the George Washington Memorial Parkway (Arlington County, Va.).

Other potentially eligible sites and structures related to the Civil War Defenses of Washington are not on NPS land and thus could not be included in this nomination for administrative reasons. Local governments have preserved several forts and batteries associated with the Civil War Defenses of Washington as part of county or municipal parks:

- Battery Bailey in Westmoreland Park, Montgomery County, Maryland (Maryland National Capital Parks and Planning Commission),
- Fort C.F. Smith Park (NRHP, 2000) and Fort Ethan Allen Park (NRHP, 2004), Arlington County, Virginia (Arlington County Parks and Recreation),
- Fort Ward Museum and Historic Site (NRHP, 1982), Alexandria, Virginia (Office of Historic Alexandria), and
- Fort Willard Circle Park, Fairfax County, Virginia (Fairfax County Park Authority).

A parapet of Battery Jameson is located within Fort Lincoln Cemetery in Brentwood, Maryland (MIHP #PG-68-15a). In addition, at least three potentially intact fortifications or archeological sites associated with the Defenses of Washington are located on private land near the historic district: Battery Terrill on the grounds of the Peruvian Embassy at 3001 Garrison Street NW (Maps #10 and #11), Battery Martin Scott on the west side of Potomac Avenue NW near Chain Bridge, and Battery Alexander on the east side of MacArthur Boulevard NW near the Sangamore Recreation Center.

Potential archeological sites associated with the Civil War Defenses of Washington also exist on land that is adjacent to the NPS-owned fortifications and managed by the government of the District of Columbia. Inventories of the D.C. Department of Recreation’s historic resources have identified these

---


63 The Louis Berger Group, Inc., *Phase I Archeological Investigation: Arlington County and Vicinity Rowing Facility, George Washington Memorial Parkway* (prepared for U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, National Capital Region, October 2005). The archeologists noted the potential for deeply buried artifacts associated with Fort Jackson, but at the Phase I level, they were unable to test for the presence of archeological resources at that depth. Ground disturbance at the Battery Sill site is likely due to agricultural use after the end of the Civil War.

64 Cooling and Owen, pp. 203-206.
locations as archeologically sensitive due to the potential presence of artifacts related to the Civil War occupation of the site.\textsuperscript{65}

Commemorative Resources, 1863-1965

Most of the twenty-eight commemorative resources in the district are located at Battleground National Cemetery (ROCR), which is listed in the National Register as an individual site. In addition, seven monuments are located within the fort parks, primarily at Fort Stevens Park (ROCR).\textsuperscript{66}

Battleground National Cemetery

Battleground National Cemetery was listed in the National Register as an individual site in 1980. A 2010 update to the nomination extended the period of significance to 1936 (the date of the last burial in the cemetery) and defined the cemetery as significant under Criteria A, B, C, and D in the areas of military history, architecture, landscape architecture, and archeology (historic, non-aboriginal). In 2011, the Keeper of the National Register determined that the period of significance of national cemeteries should extend from the cemetery’s founding to the present, in recognition of their ongoing and historically significant commemorative role. In accordance with these guidelines, a 2014 Cultural Landscape Report for Battleground National Cemetery recommended it eligible under Criteria A and D with a period of significance from 1864 to the present, and under Criterion C with a period of significance from 1864-1936.\textsuperscript{67} However, as a component of the Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District, the period of significance for Battleground National Cemetery coincides with the district’s period of significance (1861-1972).

Established in 1864, Battleground National Cemetery (ROCR, Map #13.1)\textsuperscript{68} lies within the area where the Battle of Fort Stevens took place. The cemetery occupies a roughly square, one-acre property enclosed by a stone perimeter wall. A walkway leads east from the entrance gates (circa 1916-1920) on the west side of the property to the central feature of the cemetery: a circle of headstones surrounding a flagpole (1897). (See Figure 8-7.) A marble rostrum (1921) with eight Doric columns stands east of the headstone circle, and in line with the flagpole and entrance gate. Three cast-iron tablets (circa 1881) with selections from Theodore O’Hara’s poem, “Bivouac of the Dead,” are arrayed around the east side of the headstone circle, and two War Department tablets (1880-1890) embossed with the cemetery regulations are located on the north side of the entrance walkway. These tablets are representative of types that were installed at many national cemeteries. Four regimental monuments stand north of the entrance walk, roughly in a north-south line: the 25\textsuperscript{th} New York Volunteers Cavalry Monument (1914), the 98\textsuperscript{th} Pennsylvania Volunteers Monument (1891), the 122\textsuperscript{nd} New York Volunteers Monument (1904),


\textsuperscript{66} Battleground National Cemetery and Fort Stevens are documented cultural landscapes. See McMillen, \textit{CLI: Battleground National Cemetery, and McMillen, CLI: Fort Stevens.}


\textsuperscript{68} Battleground National Cemetery is a documented cultural landscape. See McMillen, \textit{CLI: Battleground National Cemetery.}
Two buildings stand within the cemetery: a superintendent’s lodge that is located south of the entrance walk and faces west towards Georgia Avenue NW, and a tool shed at the northwest corner of the cemetery. The superintendent’s lodge was built using standardized plans developed by Montgomery C. Meigs. As it was originally constructed in 1870, the lodge followed Meigs’s standard plan for a one-story residence with a hipped roof. Built of Seneca sandstone, the L-shaped lodge had three rooms, with a porch at the southwest corner to shelter the main entrance. After visiting the lodge at Battleground National Cemetery in 1872, Meigs recommended that it be altered to conform to the other standard plan that he created for cemetery superintendents’ lodges. This design called for a mansard roof to be constructed on top of the standard one-story building, creating a second floor that housed three bedrooms. The addition of the mansard roof and second story was completed in 1873, creating the present configuration of the main part of the lodge. A one-story, brick kitchen addition was added to the east elevation of the lodge in 1929-1930, and the interior was remodeled in 1934. Currently, most of the windows are replacement wood sash in a six-over-six configuration on the first floor and a two-over-two configuration on the second floor. The roof is clad in hexagonal slate shingles and features gabled dormers.

A driveway at the northwest corner of the cemetery provides access to a four-bay, shed-roofed, brick tool shed that stands just inside the perimeter wall. Constructed in 1906-1907 and expanded in 1935, the tool shed features a molded brick water table, brick cornice, and stepped brick parapets. The south elevation incorporates two windows, a pedestrian door, and a garage door.

Monuments and Memorials at Civil War Forts

Eight monuments in the historic district commemorate the Civil War and the Defenses of Washington. As the target of the only Confederate assault on Washington during the Civil War, Fort Stevens (ROCR, Map #13.2) became the focus of early 20th-century commemorative activities at the forts. In 1911, the Military Park Association placed a boulder on the spot where President Abraham Lincoln observed the Battle of Fort Stevens; nine years later, the VI Army Corps added to the boulder a bronze bas relief depicting Lincoln observing the battle (Photo #3). The Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War monument was erected in 1936 to honor the Grand Army of the Republic and consists of a bronze bas relief model of Fort Stevens mounted on a concrete pedestal.

In the mid-20th century, the Colonial Dames of America and the National Park Service erected commemorative markers at some of the fort parks. Placed in 1955-1956, the Colonial Dames of America

69 Not all resources within the cemetery are described here, since the cemetery is already well-documented in the National Register through its individual listing, particularly the 2010 expanded nomination form prepared by Maria S. Dayton and Laura V. Trieschmann of EHT Traceries.
71 Fort Stevens is a documented cultural landscape. See McMillen, CLI: Fort Stevens.
monuments at Fort Davis (NACE, Map #17.5) and Fort Dupont (NACE, Map #17.4)\textsuperscript{72} are large boulders with bronze plaques that provide information about the fort during the Civil War. To commemorate the centennial of the Civil War, the National Park Service placed similar but smaller monuments adjacent to at least four forts: Fort Bunker Hill (ROCR, Map #14.1), Fort Totten (ROCR, Map #13.4), Fort DeRussy (Rock Creek Park, ROCR, Map #12.1),\textsuperscript{73} and Fort Reno (ROCR, Map #10.1). (See Photos #6, 16.) Documentary research has not shown how many such monuments the NPS planned or installed. The bronze plaque at Fort Reno was replaced in kind in 2014 following the theft of the original bronze plaque. Although the replacement of the plaque diminishes the monument’s integrity of materials, it still retains all other aspects of integrity and is a contributing resource.

Park Development, 1920-1972

The district encompasses twenty-one resources associated with the development of the forts as parks and the creation of a ring of parkland connecting the fort parks. Most of these resources are located east of the Anacostia River, and were built either by the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) in the 1930s, or by the NPS from the 1940s through the 1960s. Park-related resources constructed by the CCC include a segment of Fort Drive, the partial reconstruction of Fort Stevens, an amphitheater, and a picnic area. Comfort stations, a golf course and clubhouse, and a hiker-biker trail are the most notable park-related resources added by the NPS.

Fort Drive

Fort Davis Drive SE (NACE, Map #), which connects Fort Davis Park (NACE) and Fort Dupont Park (NACE) is the most complete and intact segment of the planned ring road known as Fort Drive (Photo #17). The CCC built most of the present-day Fort Davis Drive between 1935 and 1937. (See Figures 8-12 and 8-13.) Within Fort Dupont Park, CCC workers graded the segment of Fort Davis Drive that lies north of a deep stream valley that crosses the route, but this section of the road was not completed until the late 1950s, after the federal government appropriated funds to construct a bridge over the valley.\textsuperscript{74} The CCC also built a segment continuing south and west from Pennsylvania Avenue SE (Fort Drive: Fort Dupont Park to Fort Stanton Park, NACE) that fell into disuse in the 1950s or 1960s; it is not clear whether or not this section was ever paved.\textsuperscript{75} The northeastern portion of this roadbed now serves as part of the Fort Circle Park Hiker-Biker Trail (NACE, Map #17.1).

\textsuperscript{72} Fort Dupont is a documented cultural landscape. See Lester, \textit{CLI: Fort Dupont}.

\textsuperscript{73} Fort DeRussy is a documented cultural landscape; however, this monument does not contribute to the cultural landscape because it was not erected during the cultural landscape’s period of significance. See Garrison, \textit{CLI: Fort DeRussy}.

\textsuperscript{74} Harold B. Rogers, “Senate Expected to Pass Money Bill for Interior,” \textit{The Evening Star} [Washington, DC], June 5, 1956, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{75} The evolution of Fort Davis Drive SE is evident on historic aerial photographs from 1949 to 1980; these photographs are available at http://www.historicaerials.com (accessed December 15, 2014). The aerial photographs from the late 1940s and early 1950s show a clearly defined road with a width similar to that of the constructed road segments, but it is impossible to determine the materials. Quadrangle maps from the era show it as a roadway, suggesting that it was passable and being used as a road. However, the quadrangle maps from the late 1940s also show Fort Davis Drive as a continuous roadway within Fort Dupont Park, extending from Massachusetts Avenue SE to Ridge Road SE, while aerial photographs from the same era clearly show a gap in roadway construction.
The CCC also built Fort Dupont Drive within Fort Dupont Park (NACE)\textsuperscript{76} as a secondary parkway leading through the park to Fort Drive. Ultimately, the NPS intended Fort Dupont Drive to be part of a connecting parkway between Fort Drive and Anacostia Park, but this plan was never realized. As built, Fort Dupont Drive provided access from Fort Drive to the west corner of the park via the Ridge Picnic Area, one of two picnic areas built in the park by the CCC in the 1930s. Mature trees with occasional grassy areas line both Fort Davis Drive and Fort Dupont Drive, which feature gentle curves that follow the topography. Most sections of the two-lane, asphalt-paved roads have neither shoulders nor curbs; concrete curbs are located primarily at intersections. Stone gutters laid by CCC crews line shallow swales in some locations.\textsuperscript{77}

In addition to building new roads, plans for Fort Drive also called for utilizing existing streets. For example, in 1902, when the Senate Park Commission offered the first detailed plan for Fort Drive, it proposed using what is now Nebraska Avenue NW to connect Fort Reno and Battery Kemble; accordingly, several U.S. reservations were acquired along Nebraska Avenue NW, including Ward Circle and Tenley Circle (Maps #9 and #10).\textsuperscript{78} Military Road NW, which passes through Rock Creek Park south of Fort DeRussy (Map #12.1), was also intended to be incorporated into Fort Drive.\textsuperscript{79}

Two additional segments of the proposed Fort Drive were constructed and remain intact within and adjacent to Fort Reno Park (ROCR, Map #10.1); both segments are currently called Fort Drive NW. The segment of Fort Drive NW that passes through the park immediately south of Alice Deal Middle School was constructed in the late 1930s or early 1940s, possibly extending an original driveway leading to the school. This segment is not distinguishable from other city streets and does not convey its history as part of a proposed parkway. The other segment of Fort Drive NW continues south from Fort Reno Park to Tenley Circle, where the route for Fort Drive joined with Nebraska Avenue NW (Photo #18). This roadway was completed sometime between 1931 and 1949. The CCC worked on this section of Fort Drive, and may have completed it. A one-block segment of this road located south of Fort Reno Park retains landscape features associated with its development as part of Fort Drive, notably the grassy area along its east side and its spatial relationship to 40\textsuperscript{th} Street NW, which runs parallel to Fort Drive NW.\textsuperscript{80}

\textsuperscript{76} Fort Dupont is a documented cultural landscape. See Lester, CLI: Fort Dupont.

\textsuperscript{77} The other picnic area, the Pine Woods Picnic Area, was located east of Fort Davis Drive. It was removed after 1966. Robinson & Associates (2004), pp. 62-64, 90-94, 11; Lisa Pfueller Davidson and James A. Jacobs, Civilian Conservation Corps Activities in the National Capital Region of the National Park Service, Historic American Buildings Survey No. DC-858 (National Park Service, 2004), pp. 30-31.


\textsuperscript{79} NCPPC, “Fort Drive Section D: (DeRussy – Stevens) Project Plan,” March 1932 (NPS National Capital Region Map Database, File No. 832_82414). These and similar roads associated with Fort Drive are not counted as structures in the district because they are not owned by NPS, but the adjacent federal reservations are included in the district.

The CCC did some work along the proposed Fort Drive route between Fort Slocum and Fort Totten (Res. 497), but there is no evidence that they completed any roads in this area.\(^8\)

**Civilian Conservation Corps**

In addition to building sections of Fort Drive, the CCC completed a variety of other projects in the Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District, including erecting recreational facilities and support structures and partially restoring Fort Stevens. At most of the fort parks, the CCC primarily cleared and graded land, cleaned up trash, seeded and sodded, planted trees, and laid out trails and picnic areas.\(^8\) Most of the extant resources related to CCC projects are located in three parks: Fort Dupont Park, Fort Bunker Hill Park, and Fort Stevens Park.

One of the CCC camps in the Washington, DC area was located at Fort Dupont Park (NACE).\(^8\) Although the camp buildings have been demolished, evidence of the CCC’s work in the park remains visible in the landscape. Workers from the Fort Dupont camp performed labor at several parks in the area, including Fort Dupont Park, where they cleared play fields and began work on a golf course. A community garden occupies the site of a play meadow that the CCC created at the intersection of Fort Dupont Drive and Fort Davis Drive. The golf course was completed in the 1940s, and is described in more detail below (see p. 37). A small stone memorial outside the maintenance building, which stands near the location of the CCC camp, honors Robert Fechner, the first director of the CCC.\(^8\) (See Maps #17.2 and #17.3.)

Fort Dupont Park was also the site of two picnic areas built by the CCC, only one of which survives. Constructed between 1935 and 1937, the Ridge Picnic Area (Map #17.2) retains most of its original layout and is the most well-preserved of the five picnic areas built by the CCC in the fort parks. Located in a wooded area southwest of Fort Dupont Drive, the Ridge Picnic Area features picnic sites laid out on either side of a one-lane paved road that curves along a ridge. Features dating to the 1930s include stone fireplaces at some of the picnic sites, stone gutters, and wood posts along the road (Figure 7-9). The Pine Woods Picnic Area at Fort Dupont Park was removed in the late 20\(^{th}\) century. The other three picnic areas that the CCC constructed are located at Fort Mahan Park (NACE, Map #16.2), Fort Bunker Hill Park (ROCR, Map #14.1), and Barnard Hill Park (ROCR, Map #14). These sites retain only the cleared, open area created for picnicking.\(^8\)

In addition to the cleared picnic area, Fort Bunker Hill Park (ROCR, Map #14.1) includes several trails constructed by the CCC, as well as an amphitheater.\(^8\) The stone stage of the amphitheater remains largely intact beneath leaf cover and features a curved apron at its western edge, facing the seating area. The logs that served as benches in the terraced seating area have deteriorated, but many remain in place and the terracing is still evident.

\(^8\) Davidson and Jacobs, p. 83.
\(^8\) Davidson and Jacobs, pp. 83, 88-89, 96-100, 102-103.
\(^8\) Fort Dupont is a documented cultural landscape. See Lester, *CLI: Fort Dupont*.
\(^8\) Robinson & Associates (2004), pp. 124, 141; Davidson and Jacobs, pp. 87, 97-100.
\(^8\) Fort Mahan is a documented cultural landscape. See Lester, *CLI: Fort Mahan*. Davidson and Jacobs, pp. 88-89 (Barnard Hill), 96-97 (Fort Bunker Hill), 98-100 (Fort Dupont), 102-103 (Fort Mahan).
\(^8\) Davidson and Jacobs, pp. 96-97.
As part of the effort to improve and develop the fort parks, the CCC cleaned up several of the historic earthworks by removing or cutting back overgrown vegetation and seeding slopes. In 1940, CCC workers built a seawall along the Potomac River shoreline below Fort Foote (NACE, Map #20) to prevent erosion; over time, the rip-rap seawall eroded and appears now as rocks on the shoreline.87

Between 1936 and 1938, workers from the CCC completed a partial reconstruction of Fort Stevens (ROCR, Map #13.2), the focal point of the Battle of Fort Stevens in 1864 (Figure 7-10). The CCC excavated the DITCH, built up the earthen PARAPET, and installed a replica of the REVETMENT on the interior of the parapet. The revetment is constructed of concrete molded to resemble logs. Seven artillery emplacements, including EMBRASURES, WOOD PLATFORMS, and earthen RAMPS were added during the partial restoration as well. The MAGAZINE is an earthen mound with a false door that was replaced in 2010.88

(See Photo #3.)

---

87 Ibid., pp. 83, 100. Fort Foote is a documented cultural landscape. See Garrison, CLI: Fort Foote.
88 McMillen, CLI: Fort Stevens, pp. 59-62; Davidson and Jacobs, p. 103.
Mid-20th-Century Recreational Facilities

From 1948 until 1972, **Fort Dupont Park** (NACE)\(^{89}\) included a golf course (Map #17.3) in the northern part of the park. Designed by noted golf course architect William F. Gordon, the course initially had nine holes; in 1957, the course was expanded to eighteen holes. (See Figure 8-16.) The most intact section of the golf course comprises three fairways to the north, east and southeast of the activity center (Photo #19). The fairways to the north and east of the activity center (former golf clubhouse) were part of the original 1948 golf course. The activity center faces the east fairway, which was the first hole in the golf course. A fairway that was added as part of the 1957 expansion survives as a small clearing to the southeast of the activity center parking lot. Together, these three fairways form a contributing site in the historic district. Sections of fairways remain in other parts of Fort Dupont Park, and differences in vegetation type and density mark the location of other parts of the course. However, these landscape elements do not retain sufficient integrity to convey their history as part of a golf course.\(^{90}\) A wooden bridge to the south of the maintenance building may be associated with the golf course as well, but further research is needed to determine when and why the bridge was constructed.

The current activity center was originally built as the clubhouse for the golf course (Map #17.2 and #17.3; Photo #19). In 1948, National Capital Parks architect William M. Haussmann sketched out a

---

\(^{89}\) Fort Dupont is a documented cultural landscape. The resources described in this section were added after the cultural landscape’s period of significance or lie outside the CLI boundary. See Lester, *CLI: Fort Dupont*.

design for a clubhouse, and the architectural firm of Pielstick & Syme Associates prepared plans based on Haussmann’s sketches. Located at the end of a driveway north of Fort Dupont Drive, the clubhouse faced northeast towards the fairway for the first hole of the golf course. This one-story building comprises a brick, side-gable center section flanked by concrete, hipped-roof wings. An ell with a hipped roof extends from the northwest end of the rear elevation, and a concrete patio is nestled between the center section and the rear ell. With its low profile, concrete construction, and textured façade, the building’s design presages some of the characteristics of the Park Service Modern style that was widely deployed during NPS’s Mission 66 rebuilding program. Its wide, overhanging eaves, low profile, and outdoor patio also reflect the style of contemporary Ranch houses. In the early 1970s, the NPS converted it for use as an activity center, resulting in several alterations to the interior and exterior, including “removal of the dormer windows and substitution of solid doors for the glass doors.”

The NPS created the Randle Picnic Area at the western edge of Fort Dupont Park and the picnic area adjacent to the Fort Dupont earthworks in the 1950s. Both areas are grassy with scattered mature trees and picnic tables. Built in 1954, the brick comfort station near the Fort Dupont earthworks is the oldest comfort station in the historic district (Photo #21). In 1958, Haussmann and William Dennin designed the picnic shelter addition, creating the current T-shaped footprint. The picnic shelter features open sides, exposed roof trusses, and a stone fireplace. The concrete-block comfort stations at the Ridge and Randle picnic areas in Fort Dupont Park were built circa 1970, and are similar in design to comfort stations built in the National Capital Region as part of the National Park Service’s Mission 66 program.

The oldest section of the Fort Circle Park Hiker-Biker Trail (NACE, Map #17.1) was completed by 1971 and contributes to the historic district because of its association with the development of the Fort Circle Parks in the late 1960s and early 1970s, particularly the National Park Service’s 1968 Master Plan for the parks. The contributing segment is an unpaved trail that begins at the intersection of Ridge Road SE

---

and Texas Avenue SE, continues south through various U.S. Reservations associated with the Fort Circle Parks, and terminates at Good Hope Road SE (Photo #22). A portion of the trail between Pennsylvania Avenue SE and Branch Avenue SE follows the route of a segment of Fort Drive constructed by the Civilian Conservation Corps in the 1930s. Subsequent trail construction has extended the trail north to Fort Mahan Park and south to Fort Ricketts Park.

The Eastland Commons Garden Fountain (Fort Drive: Anacostia Park to Fort Mahan Park, NACE, Map #16.1) illustrates the development of the Fort Drive lands as neighborhood parks, as outlined in the 1968 Fort Circle Parks Master Plan. Located on a tract of land acquired for Fort Drive, the concrete fountain was erected in 1965-1966 for the Eastland Garden Civic Association. In the late 1950s, Rheudine Davis of the Eastland Gardens Flower Club began negotiating with the National Park Service for permission to beautify the triangular area at the entrance to the Eastland Gardens neighborhood. Volunteer landscape designers drew up plans for the park and concrete fountain, which marked the entrance to the Eastland Gardens neighborhood. Construction drawings suggest that NPS built the fountain.

### Archeological Resources

All of the areas in the historic district that are associated with Civil War Defenses of Washington have the potential to yield archeological information about the history of the nation’s capital and surrounding areas during the Civil War. However, the archeological potential of the vast majority of the historic district has yet to be professionally evaluated. The earthworks that were garrisoned during the war have particularly high archeological potential, and limited investigations at Forts Davis, Dupont, and Mahan (all NACE) confirmed that archeological sites on and around the earthworks in these parks likely retain integrity. Although this nomination acknowledges the archeological potential of much of the historic district, the contributing archeological sites are limited to those that have been formally identified and recorded in NPS or State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archeological databases.

The historic district contains four contributing archeological sites associated with the Civil War Defenses of Washington. Three of these – the Fort DeRussy dump site (Rock Creek Park, ROCR), the Battle of Fort Stevens site (Rock Creek Park, ROCR), and the Fort Totten barracks site (ROCR) – were identified and evaluated between 2002 and 2006 as part of an archeological inventory of Rock Creek Park and selected areas managed by the Rock Creek Park administrative unit. The inventory was conducted by the Louis Berger Group, Inc. on behalf of the NPS, National Capital Region. The results were published in 2008 under the title “Bold, Rocky, and Picturesque: Archeological Identification and Evaluation Study of Rock
Creek Park, District of Columbia. The fourth contributing archeological site in the Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District is located at Fort Foote (NACE); this site is also associated with the fort’s post-Civil War military use.

In addition to these four sites, five documented archeological sites are contributing features of the associated earthworks site or structure, but are not counted as separate resources (see pp. 42-43).99

Fort Totten Barracks Site (ROCR, DC #51NE37, Archeology Map #8)

The Fort Totten Barracks Site is located south of the Fort Totten earthworks (Photo #16). A gravel road passes through the site, which is mostly grassy and functions as a picnic area.

During the Civil War, two barracks buildings, a mess hall, and several officers’ quarters stood within the area that makes up the Fort Totten Barracks Site. After the war, the buildings were demolished, and the site was use for farming. During the late 19th and early 20th centuries, a dwelling stood at the southern end of the site.

Archeological investigations indicated that there has been minimal ground disturbance and that the site is intact. Most of the sixty shovel tests were positive for artifacts associated with the 19th-century use of the site. Although some of the artifacts are associated with non-military occupation during the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the excavations yielded artifacts from the Civil War era as well. Nineteenth-century artifacts recovered from the site include ceramics, bottles, and architectural materials.100

Fort DeRussy Dump Site (Rock Creek Park, ROCR, DC #51NW159, Archeology Map #5)

In 2004, archeological testing to the rear (southeast) of the fortification identified the site of a dump associated with Fort DeRussy. The site occupies the steep slope of a ravine and is bounded on the northwest by the gravel road that runs behind the fort. During the Civil War, barracks buildings and mess halls were located in the level area between the fort and the dump site.

A metal detector survey and shovel tests identified a variety of artifacts associated with the Civil War occupation of the site, including a bayonet scabbard tip, bullets, uniform buttons, pipe fragments, glass bottles, and ceramics. The site also contained architectural fragments. Since the archeological site itself is not suitable for building construction, these fragments likely come from buildings that stood in the adjacent level area. Historic artifacts were scattered throughout the site, but shovel tests indicated a dense concentration of artifacts in its eastern portion.101

99 The updated individual National Register listing for Battleground National Cemetery (ROCR) identifies it as significant under Criterion D. However, since no professional archeological work has been conducted to define or evaluate the site, it is not considered to be an archeological site within the Fort Circle Parks Historic District. Dayton and Trieschmann, p. 15. Battleground National Cemetery is a documented cultural landscape. See McMillen, CLI: Battleground National Cemetery.


Battle of Fort Stevens Archeological Site (Rock Creek Park, ROCR, DC #51NW163, Archeology Map #7)

The Battle of Fort Stevens Archeological Site is located on the east bank of Rock Creek, approximately 6,400 feet northeast of Fort DeRussy. Metal detector surveys of this area conducted for the NPS by archeologists from the Louis Berger Group over a three-year period yielded an assortment of Minié bullets that were fired into the area by Union firearms, including Sharps .52 caliber carbines, .54 caliber Burnside carbines, and .58-caliber rifled muskets. The site also included two artillery shell fragments from the Civil War era. One came from a 24-pounder Coehorn mortar and one from a 100-pounder Parrott rifle.

Documentary research on the Battle of Fort Stevens linked these artifacts to the Union advance on a Confederate skirmish line along a ridge to the north of Fort DeRussy between the afternoon of July 11, 1864 and the early morning of July 12. The location of Site #51NW163 and the presence of bullets discharged from both infantry and cavalry firearms is consistent with descriptions of the skirmish in written accounts of the battle. In addition, the artillery fragments found at the site match guns at Fort DeRussy that fired at Confederate sharpshooters during the battle.  

Fort Foote Archeological Site (NACE, ASMIS #NACE00027.000, Archeology Map #10)  

The archeological site at Fort Foote Park encompasses the entire park, which is situated on a high bluff adjacent to the Potomac River. The most extensive archeological evaluation of the park to date occurred in 2007, when the Louis Berger Group, Inc. conducted archeological monitoring on behalf of Malcolm Pirnie, Inc. and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The monitoring focused on four areas: the ditch of the Fort Foote earthworks, the dirt and gravel road leading south from the earthworks to the radio tower, the picnic grounds to the east of the earthworks, and the former parade ground to the north of the earthworks. Together, the four locations yielded a small collection of artifacts associated with the military occupation of the fort between 1861 and 1878, including a brass button from a military uniform, discarded building materials, an iron artillery fuse, a bottle fragment, and a brick foundation wall. Most of the artifacts were recovered from the surface (A-horizon) soils. In 2011, NPS staff agreed that the Fort Foote archeological site should encompass the entire park in order to cover the building ruins and earthworks, as well as other potential archeological sites.

The 2007 investigations also uncovered materials believed to be associated with the fort’s use as a training facility during World War I, but the report does not provide detailed information about the artifacts recovered from this era, nor does it evaluate the site’s potential to reveal information about the fort’s 20th-century history. A 2010 report identified the presence of concrete foundations of observation towers constructed during the World War I occupation of the site.

---

103 Fort Foote is a documented cultural landscape. See Garrison, CLI: Fort Foote.
104 Charles LeeDecker and Jason Shellenhamer (The Louis Berger Group, Inc.), Archeological Monitoring of Site Inspection at Fort Foote Park, Prince George’s County, Maryland (prepared for Malcolm Pirnie, Inc., August 2007).
105 See ASMIS Record #NACE00027.000.
A handful of prehistoric archeological finds suggest the possible presence of a Late Archaic camp on the bluff. However, it is likely that the site has been disturbed by subsequent use.  

Archeological Sites Associated with Earthworks

**Fort Marcy (GWMP, VDHR #44FX17, Map #2.1)**

The archeological site associated with Fort Marcy, which overlooks the approaches to Chain Bridge, is potentially rich in artifacts and features associated with its military use during the Civil War. The main fort and its outworks are among the most well-preserved of the forts in the Civil War Defenses of Washington, suggesting a low level of ground disturbance (Photos #4-5). In 1993, a metal detector survey in the area of the existing parking lot was conducted as part of the investigation into the death of Vince Foster, General Counsel to President Bill Clinton. The metal detector survey revealed the presence of a substantial number of artifacts related to the military occupation of the site during the Civil War. These artifacts were recovered and accessioned by the NPS. No official report was prepared, but a professional article is available to the public. See Robert C. Sonderman, “Looking for a Needle in a Haystack: Developing Closer Relationships between Law Enforcement Specialists and Archaeology,” *Historical Archaeology* 35:1 (2001): 70-78 (http://www.jstor.org/stable/25616894 (accessed December 11, 2014)). Based on the large amount of material recovered in 1993 and the low level of disturbance at the site, a 2006 assessment by NPS archeologists concluded that the site has exceptional potential to reveal information about the Civil War era.

**Fort Carroll Covered Way (Shepherd Parkway, NACE, DC #51SE065, Archeology Map #9)**

The Fort Carroll Covered Way Site was identified during a 2010 archeological assessment of a portion of Shepherd Parkway. The covered way is located west of Fort Carroll and extends from South Capitol Street to the north side of the fort’s southwest bastion. The extant depression, which is approximately six feet deep, aligns with a road that connected Fort Carroll with the U.S. cavalry depot at Gainsborough Point on the Potomac River.

A portion of the covered way located near South Capitol Street has been disturbed as a result of road construction and dumping, while the eastern section appears to be undisturbed. Metal detection along the north wall of the covered way revealed four fired bullets and one additional bullet dating to the Civil War.

**Battery Broad Branch (ROCR, DC #51NW169, Archeology Map #4)**

**Battery Rock Creek (Rock Creek Park, ROCR, DC #51NW168, Map #12 and Archeology Map #6)**

At Battery Broad Branch (Photo #10) and Battery Rock Creek (Photo #11), the surviving earthworks constitute the only documented military feature of the archeological site. Both batteries were unmanned during the Civil War. In 2004, archeologists from the Louis Berger Group, Inc. conducted metal detector surveys of the interiors of Battery Broad Branch and Battery Rock Creek, but located no 19th-century artifacts. No test excavations were performed in these locations.

---

107 LeeDecker and Shellenhamer, *Archeological Monitoring of Site Inspection at Fort Foote Park*, pp. 5, 9, 16. This report includes mention of two prehistoric artifacts (flakes) that were recovered from the southern end of the parade ground in 2006.
Reservoir Battery #2 Site (ROCR, DC #51NW175, Archeology Map #1)

In 2004, archeologists performed ten shovel tests at the site of Reservoir Battery #2, an unmanned battery that overlooked the Potomac River to the southwest and the reservoir to the north. The four tests closest to the remnants of the earthen battery yielded 19th-century artifacts such as ceramic sherds, glass fragments, and nails, but none of these were of military origin.

Cultural Landscapes

In the 1990s, the NPS initiated the Cultural Landscapes Inventory (CLI) to support the management of historically significant cultural landscapes owned by the agency. The NPS defines a cultural landscape as "a geographic area, including both cultural and natural resources and the wildlife or domestic animals therein, associated with an historic event, activity, or person, or exhibiting other cultural or aesthetic values." The CLI identifies, documents, and evaluates these landscapes, providing data "on their location, historical development, characteristics and features, condition and management."

CLIs have been completed for six cultural landscapes in the Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District: Fort Dupont (NACE), Fort Foote (NACE), Fort Mahan (NACE), Battleground National Cemetery (ROCR), Fort Stevens (ROCR), and Fort DeRussy in Rock Creek Park (ROCR). Through the CLI, these five cultural landscapes have been determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. As a result, they are counted as contributing sites in the historic district. A CLI for Fort Marcy (GWMP) was started in 2014, and one for Fort Bunker Hill (ROCR) is scheduled to be completed in 2016. These and other cultural landscapes within the district may be added as contributing sites to the historic district after a CLI has been completed.

Fort Dupont Cultural Landscape (NACE, CLI #600079, Map #17.2)

The Fort Dupont cultural landscape encompasses approximately 35.5 acres at the southeast corner of Fort Dupont Park, including the Civil War earthworks and adjacent picnic area. A ravine defines the cultural landscape’s north and west boundaries, Burns Street SE represents its east boundary, and Alabama Avenue SE forms its south boundary.

Fort Dupont was constructed during the winter of 1861-1862, inaugurating the Fort Dupont cultural landscape’s use as a military fortification. At the end of the war in 1865, the U.S. Army abandoned the fort, and the pre-war owner established a farm near the earthworks. In 1916, the federal government acquired Fort Dupont and the surrounding area for use as a public park in accordance with the 1902 Senate Park Commission’s plans for parks in Washington, D.C. A tree nursery for the District of Columbia was located north of the earthworks from 1918 through much of the 1940s. From 1933 to 1941, the

---

111 Margaret Lester (University of Pennsylvania), Cultural Landscapes Inventory [CLI]: Fort Dupont, National Capital Parks-East – Fort Circle Park-East (prepared for National Park Service, National Capital Region, 2013).
Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks

Cultural Landscape

Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) completed several projects in and around the fort, mostly clearing vegetation. The late 1940s and early 1950s saw additional park development, including the demolition of the late 19th-century farm buildings, the creation of a picnic area, and the construction of a comfort station and picnic shelter (Photo #21).

The cultural landscape’s three periods of significance reflect its Civil War military history (1861-1865), its early development as a park (1901-1927), and the CCC’s work in the park (1933-1941). The topography, the earthworks, and isolated elements of the circulation pattern retain integrity to the Civil War era, but overall, the Fort Dupont cultural landscape does not retain integrity to the period between 1861 and 1865. The current land use, spatial organization, elements of the circulation pattern, and vegetation are primarily associated with the 20th-century periods of significance (1901-1927 and 1933-1941) that relate to the cultural landscape’s development as a park. The views and vistas and the small-scale features do not retain integrity to any of the cultural landscape’s periods of significance. The Colonial Dames monument, the comfort station with attached picnic shelter, and the Alabama Avenue bridge do not contribute to the cultural landscape because they were erected after 1941, but these resources do contribute to the historic district.

Fort Foote Cultural Landscape (NACE, CLI #600084, Map #20)\(^{112}\)

The land that is now Fort Foote Park was used for agricultural purposes from the early 18th century until 1862, when the federal government seized it in order to construct a fortification to defend Washington, D.C. from a naval attack. Built 1863-1865, Fort Foote is the only Civil War fortification in the historic district that continued to function as an active military post for any appreciable amount of time after the war ended.\(^{113}\) The U.S. Army decommissioned the fort in 1878, but continued to own the property until 1930 and used it occasionally for military purposes in the early 20th century. Informal recreational use of the site began in the early 20th century, and continued after it became a federally owned public park in 1930. The periods of significance for the cultural landscape reflect its military use (1863-1865 and 1865-1878) and its early development as a park (1902-1934).

The topography is an important character-defining feature of the Fort Foote Park cultural landscape, particularly for the military era. Military officials selected the site for the fort because of its location on a high bluff overlooking the Potomac River (Photo #7). The landscape’s spatial organization, small-scale features, circulation patterns, views and vistas, vegetation, and buildings and structures retain integrity to the military period (1861-1878). Elements of the circulation patterns and the current land use convey the landscape’s early 20th-century history as a park.


\(^{113}\) The military used some of the other forts for storage or training for a few years after the war, but by 1870, only Fort Foote was being used for defensive purposes. The fortifications at Fort Whipple in Arlington, Virginia were abandoned at the close of the war, but in 1869, a military signal school was established on the grounds. In 1881, the name was changed to Fort Myer, and the post is currently designated Joint Base Fort Myer-Henderson Hall. CHEP Incorporated, *A Historic Resources Study: The Civil War Defenses of Washington*, Part 2 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2005), pp. 1:12-13 and 2:4-8.
Fort Mahan Cultural Landscape (NACE, CLI #600081, Map #16.2)\textsuperscript{114}

The Fort Mahan cultural landscape encompasses all of the 38.25-acre Fort Mahan Park in northeast Washington, D.C. Built in 1861, Fort Mahan was part of a system of earthen fortifications constructed by the U.S. Army to defend the city from enemy attack during the Civil War. After the war ended in 1865, the site returned to private ownership and was used for agriculture and mining. In 1925, Congress authorized the acquisition of former Civil War Defenses of Washington sites, including Fort Mahan, with the goal of creating a ring of parks surrounding the city. The federal government assembled the land for Fort Mahan Park between 1928 and 1933. In 1935, the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) began work to develop the site into a park; the conclusion of the CCC’s work at Fort Mahan Park in 1941 marks the end of the cultural landscape’s second period of significance. The site continues to function as a public park. The periods of significance for the cultural landscape reflect its historical use as a military fortification during the Civil War (1861-1865) and as a park (1925-1941).

Situated on a ridge 160 feet above sea level, the site of Fort Mahan provides views of the surrounding area; its topographical situation was a key reason for its selection as a fortification site during the Civil War (Photo #20). The extant sections of the Civil War earthworks also relate to the military period of significance for the Fort Mahan cultural landscape. The park’s spatial organization, vegetation, and circulation pattern are associated with the period of park development (1925-1941), especially the work of the CCC in the park. No known small-scale features remain from either period of significance, though further research is needed to determine the date of the football uprights. Although the top of the hill at Fort Mahan provides views of the surrounding area, urban and suburban development since 1941 has compromised the integrity of the views to both of the cultural landscape’s periods of significance.

Battleground National Cemetery Cultural Landscape (ROCR, CLI #600137, Map #13.1)\textsuperscript{115}

The Battleground National Cemetery cultural landscape retains a high degree of integrity to its period of significance, which extends from its creation in 1864 to the last burial in 1936. The cemetery was established as a burial place for Union soldiers killed in the Battle of Fort Stevens; a Union veteran of the battle as well as the family members of cemetery superintendent are buried there as well. The land use remains unchanged since 1864, though it is closed to new burials. During the period of significance, it functioned as a cemetery, and it continues to serve as a memorial to the Union soldiers who fought in the Battle of Fort Stevens.

The spatial organization of the cultural landscape retains the central component of its original layout: grave markers arrayed in a circular pattern around a central flagpole (Figure 8-7). Subsequent changes to the spatial organization, including the construction of the superintendent’s lodge and regimental monuments in the western half of the cemetery occurred during the period of significance. The small-scale features, buildings and structures, and circulation patterns generally date to the period between 1871 and 1936. Despite some loss of vegetation since the end of the period of significance, the extant

\textsuperscript{114} Margaret Lester (University of Pennsylvania), Cultural Landscapes Inventory [CLI]: Fort Mahan, National Capital Parks-East – Fort Circle Park-East (prepared for National Park Service, National Capital Region, 2013).

\textsuperscript{115} Frances McMillen, Cultural Landscapes Inventory [CLI]: Battleground National Cemetery, Rock Creek Park, Fort Circle Park – North (prepared for National Park Service, National Capital Region, 2010); Comisso.
plantings retain sufficient integrity to convey the overall character of the landscape’s vegetation during the period of significance.

**Fort Stevens Cultural Landscape** (ROCR, CLI #600147, Map #13.2)\textsuperscript{116}

Located east of Rock Creek Park, the Fort Stevens cultural landscape is bounded by Rittenhouse Street NW, Quackenbos Street NW, 13\textsuperscript{th} Street NW, and Piney Branch Road NW. The cultural landscape’s first period of significance reflects its use as a military installation from 1861-1866. In 1861, U.S. troops demolished a Methodist church on the site to build Fort Massachusetts (renamed Fort Stevens in 1863) to guard the 7\textsuperscript{th} Street Turnpike, one of the major routes into the city. (See Figure 8-5.) The fort was enlarged in 1862, and in 1864, it was the focal point of the Battle of Fort Stevens, the only battle that took place in the District of Columbia during the Civil War. In the decades after the land returned to private ownership in 1866, several houses were constructed on the fort site and the eastern half of the earthworks was leveled.

The second period of significance (1900-1938) is associated with efforts to preserve the fort, commemorate the battle of Fort Stevens, and develop the site into a historical park. In the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century, Fort Stevens hosted several commemorative events, and two memorials were erected. Between 1925 and 1936, the federal government acquired Fort Stevens for use as a public park. The Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) partially restored the earthen fortifications between 1936 and 1938 (Photo #3; Figure 7-10).

The Fort Stevens cultural landscape retains integrity to the second period of significance (1900-1938), which covers early preservation efforts and park development projects completed by the CCC. The spatial organization, the partially reconstructed fort, the vegetation, and the various monuments all reflect this period and are contributing features of the cultural landscape. The topography is the only landscape feature that retains integrity to the military period (1861-1866). The landscape has no existing circulation pattern, and the surrounding buildings block most of the views and vistas.

**Fort DeRussy Cultural Landscape** (Rock Creek Park, ROCR, CLI #600259, Map #12.1)\textsuperscript{117}

The Fort DeRussy cultural landscape is located within the boundaries of Rock Creek Park (Res. 339). The cultural landscape is bounded by the Western Ridge Trail (Cross Trail #5, former Milkhouse Ford Road) on the north, Rock Creek on the east, Military Road NW on the south, and Oregon Avenue NW on the west.

In 1861, the federal government seized a 200-acre farm on the west side of Rock Creek and soon began construction of Fort DeRussy on an elevated site overlooking Milkhouse Ford Road and Milkhouse Ford. The fort was completed that same year, and artillery fire from Fort DeRussy played a key role in the Battle of Fort Stevens in 1864. Fort DeRussy served as a military fortification until 1865, when the U.S. Army abandoned it and returned the land to the original owner. The land surrounding the fort was used

\textsuperscript{116} Frances McMillen, *Cultural Landscapes Inventory [CLI]: Fort Stevens, Rock Creek Park, Fort Circle Park – North* (prepared for National Park Service, National Capital Region, 2010).

\textsuperscript{117} Shannon Garrison (University of Pennsylvania), *Cultural Landscapes Inventory [CLI]: Fort DeRussy, Rock Creek Park, Fort Circle Park* (prepared for National Park Service, National Capital Region, August 2014 DRAFT).
for farming until 1890, when it was incorporated into Rock Creek Park. It has functioned as a public park since that time.

The Fort DeRussy cultural landscape has two periods of significance. The first covers the period from 1861 to 1865, when it served as a fortification in the Civil War Defenses of Washington. The second period of significance covers the landscape’s development as a park; it begins in 1890, when Fort DeRussy became part of Rock Creek Park, and ends in 1922, the date of the most recent major changes to the landscape.

The Fort DeRussy cultural landscape’s topography and the surviving earthworks are particularly important landscape characteristics for the Civil War period of significance (1861-1865). The spatial organization of the fort and elements of the circulation pattern also retain integrity to the Civil War era. Landscape characteristics associated with the park era include several trails in the circulation pattern and mature (>100 years) vegetation surrounding the historic earthworks. A boulder with bronze plaque that the National Park Service placed at the site to commemorate the centennial of the Civil War does not contribute to the cultural landscape because it was not erected during the cultural landscape’s periods of significance (Photo #6). However, the boulder is a contributing object in the Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District.

**NON-CONTRIBUTING RESOURCES**

The Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District includes twenty-seven non-contributing resources. Eleven of these are recreational buildings and structures erected by the NPS after 1972:

- the Nature Discovery Building, summer theater, and soundbooth at Fort Dupont Park (NACE, circa 1980, Map #17.2, Photo #19);
- the north and south portions of the Fort Circle Park Hiker-Biker Trail (NACE, post-1972, Map #17.1);
- the comfort station at Fort Foote (NACE, circa 2000, Map #20.1);
- the bandstand at Fort Reno Park (ROCR, circa 1980, Map #10.1);
- a pedestrian bridge (Fort Drive: Anacostia Park to Fort Mahan Park, NACE, circa 1980, Map #16.1); and
- picnic shelters constructed between 1970 and 1985 in Fort Slocum Park (ROCR, Map #13.3), Fort Ricketts Park (NACE, Map #18.1), and in the segment of Reservation 523 that is adjacent to Anacostia Park (Fort Drive: Anacostia Park to Fort Mahan Park, NACE, Map #16.1).

Though non-historic, these resources are compatible with the district’s current and historically significant use as parks, and do not detract from the district’s overall integrity.

Other non-historic resources in the district include a U.S. Park Police (USPP) stable and manure shed at Fort Dupont Park (NACE, circa 1980, Map #17.2), the Smithsonian Institution’s Anacostia Community Museum in Fort Stanton Park (NACE, 1987, Map #18.1), the Muhlenberg Memorial (Fort Drive - Fort Reno Park to Battery Broad Branch, ROCR, 1980, Map #10), and a radio tower at Fort Foote (NACE, circa 1995, Map #20.1). Because the stable complex and the Anacostia Community Museum are located near
the boundaries of their respective parks, they do not interrupt any of the character-defining open spaces in the historic district and blend in to the adjacent buildings outside the parks. Likewise, the radio tower at Fort Foote is located south of the earthworks and adjacent military resources, near the edge of the park.

Seven of the non-contributing resources were constructed during the district’s period of significance (1861-1972) but are not related to any of the district’s areas of significance (Military, Engineering, Ethnic Heritage-Black, Community Planning and Development, Archeology: Historic, Non-Aboriginal). The Milkhouse Ford structure (Rock Creek Park, ROCR, Map #12.1) is located at the perimeter of the section of Rock Creek Park that is included in the historic district; it is a contributing structure in the Rock Creek Park Historic District for its association with the development of Rock Creek Park, but is historically unrelated to the development of Fort Drive or the Fort Circle Parks.\textsuperscript{118} The brick bus station adjacent to Fort Davis Park (Fort Drive – Fort Dupont Park to Fort Stanton Park, NACE, pre-1948, Map #17.5), Chesapeake House (Fort Reno Park, ROCR, 1937, Map #10.1), and the two dwellings and garage in Shepherd Parkway (NACE, 1930s and 1940s, Map #19) are also located along the edge of the parks and are historically associated with commercial and residential development in the surrounding area. Chesapeake House, a 1937 commercial building located at 4023 Chesapeake Street NW, has been determined eligible for listing in the National Register under the Multiple Property Document \textit{Tenleytown in Washington, D.C.: Architectural and Historic Resources, 1791-1941}.\textsuperscript{119} The Artemus Ward statue in Ward Circle (Fort Drive: Ward Circle, ROCR, Map #9) is listed in the National Register of Historic Places under the \textit{American Revolutionary Statuary} Multiple Property Document.\textsuperscript{120}

The Reno City Archeological Site (DC Site #51NW74) at Fort Reno Park (ROCR, Archeology Map #3) is eligible for listing in the National Register for its association with late 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th}-century commercial and residential development in Washington, but is not directly related to the Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District’s areas of significance. The site has potential to reveal information about Reno City, a multi-racial and multi-ethnic neighborhood that occupied the area beginning in 1869. Between 1928 and circa 1960, the federal government gradually dismantled the neighborhood in order to create Fort Reno Park.\textsuperscript{121} Archeological investigations have yet to identify a National Register-eligible site within the park that relates to its Civil War history.

\textsuperscript{118} Bushong, Section 7, pp. 21-22. See Section 10 for the justification for including the Milkhouse Ford area in the historic district.
\textsuperscript{119} Simone Monteleone, \textit{D.C. State Historic Preservation Office Determination of Eligibility Form: Chesapeake House (Miss Mattingly’s Property), 4023 Chesapeake Street NW} (prepared for National Park Service, National Capital Region, 2011).
\textsuperscript{120} Gary Scott, \textit{American Revolutionary Statuary}, National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form (1978), Section 7, p. 9.
Four non-contributing archeological sites in the Fort Drive – Palisades Park to American University segment (ROCR, Archeology Map #2) of the historic district have potential to reveal information about prehistoric occupation of the area:

- two sites associated with the Maddox Branch Complex (DC Site #51NW158 and 51NW171),
- Prehistoric Site (DC Site #51NW147), and
- Chain Bridge Road Site (DC Site #51NW155).  

Other locations within the district may contain prehistoric archeological resources as well. For example, a 2007 archeological monitoring report of the Fort Foote Park Archeological Site (NACE) indicated a potential prehistoric component to the site.  

There are indications that Fort Stanton Park (NACE) may have prehistoric archeological potential as well, but professional archeological investigations have not been conducted.

EVALUATION OF INTEGRITY

Military and Commemorative Resources

The survival of military earthworks in any form is comparatively rare. Constructed of wood and earth, they require constant maintenance in order to retain their original configuration and contours. Rot and erosion represent the greatest natural threats to these resources, and abandoned earthworks can disappear completely due to the effects of rain and wind. Moreover, once the military need for them is gone, wooden revetments and other supporting materials are often removed, further destabilizing the structures. With little potential for re-use, they are often partially or entirely demolished in order to make way for other land uses. Activities such as hiking and bicycling accelerate the erosion process at abandoned forts.

Given the structural instability and inherent threats to military earthworks, the forts, batteries, rifle trenches and other earthen military features in the Fort Circle Parks Historic District retain integrity of design, materials, workmanship, and feeling. The earthworks also retain integrity of location and association with the Civil War Defenses of Washington. Many of the forts no longer retain integrity of setting due to urban and suburban development and changes in vegetation. During the Civil War, the military cleared the surrounding areas in order to provide unobstructed views; today, mature trees and an understory of vines and shrubs cover many of the earthworks and surviving areas. Although the vegetation obscures features of the earthworks and associated park land and compromises the historic setting, in many cases, it plays an important role in preserving earthen formations and slowing erosion.

After the Civil War ended, the U.S. government returned most of the land acquired for the Defenses of Washington to the original landowners, some of whom razed or damaged the earthworks. By the early 20th century, when the federal government became interested in acquiring sites in the District of

---

123 LeeDecker and Shellenhamer, Archeological Monitoring of Site Inspection at Fort Foote Park, p. 16.
Columbia that were associated with the Defenses of Washington, additional earthworks had been obliterated or severely damaged as a result of the rapid growth of the city. Urban development, combined with lack of funding, also made it difficult for the federal government to acquire the surviving earthworks in the District of Columbia, leading to more earthworks being demolished to make room for buildings and city streets. For political and jurisdictional reasons, the federal government had limited ability to acquire forts and batteries in Virginia and Maryland. Several local governments in these states have preserved Defenses of Washington sites, but these are not included in this historic district because they are neither owned nor managed by the National Park Service. (See Other Resources, p. 29.)

Despite these losses, the Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District retains sufficient integrity as a collection of resources to convey the purpose and configuration of the ring of fortifications that protected the national capital during the Civil War. On the east side of the Potomac River, the forts and batteries in the district are generally separated by less than two miles; some are less than one mile apart. The largest gap is the approximately two miles that separate Fort Mahan and Fort Lincoln, but this distance reflects the original configuration of the Defenses of Washington. Because the Anacostia River flats lay between these two forts, no earthworks were constructed between these two forts. Thus, the larger distance between Forts Mahan and Lincoln itself is consistent with the historic relationships of the forts.

The contributing commemorative resources (primarily boulders with attached plaques, resources at Battleground National Cemetery, and memorials at Fort Stevens Park) have neither been moved nor altered and generally retain all seven aspects of integrity.

The archeological sites retain sufficient integrity to reveal significant information about the Battle of Fort Stevens, soldier life at the Civil War Defenses of Washington, and the post-Civil War military occupation of Fort Foote. Historic maps and documents provide a solid base of information about the military use of these sites in the 1860s and 1870s. Surface finds and aboveground resources such as earthworks and building foundations strengthen the sites’ integrity of association, setting, and feeling. The level of disturbance at the sites is low, indicating that they retain integrity of design and materials. Surface finds and aboveground features also reveal clear spatial patterns that correspond to the sites’ military use.

**Fort Circle Parks and Fort Drive**

As a collection of landscapes and resources, the historic district as a whole conveys the evolution of this historically significant park system from the 1920s through 1972, including their establishment as federal parks and improvements carried out by the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) in the 1930s. Because the land used for the Defenses of Washington reverted to the original landowners after the war, the federal government had to re-acquire these properties in order to create the fort park system.

---

125 The federal government acquired the land in the historic district primarily through its role in governing and planning in the District of Columbia prior to the introduction of home rule for the District in 1973. Its land acquisition authority in Maryland and Virginia, which also included Defenses of Washington sites, was much more circumscribed. The federal government acquired the Defenses of Washington sites in these states because of their connection with the creation of the George Washington Memorial Parkway and other proposed parkways.

126 Although Fort Lincoln was not re-evaluated as part of this update and expansion of the historic district, it remains a contributing resource.
The U.S. government completed most these land acquisitions by 1945, and the majority of that land is currently owned by the federal government and managed by the National Park Service. Only two areas within the historic district are not managed by NPS: a 0.2-acre fishing access area within George Washington Memorial Parkway (GWMP) near Fort Marcy that is owned by Arlington County, Virginia, and the site of the Fort Lincoln battery, which was included in the 1978 National Register nomination but is not currently under NPS jurisdiction.

Primarily during and after the 1960s, the federal government transferred several areas that were originally acquired for Fort Drive and the fort parks to the District of Columbia for recreational, educational, and transportation purposes. These land transfers do not substantially detract from the historic district’s overall integrity. Land use in the transferred areas is typically consistent with the character of the historic district. Moreover, most of the transferred land is located at the edges of reservations acquired for the fort parks, and thus do not interrupt the continuity among the fort parks owned and managed by the federal government. A notable exception are two reservoirs that are located within Fort Stanton Park (NACE, Map #18). However, since most of the reservoir structures are underground and they are not adjacent to the earthworks or the proposed Fort Drive route, they have little effect on the overall character of the park.

The 1930s represented a period of rapid progress in the development of the park system, largely because of the work of the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC). Although several facilities built by the CCC have been removed, the surviving projects in the fort parks illustrate the variety of work performed by the CCC and their lasting effects on the parks. Notable examples include a segment of Fort Drive (Fort Davis Drive SE), Ridge Picnic Area at Fort Dupont, the partially reconstructed Fort Stevens, and the amphitheater at Fort Bunker Hill. In addition, several parks feature roads and landscaping created by the CCC, and several of the earthworks benefited from CCC stabilization efforts.

The current use of the parks in the historic district as urban forests, parks for outdoor recreation, green space along existing roadways, and parkways reflects the history of the park system and has facilitated preservation of these historic landscapes. Cultural Landscapes Inventories (CLI) prepared for five of the fort parks formally determined that the landscapes retain integrity to the period when they became parks, typically the 1920s through 1940s. Most of the other park landscapes also retain integrity to the park development period (1920-1972), but have not been formally evaluated through a CLI. There have been few major changes in the district since the early 1970s, and new construction is scattered and generally compatible with the district’s historic function and design. Overall, the historic district retains integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association to its park development period of significance.
INVENTORY

The inventory of resources within the historic district is organized alphabetically by administrative unit and then alphabetically by park name. The list of resources within each park is also organized alphabetically.

Resource Name (Reservation #), Historic District Section, City/County, State

The resource name is the name of the park, except in cases where a single resource overlaps several parks, in which case the resource name is used. The “historic district section” refers to the discontiguous section of the historic district where the resource is located; these lettered section designations are primarily used in describing and mapping the historic district boundaries (see Section 10).

In instances where a park contains multiple resources, a tally of the number of previously listed (PL), contributing (C) and non-contributing (NC) resources is included after the name of the park. A list of features follows entries for earthworks. These are features of the larger site or structure that were component parts of the original fortification.

For cultural landscapes, the period of significance as defined in the relevant Cultural Landscapes Inventory (CLI) is included in parentheses after the name of the cultural landscape. For all cultural landscapes in the historic district, the CLI’s period of significance is narrower than the period of significance for the Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District. Contributing status for countable resources within the district is based on the period of significance for the historic district. However, the list of landscape features for each cultural landscape includes only those features that were determined to be contributing in the CLI.

NPS ID # / State ID #

This column provides the identification numbers used to identify the resource in databases maintained by the National Park Service (NPS) and State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO).

Explanations and Abbreviations

Identification numbers for ASMIS (Archeological Sites Management Information System), an NPS database, include the park administrative unit code, followed by five digits, a decimal point, and three digits (e.g., GWMP00000.000).

LCS = List of Classified Structures (NPS)

CLI = Cultural Landscapes Inventory (NPS)

VHDR = Virginia Department of Historic Resources (SHPO for Virginia).

DC Site = archeological site number assigned by the District of Columbia (DC)

MIHP = Maryland Inventory of Historic Sites (maintained by Maryland Historical Trust, the SHPO for Maryland)

Abbreviations Used

NR Type

Bldg = Building

Str = Structure

Obj = Object

NR Status

PL = Previously Listed Contributing Resource

C = Contributing

NC = Non-Contributing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Name (Reservation #), Historic District Section, City/County, State</th>
<th>NPS ID #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Quantity - NR Type</th>
<th>NR Status</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Photo #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Marcy Park (Res. 404), Section A, Fairfax County &amp; Arlington County, VA (PL=1, C=3, NC=0)</td>
<td>LCS #12126 GWMP00021.000 VHDR #44FX0017 VDHR #029-0104</td>
<td>1861-1862</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Map #2</td>
<td>Photo #4-5, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Marcy Earthworks, Fairfax County, VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maps #2.1, #2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthworks Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Photo #4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Fort – Parapet, Ditch, Artillery Embrasures (15), Artillery Platforms (14), Artillery Ramps (8), Mortar Platform, Traverse, Bombproof, Magazine, Southwest Magazine, Road (inside fort), Sally Port, Well Southwest Battery (8-Gun) and Rifle Trench</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-Scale Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1841 12-pounder Howitzers (2), 1834-1847 (moved 1963)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Marcy Roads Site (9 road traces), Fairfax County &amp; Arlington County, VA</td>
<td>LCS #12126 GWMP00021.000 VHDR #44FX0017 VDHR #029-0104</td>
<td>1862 circa</td>
<td>1 - Site</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Maps #2.1-2.3</td>
<td>Photo #14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pimmit Run Battery (1-Gun) and Rifle Trench, Fairfax County, VA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maps #2.1, #2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Battery (1-Gun) and Rifle Trench, Arlington County, VA</td>
<td>LCS #12126 GWMP00021.000 VHDR #44FX0017 VDHR #029-0104</td>
<td>1861-1862</td>
<td>1 – Str</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf Branch Rifle Trench (Res. 404), Section C, Arlington County, VA</td>
<td>LCS #12126 GWMP00021.000 VHDR #44FX0017 VDHR #029-0104</td>
<td>1861-1862</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Maps #4, #4.1</td>
<td>Photo #12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL PARKWAY (GWMP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Name (Reservation #), Historic District Section, City/County, State</th>
<th>NPS ID # State ID#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Quantity - NR Type</th>
<th>NR Status</th>
<th>Map #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pimmit Run Bridge Abutment and Military Road (Res. 404), Section B, Arlington County, VA</td>
<td>VDHR #000-5803</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spout Run Rifle Trench Site (Res. 404), Section D, Arlington County, VA</td>
<td></td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>1 - Site</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS EAST (NACE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Name (Reservation #), Historic District Section, City/County, State</th>
<th>NPS ID # State ID#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Quantity - NR Type</th>
<th>NR Status</th>
<th>Map #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Chaplin Park (Res. 609), Section AA (North Segment), Washington, DC (PL=1, C=1, NC=0)</td>
<td>LCS #1125</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Map #16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthworks Features: Parapet, Ditch, Glacis, Artillery Embrasures (8), Artillery Platforms (6), Bombproof, Magazine, Sally Port</td>
<td>Military Road Trace</td>
<td>1862 circa</td>
<td>1 - Site</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Circle Park Hiker-Biker Trail: Central Segment [Ridge Road SE to Good Hope Road SE] (Res. 336, 405, 518), Section AA, Washington, DC</td>
<td></td>
<td>1968-1971</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #17.1, #17.2, #17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo #22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Circle Park Hiker-Biker Trail: North Segment [Fort Mahan Park to Ridge Road SE] (Res. 500, 609, 475), Section AA, Washington, DC</td>
<td></td>
<td>1972 post</td>
<td>1 – Str</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Map #16.2, #16.3, #17.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS EAST (NACE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Name (Reservation #), Historic District Section, City/County, State</th>
<th>NPS ID # State ID#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Quantity - NR Type</th>
<th>NR Status</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Photo #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fort Circle Park Hiker-Biker Trail: South Segment</strong> ([Good Hope Road SE to Fort Ricketts] ([Res. 412, 518, 575]), Section AA, Washington, DC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1972 post</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Map #17.1, #18.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fort Davis Drive SE (Res. 336, 405, 518), Section AA (Central Segment), Washington, DC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1935-1937; 1957-1963</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #17.2, #17.3, #17.5</td>
<td>Photo #17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fort Davis Park (Res. 336), Section AA (Central Segment), Washington, DC (PL=1, C=1, NC=0)</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;&lt;i&gt;See also Fort Davis Drive (NACE) and Fort Circle Park Hiker-Biker Trail: Central Segment (NACE)&lt;/i&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fort Davis Earthworks</strong></td>
<td>LCS #1127</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Map #17.5</td>
<td>Photo #9, 17, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Earthworks Features</em>&lt;br&gt;Parapet, Ditch, Artillery Platforms (3), Magazines (2), Sally Port, Well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #17.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colonial Dames of America Monument</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1955-1956</td>
<td>1 - Obj</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #17.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fort Drive: Anacostia Park to Fort Mahan Park (Res. 523), Section Z, Washington, DC (C=1, NC=2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastland Garden Commons Fountain</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1963-1966</td>
<td>1 - Obj</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #16.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bridge, Deane Ave NE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1980 circa</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Map #16.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Picnic Shelter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1980 circa</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Map #16.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fort Drive: Fort Dupont Park to Fort Stanton Park (Res. 518), Section AA (Central Segment), Washington, DC</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;&lt;i&gt;See also Fort Davis Drive SE (NACE) and Fort Circle Park Hiker-Biker Trail: Central Segment (NACE)&lt;/i&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus Station, 38th Street SE &amp; Pennsylvania Avenue SE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1948 pre</td>
<td>1 - Bldg</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Map #17.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks
Name of Property

Multiple counties, DC, MD, VA
County and State

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS EAST (NACE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Name (Reservation #), Historic District Section, City/County, State</th>
<th>NPS ID # State ID#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Quantity - NR Type</th>
<th>NR Status</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Photo #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Dupont Park (Res. 405), Section AA (Central Segment), Washington, DC (PL=1, C=12, NC=5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1948-1949; 1952</td>
<td>1 - Bldg</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Center (former golf clubhouse)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Photo #19, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Dupont Cultural Landscape (Periods of Significance: 1861-1865, 1901-1927, 1933-1941)</td>
<td>CLI #600079</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Site</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #17.2, #17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama Avenue Bridge¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>circa 1950</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonial Dames of America Monument¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1955-1956</td>
<td>1 - Obj</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort Station &amp; Picnic Shelter¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1954; 1958-1959</td>
<td>1 - Bldg</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Dupont Earthworks</td>
<td>LCS #1131</td>
<td>1861-1862</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Earthworks Features
- Parapet, Ditch, Artillery Embrasures (10), Artillery Platforms (5), Artillery Ramps (5), Magazine, Sally Port, Well

Landscape Features
- Circulation
  - Trail through sally port
  - Fort loop road
- Vegetation
  - Grassy area west and south of earthworks

¹ Although this resource contributes to the Fort Circle Parks Historic District, it is considered non-contributing in the Cultural Landscape Inventory because it was constructed outside the cultural landscape’s period of significance, which is more narrowly defined than the historic district’s period of significance.
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## NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS EAST (NACE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Name (Reservation #), Historic District Section, City/County, State</th>
<th>NPS ID # State ID#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Quantity - NR Type</th>
<th>NR Status</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Photo #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Dupont Drive SE</td>
<td></td>
<td>1935-1941</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #17.2, #17.3</td>
<td>Photo #19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td></td>
<td>1948, 1957</td>
<td>1 – Site</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #17.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Headquarters</td>
<td></td>
<td>1955 circa</td>
<td>1 - Bldg</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #17.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manure Storage Shed</td>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1 - Bldg</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Discovery Building</td>
<td></td>
<td>1980 circa</td>
<td>1 - Bldg</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Police Stable</td>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1 - Bldg</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randle Picnic Area: Comfort Station</td>
<td></td>
<td>1970 circa</td>
<td>1 - Bldg</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridge Picnic Area</td>
<td>Comfort Station</td>
<td>1970 circa</td>
<td>1 - Bldg</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Fechner Memorial</td>
<td></td>
<td>1940 circa</td>
<td>1 - Obj</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Theater</td>
<td></td>
<td>1980 circa</td>
<td>1 - Bldg</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Theater Soundbooth</td>
<td></td>
<td>1980 circa</td>
<td>1 - Bldg</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fort Foote Park (Res. 404M)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archeological Site</td>
<td>NACE00027.000</td>
<td>1861-1878*</td>
<td>1 - Site</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Arch. Map #10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 The Fort Foote Archeological Site also has potential for prehistoric archeology. Its potential to reveal information about the non-military occupation of the site has not been fully evaluated. See Charles LeeDecker and Jason Shellenhamer (The Louis Berger Group), *Archeological Monitoring of Site Inspection at Fort Foote Park* (prepared for Malcolm Pirnie, Inc. Washington, D.C., August 2007).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Name (Reservation #), Historic District Section, City/County, State</th>
<th>NPS ID # State ID#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Quantity - NR Type</th>
<th>NR Status</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Photo #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Foote Cultural Landscape (Periods of Significance: 1863-1865, 1865-1878, 1902-1934)</td>
<td>CLI #600084 MIHP #PG-80-6</td>
<td>1863-1878, 1917-1918</td>
<td>1 - Site</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #20</td>
<td>Photo #7-8, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Foundations</td>
<td>LCS #23456</td>
<td>1863-1878</td>
<td>1 - Site</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Arch. Map #10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort Station</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000 circa</td>
<td>1 - Bldg</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Map #20.1, #20.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers' Storehouse</td>
<td>LCS #100156</td>
<td>1863-1878</td>
<td>1 - Bldg</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #20.1</td>
<td>Photo #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Tower</td>
<td></td>
<td>1995 circa</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Map #20.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Foote Earthworks</td>
<td>LCS #23440 MHT #PG:80-6</td>
<td>1863-1872</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Map #20.2</td>
<td>Photo #7, 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Earthworks Features*
- Parapet, Ditch, Banquette, Counterscarp Gallery, Caponniere, Artillery Embrasures (13), Artillery Platforms – Stone and Concrete (5, LCS #23441)
- Artillery Platforms – Earthen (11), Artillery Ramps (4), Central Traverse

*Small-Scale Features*
- Rodman Cannons (2), 1864, LCS #12904

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Quantity - NR Type</th>
<th>NR Status</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Photo #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postern</td>
<td></td>
<td>1870 c.</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #20.2</td>
<td>Photo #13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's Depression Carriage Mount</td>
<td>LCS #208186</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #20.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Magazine and Traverse</td>
<td>LCS #100157</td>
<td>1872-1874</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 This LCS record includes only the three empty concrete and stone artillery emplacements. The two that support the Rodman cannons are documented in LCS Record #12904. Two of the platforms were constructed in 1863-1864, while the remaining three were constructed after the war ended. See National Park Service, *Fort Foote CRGIS GPS Report* (2014), p. 8.
# Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks

**Name of Property:**

**County and State:** Multiple counties, DC, MD, VA

## NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS EAST (NACE)

### Resource Name (Reservation #), Historic District Section, City/County, State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Name</th>
<th>NPS ID #</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Quantity - NR Type</th>
<th>NR Status</th>
<th>Map #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Magazine</td>
<td>LCS #100795</td>
<td>1863; early 1870s</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse Trough</td>
<td>LCS #208736</td>
<td>1863-1878</td>
<td>1 - Obj</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #20.1, #20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icehouse</td>
<td>LCS #210409</td>
<td>1863-1864</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Arch. Map #10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Landscape Features

- **Circulation** – *see Map #44*
  - Trail leading north from fort to parade ground and cemetery site
  - Trail through sally port
  - Wharf road
  - Parade grounds

- **Vegetation**
  - Cleared, grassy area at former parade ground (*Map #44*)
  - Meadow at former garden

- **Views & Vistas**
  - View across the Potomac River from the parade ground
  - Views from Rodman cannons (partial; winter only) – *Photo #7*

### Small-Scale Features

- Culvert near Fort Foote Road

### Fort Mahan Park (Res. 475), Section AA (North Segment), Washington, DC (PL=1, C=1, NC=0)

*See also Fort Circle Park Hiker-Biker Trail: North Segment (NACE)*

- **Well**
  - LCS #23457 | 1863-1870 | 1 - Str | C | Map #20.2 |
  - Photo #20

- **Wharf**
  - LCS #210436 | 1864 | 1 - Site | C | Map #20.1 |
  - Photo #8

- **Fort Mahan Cultural Landscape** (Periods of Significance: 1861-1865, 1925-1941)
  - CLI #600081 | | 1 - Site | C | Map #16.2 |
  - Photo #20
### Fort Mahan Earthworks

**LCS #1129**

**Date:** 1861

**Quantity - NR Type:** 1 - Str

**NR Status:** PL

**Map #**

**Photo #**

**Earthworks Features**
- SE Bastion – Parapet, Ditch, Artillery Embrasures (2)
- SW Bastion – Parapet, Ditch, Artillery Platforms (2)
- Battery – Ditch, Artillery Embrasures (3)
- Outworks - Parapet

**Landscape Features**
- Circulation
  - Circular pedestrian trail (unpaved)
  - Access road (graveled)
- Vegetation
  - Open grassy area at the crest of the fort (playing field circa 1940)
  - Willow oak, SE corner of the park
  - Tulip poplars near gravel road
- Views & Vistas
  - None.

### Fort Ricketts Park (Res. 575), Section AA (South Segment), Washington, DC (PL=1, C=0, NC=1)

*See also Fort Circle Park Hiker-Biker Trail: South Segment (NACE)*

**Map #**

**Photo #**

**Fort Ricketts Earthworks**

**LCS #1117**

**Date:** 1861

**Quantity - NR Type:** 1 - Str

**NR Status:** PL

**Map #**

**Photo #**

**Earthworks Features**
- Parapet, Ditch

**Picnic Shelter**

**Date:** 1975 circa

**Quantity - NR Type:** 1 - Str

**NR Status:** NC

**Map #**

**Photo #**
# National Capital Parks East (NACE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Name (Reservation #), Historic District Section, City/County, State</th>
<th>NPS ID # State ID#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Quantity - NR Type</th>
<th>NR Status</th>
<th>Map #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fort Stanton Park (Res. 412)</strong>, Section AA (South Segment), Washington, DC (PL=1, C=1, NC=1)</td>
<td>NACE #1113</td>
<td>1863-1864</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Map #18.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Earthworks Features**
- Glacis
- NE Bastion – Parapet, Ditch
- NW Bastion – Parapet, Ditch, Artillery Embrasures (2)

| Magazine, Masonry | LCS #1113 | 1864 | 1 - Str | C | Map #18.1 |

*See also Fort Circle Park Hiker-Biker Trail: South Segment (NACE)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shepherd Parkway (Res. 421), Section AB, Washington, DC (PL=2, C=1, NC=3)</th>
<th>NPS ID # State ID#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Quantity - NR Type</th>
<th>NR Status</th>
<th>Map #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fort Carroll Covered Way</strong></td>
<td>NACE00101.000</td>
<td>1862 circa</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Arch. Map #9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fort Carroll Earthworks</strong></td>
<td>NACE #1133</td>
<td>1861; 1864</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Map #19.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Earthworks Features**
- NW Bastion - Ditch
- SW Bastion – Parapet, Ditch, Artillery Embrasures (2)

| Fort Greble Earthworks | LCS #1133 | 1861-1864 | 1 - Site | PL | Map #19.2 |

**Earthworks Features**
- NW parapet (fragment), SW parapet (fragment), E ditch (fragment, shallow), S ditch (fragment, deep), bombproof
- Rifle pits (trace)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raleigh Street House, 126 Raleigh Street SE (USPP)</th>
<th>1934</th>
<th>1 - Bldg</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>Map #19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Capitol Street Garage (USPP)</td>
<td>1949 pre</td>
<td>1 - Bldg</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Capitol Street House, 2901 S. Capitol Street SE (USPP)</td>
<td>1949 pre</td>
<td>1 - Bldg</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ROCK CREEK PARK (ROCR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Name (Reservation #), Historic District Section, City/County, State</th>
<th>NPS ID # State ID#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Quantity - NR Type</th>
<th>NR Status</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Photo #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battery Broad Branch (Res. 515), Section M, Washington, DC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery Broad Branch Earthworks</td>
<td>ROCR00057.000 DC #51NW169</td>
<td>circa 1862</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #11, Archeology Map #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parapet, Ditch, Artillery Platforms (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Photo #10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery Kemble Park (Res. 521), Section F, Washington, DC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery Kemble Earthworks</td>
<td>LCS #5362</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Map #7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parapet, Ditch, Magazine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battleground National Cemetery (Res. 568), Section P, Washington, DC (PL=20, C=0, NC=0)</td>
<td>CLI #600137</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Site</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Map #13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battleground National Cemetery Cultural Landscape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Period of Significance: 1864-1936)</td>
<td>LCS #1300 LCS #100213 LCS #100214</td>
<td>1880-1890</td>
<td>3 - Obj</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bivouac of the Dead Tablets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannons</td>
<td>LCS #545785</td>
<td>1860 circa; moved 1904</td>
<td>2 - Obj</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 2010 updated and expanded National Register nomination for Battleground National Cemetery by Dayton and Trieschmann, there is a discrepancy between the total number of resources given in Section 5: Classification and the number of resources listed in the inventory in Section 7: Description. Section 5 (p. 2) lists sixteen previously listed resources, plus two additional non-contributing resources for a total of eighteen. However, the inventory in Section 7 (p. 11) lists twenty-two resources (20 contributing and 2 non-contributing).
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## ROCK CREEK PARK (ROCR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Name (Reservation #), Historic District Section, City/County, State</th>
<th>NPS ID # State ID#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Quantity - NR Type</th>
<th>NR Status</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Photo #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flagpole</td>
<td>LCS #10832</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1 - Obj</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates</td>
<td>LCS #872919</td>
<td>1916 circa -1920</td>
<td>1 - Obj</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Landscape Features (see Map #13.1)

- **Buildings & Structures (not including individually counted resources or earthworks features)**
  - Stairs
  - Circulation
    - Central walk from entrance to headstones
    - Circular walkway around flagpole
    - Walkways around the lodge
    - Brick walk outside maintenance building
    - Driveway outside maintenance building
    - Flagstone pavers
  - Vegetation
    - Specimen trees (maple and hickory) (15)
    - American boxwood
    - Lawn
  - Views & Vistas
    - View between gate and rostrum

### Small-Scale Features

- 44 Headstones, 18 (LCS #5377), 1875-1936
- Gettysburg Address Plaque (attached to lodge)
- Cemetery Dedication Plaque (attached to lodge)
- Manholes
- Interpretive Waysides (2)

---

5 The splashpad was listed as a contributing feature in the Cultural Landscapes Inventory and Cultural Landscape Report for Battleground National Cemetery. Because it was replaced in 2010 and thus is no longer a contributing feature, it is not listed here.

6 Although the interpretive waysides are considered to be contributing landscape features, they were counted as non-contributing resources in the 2010 update and expansion of the Battleground National Cemetery National Register nomination, which defined the cemetery’s period of significance as 1864-1936. This difference in contributing status is the result of a policy change that occurred the year after the updated National Register nomination was completed. In 2011, the Keeper of the National Register established a policy that the period of significance for all national cemeteries extends up to the present. A 2014 Cultural Landscape Report for Battleground National Cemetery incorporates
## ROCK CREEK PARK (ROCR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Name (Reservation #), Historic District Section, City/County, State</th>
<th>NPS ID # State ID#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Quantity - NR Type</th>
<th>NR Status</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Photo #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter Wall</td>
<td>LCS #12918</td>
<td>1871-1935</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regimental Monuments</td>
<td>LCS #5372, #5373, #5374, #5375</td>
<td>1891, 1904, 1907, 1914</td>
<td>4 - Obj</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rostrum</td>
<td>LCS #5371</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urns</td>
<td>LCS #100222, #100223</td>
<td>1896 pre</td>
<td>2 - Obj</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Department Tablet</td>
<td>LCS #13005</td>
<td>1880 circa -1890</td>
<td>2 - Obj</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodge</td>
<td>LCS #5369, #5376, #13006</td>
<td>1871; 1874; 1929-1930</td>
<td>1 - Bldg</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool Shed (Maintenance Building)</td>
<td>LCS #5370</td>
<td>1907; 1935</td>
<td>1 - Bldg</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fort Bayard Park (Res. 359), Section H, Washington, DC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthworks Site</td>
<td></td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>1 - Site</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Map #8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fort Bunker Hill Park (Res. 443), Section R, Washington, DC (PL=1, C=2, NC=0)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphitheater</td>
<td></td>
<td>1935-1937 c.</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #14.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Bunker Hill Earthworks</td>
<td>LCS #5381</td>
<td>1861-1862</td>
<td>1 - Site</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Map #14.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Earthworks Features</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parapet (fragment), Ditch (shallow trace), Sally Port</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS Civil War Centennial Monument</td>
<td></td>
<td>1961 circa</td>
<td>1 - Obj</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #14.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

this change in policy and considers the waysides as contributing small-scale features. See Dayton and Trieschmann, *Battleground National Cemetery* (2010); Keeper of the National Register, "National Register Eligibility of National Cemeteries – A Clarification of Policy – A Clarification of Policy (9/8/2011),”

### ROCK CREEK PARK (ROCR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Name (Reservation #), Historic District Section, City/County, State</th>
<th>NPS ID # State ID#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Quantity - NR Type</th>
<th>NR Status</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Photo #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fort Drive – Fort Reno Park to Battery Broad Branch (Res. 397)</strong>, Section L, Washington, DC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Hill Stone</td>
<td>LCS #100211</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1 - Obj</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fort Drive – Palisades Park to American University (Res. 530)</strong>, Section F, Washington, DC (PL=0, C=0, NC=2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain Bridge Road Archeological Site</td>
<td>DC #51NW155</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>1 - Site</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Arch. Map #2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maddox Branch Archeological Complex</td>
<td>DC #51NW158</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>2 - Site</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fort Drive – Ward Circle (Res. 572)</strong>, Section G, Washington, DC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major General Artemas Ward Monument</td>
<td>LCS #6457</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>1 - Obj</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fort Reno Park (Res. 470)</strong>, Section K, Washington, DC (PL=0, C=1, NC=3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandstand</td>
<td></td>
<td>1980 circa</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake House, 4023 Chesapeake Street NW</td>
<td>LCS #872928</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>1 - Bldg</td>
<td>NC*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS Civil War Centennial Monument</td>
<td></td>
<td>1961 circa</td>
<td>1 - Obj</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reno City Archeological Site</td>
<td>ROCR00015.000 DC #51NW74</td>
<td>1869-circa 1960</td>
<td>1 - Site</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Arch. Map #3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

7 Although they do not contribute to the Fort Circle Parks Historic District, these four archeological sites are listed as contributing resources in a draft update and expansion of the Rock Creek Park Historic District (John Liebertz and Kate Ritson, *Rock Creek Park Historic District (Amendment and Boundary Expansion)*, National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form (January 2014)).

8 In 2011, Chesapeake House was determined eligible for listing in the National Register listing under the *Tenleytown in Washington, D.C.: Architectural and Historical Resources, 1791-1941* Multiple Property Documentation Form, prepared by Kim Protho Williams. The Determination of Eligibility form notes that historically and architecturally, the building is related to the development of Tenleytown, and is not directly associated with Fort Reno, the Reno City subdivision, or the development of Fort Reno into a park. See Simone Monteleone, *D.C. State Historic Preservation Office Determination of Eligibility Form: Chesapeake House (Miss Mattingly’s Property), 4023 Chesapeake Street NW* (prepared for National Park Service, National Capital Region, 2011), pp. 2, 3.
### ROCK CREEK PARK (ROCR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Name (Reservation #), Historic District Section, City/County, State</th>
<th>NPS ID # State ID#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Quantity - NR Type</th>
<th>NR Status</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Photo #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Slocum Park (Res. 435), Section Q (West Segment), Washington, DC (PL=1, C=0, NC=1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1970-1980</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rifle Trench</td>
<td>LCS #23395</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>1 - Site</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Stevens Park (Res. 358), Section Q (West Segment), Washington, DC (PL=1, C=3, NC=0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Stevens Cultural Landscape (Periods of Significance: 1861-1866, 1900-1938)</td>
<td>CLI #600147</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - Site</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daughters of Union Veterans of the Civil War Monument</td>
<td>LCS #10831</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>1 - Obj</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Stevens Earthworks</td>
<td>LCS #13018</td>
<td>1862; 1936-1938</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthworks Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parapet, Ditch, Artillery Embrasures (7), Artillery Platforms (9), Artillery Ramps (7), Magazine, Revetment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-Scale Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproduction Cannons (2), 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassy landscape with few trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Earthworks Features
- Parapet, Ditch, Artillery Embrasures (7), Artillery Platforms (9), Artillery Ramps (7), Magazine, Revetment

Small-Scale Features
- Reproduction Cannons (2), 1966

Landscape Features

Vegetation
- Grassy landscape with few trees
# ROCK CREEK PARK (ROCR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Name (Reservation #), Historic District Section, City/County, State</th>
<th>NPS ID # State ID#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Quantity - NR Type</th>
<th>NR Status</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Photo #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Totten Park (Res. 544), Section Q (West Segment), Washington, DC (PL=1, C=2, NC=0)</td>
<td>ROCR00081.000 DC #51NE37</td>
<td>1861-1862</td>
<td>1 - Site</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #13</td>
<td>Photo #16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Totten Barracks Archeological Site</td>
<td>ROCR00081.000 DC #51NE37</td>
<td>1861-1862</td>
<td>1 - Site</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Arch. Map #8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Totten Earthworks</td>
<td>LCS #1123</td>
<td>1861-1862</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Map #13.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earthworks Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parapet, Ditch, Artillery Platform, Bombproof, Magazines (2), Sally Port, Well, Outworks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS Civil War Centennial Monument</td>
<td></td>
<td>1961 circa</td>
<td>1 - Obj</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #13.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservoir Battery #2 Earthworks Site (Res. 404), Section E, Washington, DC</td>
<td>ROCR00062.000 DC #51NW175</td>
<td>1864 circa</td>
<td>1 - Site</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #6</td>
<td>Arch. Map #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reservoir Battery #2 Earthworks (Urban Ecology Center Archeological Site)</td>
<td>ROCR00062.000 DC #51NW175</td>
<td>1864 circa</td>
<td>1 - Site</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #6</td>
<td>Arch. Map #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Creek Park (Res. 339), Sections N and O, Washington, DC (PL=1, C=8, NC=1)</td>
<td>ROCR00056.000 DC #51NW168</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #12</td>
<td>Arch. Map #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery Rock Creek Earthworks (Section N)</td>
<td>ROCR00056.000 DC #51NW168</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Map #12</td>
<td>Arch. Map #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earthworks Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parapet, Ditch, Artillery Embrasures (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle of Fort Stevens [East of Parking Area 10] Archeological Site (Section O)</td>
<td>ROCR00050.000 DC #51NW163</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>1 - Site</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Arch. Map #7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered Way and Supply Cache (Section N)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Arch. Map #6</td>
<td>Photo #15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# ROCK CREEK PARK (ROCR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Name (Reservation #), Historic District Section, City/County, State</th>
<th>NPS ID # State ID#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>NR Type</th>
<th>NR Status</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Photo #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encampment Site (Section N)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1864 circa</td>
<td>1 - Site</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arch. Map #6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunker, Unidentified Excavation, Hut Sites (5), Road Trace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort DeRussy Cultural Landscape (Section N) (Periods of Significance: 1861-1865, 1890-1922)</td>
<td>CLI #600259</td>
<td>1861-1865</td>
<td>1 - Site</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #12.1</td>
<td>Photo #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery Kingsbury Site</td>
<td></td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>1 - Site</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #12.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort DeRussy Dump Archeological Site</td>
<td>ROCR00046.000 DC #51NW159</td>
<td>1861-1865</td>
<td>1 - Site</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arch. Map #5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort DeRussy Earthworks</td>
<td>LCS #1119</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #12.1</td>
<td>Photo #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earthworks Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parapet, Ditch, Artillery Embrasures (6), Artillery Platforms (10), Artillery Ramps (6), Magazine, Bombproof, Sally Port, Covered Way, Outworks, Connecting Ditch to Battery Kingsbury (remnant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape Features</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hiking Trails (Milkhouse Ford Trail, Fort DeRussy Hiking Trail, and Western Ridge Equestrian Trail)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mature trees and brush vegetation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS Civil War Centennial Monument</td>
<td></td>
<td>1961 circa</td>
<td>1 - Obj</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #12.1</td>
<td>Photo #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milkhouse Ford Structure (Section N)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>1 - Str</td>
<td>NC⁹</td>
<td></td>
<td>Map #12.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁹ Milkhouse Ford is a contributing resource in the Rock Creek Park Historic District. See William Bushong, *Rock Creek Park Historic District*, National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form (1990), Section 7, pp. 21-22.
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### RESOURCES NOT UNDER NATIONAL PARK SERVICE JURISDICTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Name, Location, Historic District Section, City/County, State</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Quantity - NR Type</th>
<th>NR Status</th>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Photo #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fort Lincoln Battery</strong>, Eastern Avenue NE, just east of Bladensburg Road</td>
<td>U.S. and D.C. governments</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>1 – not evaluated</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>See 1978 NR nomination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GLOSSARY


Diagrams of the major components of military earthworks are included in the nomination as Figure 7-6 (p. 21) and Figure 8-1 (p. 91).

---

Abattis or Abatis (Fr.) -- felled trees, arranged in the form of a hedge with trunks aligned and anchored in a shallow ditch. Branches were sharpened and interlaced pointing toward the enemy. Its purpose was to prevent surprise and to delay an attacking force within range of defensive weapons. Sometimes called a slashing.

Angle - where two faces of a fortification meet.

Banquette (Fr.) or Firing Step - a shelf dug behind a parapet that allowed a defender to step up from the ground to fire over the parapet, then step back down under cover to reload. A banquette was only necessary when the parapet was higher than a man's armpits. It was a common feature associated with prepared fortifications, curtains, and detached works, such as redoubts. If a banquette survives, it is often blurred by soil eroding from the parapet.

Bastion (Fr.) - an angular work that projected outward from the main faces of a fortification. Its purpose was to eliminate defilade by directing fire along the front of an adjacent curtain wall. Like a lunette, a bastion consisted of four parts: two faces forming a salient angle oriented towards the enemy, and two reentering flanks that directed fire sideways across the faces of adjacent bastions. A curtain (or curtain wall) connected two or more bastions. See Lunette.

Bastioned Fort - an enclosed earthwork with bastions in the angles to provide fire along the fronts of the connecting curtains.

Battery - an artillery unit or a fortification designed to defend an artillery unit.

Blockhouse - building constructed of heavy logs in the shape of a square, rectangle, or cross, to serve as a strong point for infantry or artillery. A ditch was often excavated around the exterior with the spoil thrown up against the wooden structure as a protection against fire and gunfire. Often part of the first floor of a blockhouse was below ground, while the upper floor, pierced with loopholes and embrasures, was built with an overhang so that defenders could fire down around the base of the structure. Blockhouses were used to defend railroad trestles, bridges, and depots, or served as a "keep" or place of final refuge in a larger fortress or stockade. The excavations associated with many blockhouses survive, although timbers were often scavenged for other uses. Some had brick or stone flooring and fireplaces.

Bombproof - a log or plank room or bunker covered over with earth to protect troops from artillery fire. A surviving bombproof appears as a large mound of earth, sometimes with an elongated depression in

---

1 In the original glossary, the authors italicized all words in the definitions that also appear within the glossary. In this abridged version, the italics were removed in cases where the terms that do not appear in the abridged glossary. Likewise, related terms were omitted if they were not included in this abridged glossary.
the top where underlying timbers have collapsed or in the side where the entrance used to be. See Magazine.

Caponière (Fr.) - projection from the front of a curtain wall that enabled infantry or artillery to fire into an exterior ditch.

Covered or Covert Way - in permanent fortifications, a walkway extending around the outside of the moat or ditch of the main line; in fieldworks, a ditch and parapet designed to protect and conceal the movement of troops and supplies to the front lines from camps or supply caches in the rear. A covered way was not "covered," in the sense of being roofed over; it provided cover from gunfire.

Counterscarp - outer or exterior slope of a ditch. See Scarp.

Curtain or Curtain Wall - a straight line of parapet that connected two bastions or artillery strong points, technically with an exterior ditch.

Defilade or Dead Ground - a ravine, gully, or depression within range of an earthwork's weapons that could not be seen or fired into from the defenders' position.

Demi-bastion (Fr.) - an angular work that projected outward from the corner of an enclosed or detached earthwork. A demi-bastion consisted of one face and one flank forming a salient angle. The flank directed fire across the front of an adjacent face or curtain.

Ditch - excavation providing soil to construct a parapet. A ditch could be in front of the parapet (front-ditch or exterior), behind it (back-ditch or interior), or on both sides (double-ditch). Engineers preferred front-ditch construction whenever time and labor permitted, as it created a stronger profile. Batteries, redans, lunettes, and redoubts were consistently constructed with a front-ditch. Back-ditch construction was the fastest way to entrench, and therefore was used most often for rapid infantry entrenchments. A double-ditch resulted from digging in front to widen an existing back-ditch parapet, from constructing a covered way behind a front-ditched line, or from capture and refacing. Some evidence of the ditch—a shallow trough—often survives even if its parapet has eroded away. The scarp and counterscarp are the inner and outer slopes of the ditch.

Earthenwork - any earthen structure excavated for military purposes. In simplest form, a defensive earthenwork was composed of a parapet or mound of earth and a ditch from which the earth was excavated.

Embrasure (Fr.) - a wedge-shaped opening cut to allow artillery to fire through the parapet. A cannon firing en embrasure had a restricted (45-degree) field of fire but the parapet protected the gunners. The sides, or cheeks, of an embrasure often were reinforced by logs, planks, stones, sandbags, or gabions. Embrasures were common features of artillery fortifications and often survive as an indentation in the otherwise uniform parapet crest. Not all indentations are embrasures. Typically, there is other evidence of the presence of artillery—a gun platform and gun ramp, for example. A single gun might have had multiple embrasures.

Enclosed Work - an earthwork designed to be defended from all sides. See Redoubt.

Exterior Slope - outer side of the parapet that faced the enemy and intercepted incoming fire. The exterior slope typically inclined 45 degrees, the natural angle of repose for most soils. The interior slope was more vertical to enable defenders to stand directly behind it. Nearly all extant earthworks in
original condition will display some difference in angle between the exterior and interior slopes. See Interior and Superior Slope.

**Face** - a straight segment of parapet making up a larger earthwork that delivered direct or oblique fire to the front.

**Flank** - left or right end of a line of battle or position; side; a segment of parapet thrown back to protect the side of a position or to allow defenders to deliver fire across the front of an adjacent face.

**Fort** - an enclosed fortification defended by artillery; a complex, multi-component earthwork; a wooden stockade with corner blockhouses, often with ditching or other earthen components; generically, a military base.

**Fortification** - earthen works or other structures erected to defend a place or position.

**Glacis** (Fr.) - outer edge of the ditch, or, by extension, the field of fire of a fortification. In permanent fortifications, the glacis was shaped so that the ground rose gently as it approached the ditch to protect and conceal the masonry revetment of the scarp. In fieldworks, time permitting, the glacis was sloped as a continuation of the angle of the superior slope of the parapet. Some surviving artillery works have a shaped glacis, though it is fairly rare.

**Irregular Works** - See Regular and Irregular Works.

**Lunette** (Fr.) - a detached earthwork, open to the rear, composed of two faces forming a salient angle and two flanks, flanks and faces being of nearly equal length. Called a bastion when connected to another lunette by a curtain wall. Imprecisely applied to a demilune or epaulement.

**Magazine** - a secure, water-tight place to store ordnance supplies; in prepared works or fieldworks, a log or plank room or bunker covered over with a thick layer of earth to protect ammunition from accidental discharge or incoming artillery fire. Most artillery fortifications occupied for any length of time had at least one magazine, depending on the number and types of guns. A surviving magazine typically appears as a large mound of earth, sometimes with a depression in the top where underlying timbers have collapsed or in the side where the entrance used to be. The entrance was to the rear, opposite any incoming fire. Communication trenches or at least unobstructed paths for runners lead from the entrance to the gun platforms. From visible remains, it is difficult to tell if a mound was a magazine or a bombproof. A single mound within an artillery fortification is likely to have been a magazine, because engineers generally protected ordnance before men.

**Parapet** (It. parapetto, shield the chest) - a linear mound of earth built to defend against incoming fire. The thickness of a parapet was determined by the armament that it was expected to withstand—musketry, 5-7 feet; field artillery, 8-16 feet; for siege or naval guns, up to 35 feet. The parapet consisted of an interior slope, usually revetted with logs, planks, rails, stones, sandbags, or fascines, so as to be nearly vertical, the superior slope or crest, which inclined slightly downward toward the enemy, and the exterior slope or outer face, which took the brunt of enemy fire. The exterior slope typically inclined 45 degrees, the natural angle of repose for most soils.

**Platform** - a flat, usually rectangular, area behind a parapet on which an artillery piece was positioned. The platform surface was usually floored with planks or split logs or corduroyed with logs placed side by

---

2 The original glossary uses the term “Gun Platform.” Since the nomination refers to these features as “artillery platforms,” the term “platform,” without modifiers, was included here.
side. A platform might be excavated or elevated relative to grade, depending on whether it was firing through an embrasure or over the parapet (en barbette). The size of the platform is indicative of the size of cannon it was intended to service (average 10 x 14 ft. for a standard field piece). Sometimes, a platform was edged by a narrow drainage ditch or flanked by traverses.

**Postern** - See Sally Port.

**Profile** - cross-section of an earthwork. The higher and wider the parapet, the wider and deeper the ditch, the "stronger" the profile. A simple rear-ditched rifle trench had a "weak" profile.

**Ramp**\(^3\) - a ramp constructed to move a cannon into firing position on its platform; the ramp may ascend or descend to the platform from ground level. A gun ramp is a common surviving feature of artillery works.

**Redoubt** - an enclosed fortification designed to be defended from all sides. The trace of a redoubt could be square, polygonal, or occasionally circular. A redoubt could stand alone as a detached work, serve as a place of refuge within a larger fortification, or be incorporated into a continuous line of entrenchments as an artillery or infantry strong point. Redoubts were a common feature of all military eras.

**Reentering Angle or Reentrant** - angle in an earthwork or line of earthworks that points toward the rear and away from the enemy. Systems of earthworks were purposely designed with both reentering and salient angles.

**Regular and Irregular Works** - enclosed earthworks. Regular works were based on classic models-square or six-sided redoubts, and bastioned forts-and generally appeared balanced in proportion and symmetrical in trace. Irregular works were adapted to the peculiarities of the terrain and took a variety of shapes and traces. Although less "elegant" in terms of geometry, irregular works were often measurably stronger than the more rigid, classical prototypes.

**Revetment** - retaining wall constructed to support the interior slope of a parapet. Made of logs, wood planks, fence rails, fascines, gabions, hurdles, sods, or stones, the revetment provided additional protection from enemy fire, and, most importantly, kept the interior slope nearly vertical. Stone revetments commonly survive. A few log revetments have been preserved due to high resin pine or cypress and porous sandy soils. After an entrenchment was abandoned, many log or rail revetments were scavenged for other uses, causing the interior slope to slump more quickly. An interior slope will appear more vertical if the parapet eroded with the revetment still in place.

**Rifle Trench** - a parapet for infantry, typically thrown up rapidly with a rear-ditch. Also called a shelter trench.

**Salient Angle** - an angle in a work or line of earthworks that pointed toward the enemy. See Reentering Angle. Systems of earthworks were designed purposely with both reentering and salient angles.

**Sally Port** - opening left in the parapet as an entrance to an enclosed earthwork. All enclosed earthworks had a sally port; called a postern when vaulted or roofed to form a tunnel.

**Scarp, Escarp, or Escarpment** - inner slope of the ditch, as opposed to counterscarp, the outer slope of a ditch. Both scarp and counterscarp are below grade and are visible components of all ditches.

---

\(^3\) The original glossary uses the term “Gun Ramp.” Since the nomination refers to these features as “artillery ramps,” the term “ramp,” without modifiers, was included here.
Supply Cache - a rectangular excavation, usually 5-10 feet on a side and three feet deep, found in rear of the Main Line of Defense. These served as temporary storage for boxes of food or ammunition and are found in sheltered terrain adjacent to a road or a covered way. On rare occasions in the field or during siege operations, a supply cached might be roofed or partially roofed with logs and earth.

Terreplein (Fr.) - ground level, grade; generically a level area inside an enclosed fortification; in permanent fortifications, the flat surface of the rampart behind the parapet.

Traverse - a short segment of parapet used to prevent incoming enfilade fire from sweeping the length of a line, to protect the rear wall of an enclosed work from a plunging fire from the front, to cover a sally port, or to provide extra protection for a magazine or supply cache. Traverses were sometimes built of or reinforced by gabions and were usually constructed perpendicular to incoming fire, rather than perpendicular to the defensive parapet. In rapid entrenchments, traverses might be constructed entirely of logs.

Trench - usually short for entrenchment, sometimes referring to the ditch of an entrenchment or to an auxiliary entrenchment in rear of a rampart.
8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for National Register listing.)

- [x] A. Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
- [ ] B. Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
- [x] C. Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.
- [x] D. Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criteria Considerations
(Mark “x” in all the boxes that apply.)

- [ ] A. Owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes
- [ ] B. Removed from its original location
- [ ] C. A birthplace or grave
- [ ] D. A cemetery
- [ ] E. A reconstructed building, object, or structure
- [ ] F. A commemorative property
- [ ] G. Less than 50 years old or achieving significance within the past 50 years
Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks

Name of Property

Multiple counties, DC, MD, VA

County and State

Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions.)

- MILITARY
- ENGINEERING
- ETHNIC HERITAGE: Black
- COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
- ARCHEOLOGY: Historic, Non-Aboriginal

Period of Significance
1861-1972

Significant Dates

Significant Person
(Complete only if Criterion B is marked above.)
N/A

Cultural Affiliation
- American Civil War Soldiers
- African American

Architect/Builder
- Barnard, Maj. John G. (military engineer)
- Meigs, Montgomery C. (military engineer & architect)
- Haussmann, William (NPS architect)
- Eliot II, Charles W. (landscape architect & urban planner)
Statement of Significance Summary Paragraph (Provide a summary paragraph that includes level of significance, applicable criteria, justification for the period of significance, and any applicable criteria considerations.)

The Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District is nationally significant in military history and engineering for its collection of Civil War-era earthworks, which constitute the remnants of the ring of defensive fortifications that protected the nation’s capital during the war and are an outstanding example of military engineering of the era. The forts in the district have local significance as a result of their association with the history of African Americans in the District of Columbia during and immediately after the Civil War. With the boundary increase included in this updated nomination, the Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District gains significance at the local level in 20th-century park planning as an innovative park system and greenway along the city’s perimeter. The period of significance for the district spans the years 1861 to 1972. The first date marks the beginning of the Civil War and the initial construction of the vast defensive system built to protect the national capital of Washington, D.C. from Confederate attack. The closing date extends the period of significance to include the completion of recreational facilities within the parks as stipulated in the 1968 Fort Circle Parks Master Plan.

The district is historically significant under National Register Criterion A in three areas of significance: Military History (national significance), Ethnic Heritage-Black (local significance), and Community Planning and Development (local significance). In addition, it possesses national significance under National Register Criterion C in the area of Engineering and as the masterwork of Major John G. Barnard, and local significance under Criterion C in the area of Community Planning and Development. Finally, the district is locally significant under Criterion D for its potential to yield information about its Civil War history.

Narrative Statement of Significance (Provide at least one paragraph for each area of significance.)

AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Military (Criterion A, national)

The Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District is nationally significant because it contains the physical remnants of an unprecedented ring of armed fortifications that defended the national capital during the Civil War. For much of the conflict, the presence of this robust defensive network effectively deterred Confederate attacks. The district is also significant because of its association with the Battle of Fort Stevens, the only Civil War battle fought in the District of Columbia and the only test of Washington’s fortifications. The defenses held, ensuring the safety of Washington, D.C. and contributing to the ultimate Union victory in the Civil War and the preservation of the United States. The district therefore meets National Register Criterion A in the area of Military History.

Because of its dual role as the seat of the U.S. government and the command center of the Union war effort, Washington, D.C. represented a strategic and symbolic target to the Confederacy during the Civil War. At the outbreak of armed hostilities in April 1861, a single fort, the poorly maintained and lightly armed Fort Washington located some eight miles south of the city, served as the only permanent
defensive feature. Washington, D.C. was dangerously exposed and unprotected. The secession of Virginia in May 1861 and the Union defeat at the First Battle of Manassas, fought July 21, 1861 only 35 miles west of the capital, exposed this vulnerability, raised fears of a Confederate invasion of the national capital, and prompted the construction of an extensive fortification system to protect Washington, D.C.

On July 11-12, 1864, Confederate forces under the leadership of Lt. General Jubal A. Early launched a raid centered on Fort Stevens, one of the forts defending the northern approaches to the city. This engagement, known as the Battle of Fort Stevens, was the only attack on Washington during the Civil War and the sole test of its defenses in armed combat. With the war going increasingly poorly for the South since their defeat at Gettysburg the previous July, the Confederate leadership was anxious for a significant victory that would change the trajectory of the conflict. Early sought to capture the federal seat, President Lincoln, and other leaders, and held the ultimate goal of dispersing the U.S. government. At this time, the Union defenders were mostly reservists, semi-disabled veterans, volunteers, and conscripts, as the majority of the able-bodied soldiers had been removed from garrison duty and sent into the field. Washington’s defenses, while formidable, were perilously undermanned. The Confederates, however, were exhausted from a long march through hot summer weather and fighting in the recent Battle of Monocacy,¹ a vital Union delaying action that slowed the Rebel advance by one day. As a result, Early did not order an immediate, full-scale attack on Fort Stevens. This delay allowed for the timely arrival of Union reinforcements, and the Confederates ultimately withdrew after a series of small but deadly skirmishes. Additionally, President Lincoln, who rode out to view the battle firsthand and was fired upon while at Fort Stevens, became the only sitting U.S. president to come under enemy attack during wartime.

Engineering (Criterion C, national)

The Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District holds national significance and qualifies for listing under National Register Criterion C in the area of Engineering as the nation’s preeminent example of comprehensive Civil War-era military engineering and city defense. The district also qualifies for listing under Criterion C as the masterwork of Major John G. Barnard, the Union engineer officer who commanded and coordinated the design and construction of the entire fortification system. In the process, Barnard came to be known as “The Father of the Defenses of Washington” and emerged as a foremost practitioner of his discipline in mid-19th century America.

During the Civil War, a total of 164 distinct fortifications ringed Washington. Built between 1861 and 1865, the forts and batteries were constructed of earth and timber; some forts and batteries included bombproofs, magazines, and other structures. In some cases there were also stockades, barracks, quarters, and supply buildings on site. Twenty miles of earthen rifle trenches connected the more vulnerable stretches between the forts and batteries, and some 32 miles of military roads served as a means of communication along the defensive lines and connected with preexisting streets to provide access into the city’s interior.

¹ The Secretary of the Interior has designated Monocacy National Battlefield a National Historic Landmark and Monocacy National Battlefield Park is listed in the National Register of Historic Places.
Much of the credit for the successful defense of Washington, D.C. is attributed to Major Barnard, who employed the most up-to-date methods of construction and sound defensive strategies to provide the best possible protection for the national capital. He utilized Dennis Hart Mahan’s *A Treatise on Field Fortifications*, then the U.S. Army’s primary technical manual on fortification design and construction, as his principal reference and practical guide, but modified Mahan’s instructions to better suit the long-term defense of a city. Barnard also studied the Lines of Torres Vedras, the network of fortifications that shielded Lisbon against Napoleon’s 1810-11 invasion of Portugal, as a historical model of effective city defense. Following this example, Barnard situated Washington’s fortifications atop the strategic high ground surrounding the city, and spaced them so that they were within range of one another’s guns and therefore able to support each other along the defensive line. Further, the rifle trenches and military roads were designed to allow soldiers and supplies to move quickly and efficiently throughout the system, eliminating any obvious weak points and allowing reinforcements to be summoned.

At the close of the Civil War in April 1865, Washington, D.C. was the most heavily fortified city in North America. It boasted four times as many forts and batteries as Richmond, the Confederate capital, and nearly three times as many as Petersburg, Virginia, probably the best-defended city in the South. While most fortified cities had flaws in their defenses that could be exposed during an attack, Washington benefitted from a complete, mutually reinforcing fortification network. It therefore constituted not only the largest system of defenses constructed anywhere during the Civil War, but also the most secure.

**Ethnic Heritage-Black (Criterion A, local)**

As one of the primary locations for the settlement and sometimes employment of self-emancipated slaves, the Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District possesses local significance under National Register Criterion A for its important connection to the history of African Americans in Washington, D.C. during and shortly after the Civil War (1861-1870s). Throughout the war, slaves fled the Confederacy to claim their freedom, and Washington, D.C. received more of these freed people than any other northern city. Many of the new arrivals settled in temporary camps near Washington’s fortifications and some found work building and maintaining the defenses. During the Reconstruction era that followed the Civil War, these displaced people utilized a number of the fortifications as temporary shelters and, in some cases, established settlements nearby. The district is therefore associated with the transition from slavery to freedom, and represents a locally significant example of this broad pattern in American history.

By the end of the Civil War, as many as 40,000 self-emancipated slaves had made their way to Washington, D.C. The national capital was a logical destination for several reasons. First, it was the southernmost major city remaining in the Union. Second, the city’s population included a longstanding and well-established free black community that encouraged escaping slaves to move to the city. Upon their arrival, local African American benevolent societies and private individuals provided much-needed aid. Third, and perhaps most importantly, the District of Columbia Emancipation Act became law on April 16, 1862, more than eight months before President Lincoln issued his general Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863. Legally, the D.C. Emancipation Act did not free any escaping slaves that arrived within the District’s borders, but this provision proved almost impossible to enforce and the refugees came surging in.
Many of the self-emancipated slaves initially lived in temporary settlements near Union troop encampments and the ring of fortifications surrounding Washington. Such locations afforded a certain amount of physical security as well as employment opportunities; some of the freedmen worked as laborers on the construction and maintenance of the defenses. Consequently, they provided a boon to the local war effort, but they were also significantly underpaid and often mistreated as well. Following the close of the Civil War, the Army vacated the fortifications and some briefly served as temporary shelters for former slaves. Then, during Washington’s post-war real estate boom, several new African American enclaves were founded in the vicinities of the fortifications. Although there are scant physical remains of these developments, some of the fortifications themselves are still extant and provide a tangible link with this important facet of local African American history.

Community Planning and Development: Park Planning (Criterion A & C, local)

The Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District is locally significant under Criterion A in the area of Community Planning and Development for its association with broad trends in the history of American park planning and urban recreation. The fort park system formed a major element of the 1902 Senate Park Commission Plan for the redevelopment of Washington, D.C., and evolved into a prime example of urban open space planning in the early 20th century and a key component of local “greenway” corridor creation in the region during the mid-20th century. The Senate Park Commission Plan, which is recognized as one of the seminal works in the history of American city planning, proposed preserving Washington’s Civil War fortifications as public parks and creating a pleasure drive between them. In 1927, noted city planner Charles W. Eliot II built upon the Senate Park Commission’s plan for the fort parks and Fort Drive. Guided by Eliot’s plan, the federal government acquired the majority of the land required to carry out this project in the 1920s and 1930s. Although the Fort Drive was never fully realized, the fort sites and connecting rights-of-way were successfully preserved as a ribbon of urban parkland. In the 1960s, the NPS developed a new Master Plan that focused on transforming the planned drive into an urban “greenway,” a term that denotes a corridor of parkland or other protected open space that is maintained for the purposes of conservation, recreation, and the use of non-motorized transportation. The historic district qualifies for listing in the National Register under Criterion C as an early and pivotal project by Charles W. Eliot II, a city planner at the vanguard of the urban open space movement. Eliot’s plan for Fort Drive and the fort parks provided for a system of open spaces that integrated recreational, environmental, and functional uses of the landscape. These design principles shaped Eliot’s subsequent work and laid the groundwork for the development of the concept of urban greenways.

Developed in the context of the City Beautiful movement, the 1902 Senate Park Commission Plan held two primary objectives: to redevelop Washington’s historic core according to L’Enfant’s original 1792 plan of the city and to extend this design beyond the borders of the old city via a park system ranging over the entire District of Columbia and extending out into neighboring Maryland and Virginia. The commission’s vision of Fort Drive connecting parks at the Civil War forts constituted a major aspect of the latter goal, and formed a significant part of the commission’s overall park system. It also showed a clear regard for the historical value of the forts, and the Fort Drive concept stands amongst the earliest parkway proposals explicitly intended to connect historic sites. The plan for the fort parks and connecting drive was a response to a clear need to protect the fort sites and intervening rights-of-way from the rampant development and suburbanization spreading across Washington, D.C. at the turn of the 20th century. The commission, therefore, combined Civil War commemoration and historic
preservation with urban planning in its proposal for the fort parks. The creation of the 23-mile ribbon of urban parkland that makes up the present Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District stemmed directly from the recommendations of the Senate Park Commission. This forested landscape remains in place today and is readily apparent amid the heavily urbanized environment of Washington, D.C. It consequently provides a physical link with the influential plan of 1902.

Beyond this association with City Beautiful planning and the Senate Park Commission, the historic district is historically significant as an early example of comprehensive urban open space planning. It stands as an important local example of the nationwide trend toward the creation of city-wide and county-wide park systems to beautify and provide recreation and leisure activities to city and county residents. In 1927, city planner Charles W. Eliot II prepared a report for the National Capital Park and Planning Commission (NCPPC) that updated and expanded the Fort Drive proposal espoused in the Plan of 1902 and guided the federal government’s acquisition of land for the parkway and associated parks. Eliot’s report includes many of the same general design considerations that he codified two years later in his much more widely read 1928 “Open Space Plan for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts,” generally considered the first statewide open space planning document. The 23-mile-long system of fort parks ringing Washington fills precisely the same role as the 70-mile semi-circular greenbelt that Eliot proposed for metropolitan Boston two years later. The former is little-regarded outside the District of Columbia and the latter much better known, but Eliot’s report for the NCPPC in Washington was undoubtedly the predecessor and progenitor of his Massachusetts plan. While the onset of the Great Depression stalled the implementation of the Eliot’s Massachusetts plan for some 30 years, federal funds appropriated through the Capper-Cramton Act (1930) allowed the vast majority of land for the Fort Circle to be acquired for public use by 1932.

The construction of recreational facilities in the parks beginning in the 1930s represented important steps towards fulfilling the goals that the Senate Park Commission, the NCPPC, and the National Park Service had for Fort Drive and the fort parks as sites for outdoor recreation in the city. Members of the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) constructed many of these amenities, such as the outdoor amphitheater at Fort Bunker Hill and a children’s playfield near the historic Fort Dupont earthworks. Other CCC contributions to the parks included adding picnic areas, fire pits, rustic shelters, and comfort stations; cutting through walking and bridle trails; and grading and paving sections of the Fort Drive roadway. The National Park Service continued to add recreational facilities after World War II, though at a much slower pace than during the 1930s. The evolution of recreational facilities in the parks reflects broader changes in concepts and expectations for outdoor recreation in urban areas.

Spared from private development, much of the historic district grew into urban forest in the decades after federal acquisition. In 1968, the NPS adopted a management plan that preserved the fort parks as urban open space and highlighted the landscape’s exceptional capacity for historical interpretation, natural resource conservation, and active and passive recreation. It consequently became an early local example of the “greenway” concept, a major city planning idea that began to garner broad national support in the early 1970s. The current system of hiking and biking trails continues to provide opportunity for recreational pursuits and also recalls the earlier vision for the Fort Drive. The history and contributions of the historic district toward urban park planning therefore remain evident upon the landscape today.
Archeology: Historic - Non-Aboriginal (Criterion D, local)

The Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District is locally significant under Criterion D for its potential to yield information about the Battle of Fort Stevens (July 11-12, 1864), the Civil War Defenses of Washington, and the post-Civil War military history of Fort Foote. Archeologists have thus far evaluated only a small portion of the historic district, but the documented archeological sites indicate that the historic district has the potential to shed light on several important research topics, including troop positions and movements during the Battle of Fort Stevens, soldier life at the Civil War Defenses of Washington, and military activities at Fort Foote from the end of the Civil War in 1865 until the fort closed in 1878. The archeological resources in the historic district are uniquely able to address these topics, since the closure of the forts as military installations and subsequent development obliterated many of the aboveground resources that could convey these particular aspects of the history of the fortifications constructed to defend Washington, D.C. during the Civil War. The information gathered from the archeological investigations in the historic district to date also suggests that many other areas in the historic district are archeologically rich as well.

Battle of Fort Stevens (July 11-12, 1864)

The Battle of Fort Stevens archeological site (DC #51NW163) in Rock Creek Park (ROCR)\(^2\) contains the most intact archeological record of the battle yet discovered. Previous assessments of the remnants of the battlefield landscape concentrated on the area near Fort Stevens, the main target of Confederate General Jubal Early’s attack on the Defenses of Washington. With the exception of Battleground National Cemetery and a portion of Fort Stevens (ROCR) that was partially reconstructed in the 1930s, urban development now covers most of the battlefield in the vicinity of Fort Stevens. As a result, prior to the identification of the battlefield site in Rock Creek Park in 2002, archeologists believed that little of the battlefield landscape remained intact.

The Battle of Fort Stevens site in Rock Creek Park is associated with skirmishes that took place as Confederate troops sought weak points in the Union defenses around Fort Stevens in the afternoon and evening of July 11, 1864, following General Early’s decision not to attack Fort Stevens immediately upon his arrival at midday. By comparing the documentary record with the artifacts located at the site, archeologists were able to determine that site is located on a slope leading up to a Confederate position on a ridge above Rock Creek. The fired bullets and artillery shell fragments found at the site confirm documentary sources indicating that on July 11, 1864, Union troops engaged the Confederate troops on the ridge, with support from artillery at Fort DeRussy. The archeological site thus has the potential to reveal details about the Confederates’ failed effort to expose weak points in the Defenses of Washington near Fort DeRussy and about the Union Army’s successful defense of the nation’s capital. Further archeological work in this area could uncover additional sites that would add to our understanding of troop positions and movements associated with the military action near Fort DeRussy and potentially lead to the delineation of a larger battlefield site within Rock Creek Park.

---

\(^2\) Parenthetical references following the names of individual parks and major resources provide the four-letter abbreviation for the NPS administrative unit to assist in locating the park in the inventory, which is organized alphabetically by NPS administrative unit and park name. The park name is provided in instances where the resource name is different from the park name.
Civil War Defenses of Washington

The archeological sites within the historic district that overlap or are adjacent to the aboveground remnants of the Defenses of Washington are significant for their potential to reveal information about the buildings constructed at the forts and about the soldiers and civilians who lived and worked there during the Civil War.

During the war, a number of buildings stood behind garrisoned fortifications: mess halls, cook houses, barracks, officers’ quarters, guard houses, and headquarters buildings. All of these buildings were demolished after the war, and the existing written and visual documentation of them is limited. While some of these buildings appear in photographs and sketches created during the war, most are documented only in maps. Archeological sites within and around the historic earthworks have the potential to uncover information about the location and arrangement of these buildings, as well as construction materials. For example, the site of the barracks and mess hall at Fort Totten (ROCR, DC #51NE37) is intact, and the dump site at Fort DeRussy (Rock Creek Park, ROCR, DC #51NW159) contains architectural fragments that may be associated with buildings in the adjacent area.

The archeological sites associated with the Civil War Defenses of Washington also have the potential to reveal information about the lives of soldiers and civilians at the fortifications during the war. Although official military records, diaries, and letters provide important information about soldier life, the archeological record complements this information and has the potential to shed light on the work of civilians at the forts, a topic that is less well-documented in the written record. Archeological investigations at Fort Marcy (GWMP, VDHR #44FX17), Fort Totten (ROCR, DC #51NE37), and Fort DeRussy (Rock Creek Park, ROCR, DC #51NW159) uncovered artifacts such as items of clothing, ceramics, glassware, cookware, and pipe fragments, materials that reflect the day-to-day lives of soldiers at the fort.

In addition to these documented archeological sites, the historic district encompasses other fortifications that were occupied during the Civil War and that retain aboveground earthwork features. As a result, it is likely that other intact archeological sites with the potential to reveal information about fort buildings and soldier life exist within the district.

Fort Foote, 1865-1878

The archeological site at Fort Foote Park is potentially significant for understanding the military use of the fort both during and after the Civil War. While most of the forts in the Civil War Defenses of Washington closed soon after the end of the war, Fort Foote remained an active military post until 1878. In addition to the building foundations visible on the surface, artifacts that have been recovered from the site include a military uniform button, an artillery fuse, and building materials, suggesting that the site could shed light on the physical landscape of the fort and on the lives and work of soldiers and civilians. Nearly all of the historic military buildings at Fort Foote have been demolished or are in ruins, and this era in the fort’s history is not well-documented in the written record. As a result, the archeological site has the potential to fill gaps in our knowledge of military activities at Fort Foote.
HISTORICAL NARRATIVE

Washington, D.C. on the Eve of the Civil War: 1861

Establishment and Design of Washington, D.C.

On July 16, 1790, Congress passed the Residence Act granting President George Washington the authority to select a “district of territory, not exceeding ten miles square,” along the Potomac River “as the permanent seat of the government of the United States.” Washington officially fixed the borders of the new federal District, to be named Columbia in honor of Christopher Columbus, on January 24, 1791. President Washington received the singular honor of having the capital city share his name, and so it became the City of Washington within the District of Columbia.

The president retained French-born architect and civil engineer Pierre Charles L’Enfant to design the federal city. Anchored by the U.S. Capitol and the White House, L’Enfant’s vision emerged as a tour de force of city planning: a grid of intersecting north-south and east-west running streets overlaid with grand diagonal avenues that incorporated circles, squares, and numerous parcels reserved for the development of public buildings, urban parks, and memorial spaces. The federal government designated these public lands as U.S. Reservations; this system of U.S. Reservations is still in use today.

As laid out by L’Enfant, the City of Washington occupied less than 10 percent of the total land in the District. The city limits extended only from Boundary Street (present-day Florida Avenue) in the north to Georgetown in the west, the Potomac River in the south, and the Anacostia River (Eastern Branch) in the east. In 1801, the District of Columbia Organic Act divided into two counties the remaining land that fell outside Washington City but within the District: Washington County to the north and east of the Potomac, and Alexandria County to the west and south. Georgetown remained a separate municipality until 1871, when it merged with Washington City and Washington County. The federal government retroceded Alexandria County, including the City of Alexandria, to the Commonwealth of Virginia in 1846. This decision reduced the acreage of the District of Columbia by approximately one-third, and little more than a decade later left the national capital perilously exposed at the outset of the Civil War.

---

Topography, Population, and Demographics

Topographically, the City of Washington sits in a low depression, with the surrounding heights located in the District of Columbia and neighboring Maryland and Virginia. The overall effect is that of a bowl with a well-defined rim, and it was along this rim that the Union Army would, beginning in May 1861, establish a ring of fortifications to protect the city from Confederate attack. In Virginia, these fortifications occupied a chain of highpoints along the Potomac known as the Arlington Heights. In the District and Maryland, Union engineers established fortifications along similar stretches of strategic high ground north of Florida Avenue and east of the Anacostia River. From these elevated vantage points, Union defenders observed and tracked advancing Confederate forces, assessed the enemy’s strength, protected important routes in and out of the city, extended the effective range of their guns, and most importantly, prevented the Confederates from occupying the high ground and shelling the city below.9

The permanent population of the District of Columbia in 1860 totaled 75,080 people: 61,122 in Washington City, 8,733 in Georgetown, and 5,225 in Washington County.10 Fully 93 percent of the inhabitants resided in the established population centers of Washington City and Georgetown, with only seven percent located in the predominately rural Washington County. This land was largely undeveloped and mainly occupied by forests and farms of various sizes, with a few grand estates owned by the wealthy elite. The adjacent portions of Maryland and Virginia, except for a few scattered towns and the City of Alexandria, were also rural.11

The presence of a long-established, “self-reliant, increasingly literate, and sometimes even prosperous” African American community also characterized Washington, D.C. on the eve of the Civil War.12 In 1800, the first year the District of Columbia appeared in the federal census, slaves outnumbered free blacks by more than four to one. However, 30 years later the majority of the black population was free, and by 1860, there were 11,131 free African Americans, about 15 percent of the total population, and 3,185 slaves, just over four percent of the total.13 This transformation from a predominately enslaved people to a predominately free community reveals that Washington’s African American population gained a level of independence and upward mobility unheard of in most other areas of the antebellum south. The first free black Washingtonians came to the national capital to help construct its public edifices and private buildings, drive coaches, take in laundry, or work as skilled craftsmen, domestic servants, or common laborers. As the city grew, they dominated much of the hospitality industry, and the most successful entrepreneurs owned and operated their own establishments. Likewise, enslaved people in the city experienced more autonomy than their counterparts held in rural areas further south.

12 Janke, p. 92.
Washington’s urban slaves often hired out their own time and some lived apart from their masters. A few even saved enough money to purchase their freedom and that of friends and family members.  

Members of Washington’s burgeoning African American community, both slave and free, came together for mutual support. By the 1860s, approximately one dozen African American churches existed within the city. In addition to their religious focus, these churches provided aid to the needy, raised money so that parishioners could purchase their freedom, and assisted fugitive slaves making their way north via the Underground Railroad. No black public schools existed as yet, but the first private academy opened in 1807 and many others followed. Operational funding often came from the students, their families, and the community at large. By the start of the Civil War, Washington’s African American population was therefore not only increasingly successful but also increasingly autonomous. This sense of independence and determination would soon be called upon to help support the steady stream of escaped slaves that poured into Washington, D.C. once the fighting began.

The Civil War: 1861-1865
Terms in SMALL CAPS can be found in the glossary included at the end of Section 7 (p. 70).

The Need for Fortifications around Washington

At the outset of the Civil War, Washington, D.C. was decidedly southern in both its geography and cultural identity. The national capital sat completely surrounded by two slave states, Maryland and Virginia, both of which were considering secession when President Lincoln took office on March 4, 1861. About a third of all D.C. residents had been born in one of these two states, and at least half of the native-born population had family in Maryland or Virginia. As such, pro-southern sentiment rose, and secessionists operated openly in Washington during the early spring of 1861. On April 12, the Confederates opened fire on Fort Sumter in the harbor of Charleston, South Carolina. Three days later, Lincoln declared that “an insurrection existed” and called for 75,000 federal volunteers to enlist in a 90-day term of service. The nation now irrevocably moved toward civil war, and Washington would emerge as the center of the Union war effort as well as the seat of government.

When the war began, the national capital featured very few defenses. Because it occupied the low ground, the city possessed a strategic disadvantage that left it vulnerable from all sides. Fort Washington, located some 12 miles south on the Potomac River, stood as the only fortification in the vicinity of the District of Columbia. Constructed as a response to the British invasion of Washington in 1814, the fort served primarily as a defense against waterborne incursions but fell into disrepair after the removal of its garrison in 1853. Nor could the city rely on force of numbers for protection. At the...

---

16 Floyd and CHEP, Historic Resources Study, Part 1, p. 4:1; Jenke, pp. 35, 39, 41, 45, 46.
time of the attack on Fort Sumter, Washington, D.C housed approximately 1,400 soldiers. Such a small contingent had no chance of mounting an adequate defense and, to make matters worse, many of the men were of questionable loyalty.\textsuperscript{19}

Anxiety over the deepening sectional crisis and lack of security soon peaked, and panic briefly gripped the national capital. On April 19, 1861, a group of Baltimore secessionists destroyed that city’s railroad bridges so as to prevent Union volunteers from reaching Washington. This action also stopped all land transportation and mail service. Two days later, a riot erupted as the secessionists seized the Baltimore telegraph office, effectively cutting off all communication to and from Washington. Rumors of an impending invasion spread rapidly, and a mass departure out of the capital began before Union troops arrived in Baltimore and restored order.\textsuperscript{20} The episode, however, further emphasized Washington’s vulnerability and the need for an armed defense.

The occupation of Baltimore also helped ensure that Maryland remained in the Union, and so the War Department turned its attention to Virginia, which had passed an ordinance of secession on April 17. On May 23, 1861, the state held a public referendum and approved the ordinance by a margin of three to one. Virginia joined the Confederacy, leaving only the Potomac River as a buffer between Washington, D.C. and enemy territory. That night, 13,000 Union soldiers invaded northern Virginia and moved swiftly to capture Alexandria and the Arlington Heights. Without Alexandria, navigation on the Potomac would not be possible, and securing the Heights proved vital to the defense of Washington.\textsuperscript{21}

By daylight on May 24, Union soldiers broke ground on the first two FORTIFICATIONS of what would eventually become a defensive ring around Washington.\textsuperscript{22} The soldiers worked under the supervision of Army engineers, and by mid-July had largely completed these FORTS and five more, all in Virginia. These initial works were more isolated footholds than a comprehensive fortification system, and Major (later Brevet Major General) John G. Barnard, the engineer officer in charge of erecting Washington’s defenses, admitted as much. Still, these forts did provide a line of defense for the southern approach to the capital, where any potential attack was expected to come from.\textsuperscript{23}

By July 1861, roughly 50,000 Union troops travelled to Washington, D.C. With such a large force on hand, fears over the security of the capital dissipated. The local citizenry and federal government also grew impatient and desired to crush the rebels in one decisive battle before the Confederacy could mobilize, train, and coordinate its army. Moreover, many of the Union soldiers donned their uniforms as part of Lincoln’s call for 90-day volunteers, and their terms of service were almost up. The War Department needed to take advantage of this manpower while it was still available, and that meant committing the army to the field. The Confederates also recognized the opportunity before them. A victory would mean the chance to capture Washington, which now served as both the political and the


\textsuperscript{20} Floyd and CHEP,\textit{ Historic Resources Study, Part 1}, pp. 4:2-3; Leech, pp. 61-65; Furgurson, pp. 80-82; Cooling and Owen, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{21} Floyd and CHEP,\textit{ Historic Resources Study, Part 1}, pp. 4:3-5; Cooling and Owen, pp. 4-5; Janke, p. 50.

\textsuperscript{22} The first two fortifications, Forts Corcoran and Runyon, are no longer extant.

\textsuperscript{23} Floyd and CHEP,\textit{ Historic Resources Study, Part 1}, pp. 4:6, 4:7; Cooling and Owen, p. 7.
military capital of the United States. The city became a “great prize whose capture would enhance the prestige of the rebellious government, and surely bring it recognition by foreign powers.”

This anticipation and posturing culminated at the First Battle of Manassas, fought on July 21, 1861, only some 30 miles outside Washington, D.C. At first the Federals appeared on the brink of victory. However, later in the day the Confederates rallied, made a crucial stand, and then counterattacked. The inexperienced Union troops, composed mainly of state militiamen and raw recruits, panicked and fled back to Washington in a rout. Fear and uncertainty again descended on the capital. Confederate attack seemed assured, and the handful of newly built fortifications now appeared woefully inadequate. But the Confederates, also exhausted and disorganized, chose not to press their advantage. Nonetheless, the debacle at Manassas once again exposed Washington’s vulnerability, and the renewed fear of capture became the driving force behind the construction of a comprehensive FORTIFICATION system to encircle and defend the city.

The Defenses of Washington: Engineering and Design

Less than a week after the First Battle of Manassas, Lincoln appointed Major General George B. McClellan commander of the Military Division of the Potomac, the main force responsible for the defense of Washington. McClellan, a trained military engineer, recognized Major Barnard as a competent officer and engineer in his own right, and placed him in charge of the massive construction project. In this role, Barnard transformed the national capital into a heavily defended fortress and subsequently earned the sobriquet “Father of the Defenses of Washington.” A small group of Army engineer officers, never numbering much more than a dozen at a time, served under him, carried out his orders, and supervised the men who labored to make his vision a reality. However, only one of his assistants, Lieutenant Colonel (later Brevet Major General) Barton S. Alexander stayed with the fortifications throughout the war, and it was Alexander who took over as chief engineer when Barnard himself was transferred to the field in June, 1864.

Barnard did not have the luxury of working from a master design of the FORTIFICATION system. Rather, with the capital still at risk of attack, speed mattered most, and construction began immediately and proceeded systematically. He later reported that the “situation was such as to admit of no elaborate plans nor previously-prepared estimates. Defensive arrangements were improvised and works commenced as speedily as possible where most needed.” Barnard first turned his attention to expanding and strengthening the string of FORTS along the Arlington Heights, and then extended this line to cover the City of Alexandria.

These efforts increased the security of Washington from the south and west, but approaches to the city from the north and east, encompassing all of Washington County and adjacent areas in rural Maryland, remained completely undefended. Moreover, low water in the Potomac River during the spring and

---

24 Furgurson, pp. 95-96, 116-117; Floyd and CHEP, Historic Resources Study, Part I, p. 4:7; Cooling and Owen, pp. 1, 2; Leech, pp. 55-56.
25 Ibid., pp. 99-105; Janke, pp. 53, 60; Furgurson, pp. 119-121; Floyd and CHEP, Historic Resources Study, Part I, p. 4:8; Cooling and Owen, p. 7.
26 Floyd and CHEP, Historic Resources Study, Part I, p. 4:8; Cooling and Owen, pp. 7, 251-252.
27 Floyd and CHEP, Historic Resources Study, Part I, p. 4:20; Cooling and Owen, p. 251.
28 Floyd and CHEP, Historic Resources Study, Part I, pp. 4:8-9; Cooling and Owen, p. 7.
summer of 1861 led to concerns that the Confederates could simply cross the river to the north of the Virginia defenses and then swing south and attack these two exposed FLANKS. Barnard once again improvised a solution to meet this new emergency. After his men reconnoitered the landscape, he directed them to construct fortifications covering the most strategically important locations. Begun in August, Fort Pennsylvania (later renamed Fort Reno (ROCR)) was the first such fortification. Others soon followed, with Barnard siting them so as to protect major transportation routes. Fort Massachusetts (later Fort Stevens (ROCR)), which defended the 7th Street Road (present-day Georgia Avenue NW), the main route in and out of the city to the north, later became the most famous of these fortifications.29

At the end of 1861, a total of 48 defensive works ringed Washington, with the majority of these FORTIFICATIONS constructed during the five months since the First Battle of Manassas.30 All took advantage of the high ridge surrounding the city, but Barnard stressed that he did not consider the fortification system complete or the capital secure. He needed additional FORTS and BATTERIES to fill in gaps in the defenses, and many of the extant fortifications were not yet connected by RIFLE TRENCHES. The engineers and laborers also laid down several miles of military roads linking the defensive works to each other and with Washington’s streets, but many more miles of roads were still required.31 They constructed most of these military roads in 1862, and substantially completed the entire fortification system by the end of 1863.

At the conclusion of the Civil War in April 1865, the defensive system around Washington encompassed a total of 164 distinct FORTIFICATIONS (see Figure 7-1). The War Department classified sixty-eight of these FORTIFICATIONS as major FORTS and BATTERIES; together, they had emplacements for 1,120 guns, with 807 cannon and 98 mortars actually mounted. Ninety-three unmanned BATTERIES, with room for an additional 401 mobile field guns, and three BLOCKHOUSES (structures designed to counter the threat of a Confederate cavalry charge), filled in the gaps between the major forts and batteries. Twenty miles of RIFLE TRENCHES connected the more vulnerable stretches between the fortifications. Finally, approximately 32 miles of military roads served as a means of communicating along the defensive lines and moving troops and supplies. In addition, the roads joined with preexisting streets to provide access into the city’s interior.32

Some historians have characterized Civil War Washington as the most heavily defended city in North America at the time.33 Armies fortified other cities in the North and the South during the Civil War, but none equaled the fortification system surrounding Washington, D.C. Richmond, the Confederate capital, featured more than 40 FORTS and BATTERIES, and Petersburg, Virginia was probably the most well-defended city in the Confederacy with 55 partially enclosed artillery batteries linked by RIFLE TRENCHES.34 Washington boasted more forts and more guns than these or any other city, but a sheer force of numbers was not the only aspect that contributed to its defensibility. Rather, “the combination of the

29 Floyd and CHEP, Historic Resources Study, Part 1, pp. 4:11-12; Cooling and Owen, p. 9.
30 Twenty-three forts were located south of the Potomac, with 14 forts and three batteries between the Potomac and the Anacostia Rivers, and 11 forts beyond the Anacostia.
32 Floyd and CHEP, Historic Resources Study, Part 1, p. 5:1; Cooling and Owen, pp. xi, 1, 33-34.
33 Floyd and CHEP, Historic Resources Study, Part 1, p. 4:8; Cooling and Owen, pp. 7, 251-252.
forts, batteries, BLOCKHOUSES, TRENCHES and guns and their interaction made the entire fortification system effective."\textsuperscript{35} Barnard situated the forts and batteries so that they were within range of one another’s guns and able to support each other along the line of battle. The rifle trenches, blockhouses, and unmanned batteries could also be manned in the event of an attack, bringing extra firepower to bear where it was needed most, and the military roads allowed troops and supplies to quickly move about the lines in order to respond to threats as they arose. The Defenses of Washington suffered no obvious weak points because Barnard designed the entire system to be mutually reinforcing. Conversely, other cities had glaring flaws in their fortifications. The defenses of Petersburg, for instance, included two major gaps caused by deep ravines.\textsuperscript{36}

Barnard’s FORTIFICATION system occupied private lands hastily seized and occupied by the Union Army. The security of the national capital trumped the landowners’ property rights, and the War Department simply moved in and took possession without providing any compensation at the time or promising future recompense. To make matters worse, the construction of the fortifications often severely damaged the land. Farmers saw their cultivated fields and orchards obliterated as RIFLE TRENCHES and military roads cut through them. Level soil that previously supported crops and livestock now dropped down into DITCHES and rose to form earthen PARAPETS. Soldiers and Army laborers felled acre upon acre of valuable forest trees in order to open up reconnaissance views and create lines of fire for infantrymen and artillery guns. Many of these trees became the timber used to erect the fortifications. Soldiers often moved or destroyed private buildings when they impinged upon the defensive ring encircling the city.\textsuperscript{37}

Barnard drew upon two primary sources of information in developing the Civil War Defenses of Washington. The first was a historical example of effective city defense, the Lines of Torres Vedras built to defend Lisbon during Napoleon’s 1810-11 invasion of Portugal. The key aspects of Washington’s fortifications are readily apparent in the design of the Lines of Torres Vedras: occupation of the high ground, major forts with heavy artillery linked by TRENCHES and secondary fortifications, and an extensive system of military roads that allowed for quick movement.\textsuperscript{38}

Dennis Hart Mahan’s \textit{A Treatise on Field Fortifications} served as Barnard’s second major source of information. Mahan, a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, had taught military science and engineering at the Academy since 1830 and his \textit{Treatise} became the U.S. Army’s primary technical manual on the subject after it was published in 1836. The book provided instruction on the practical aspects of fortification design and construction, including where to situate them on the landscape, what materials to use in their construction, their appropriate dimensions, and which specific features to include. Although Barnard used Mahan’s directions as the basis for his own work, the book was precisely what the title advertised: a treatise on \textit{field} fortifications. Fieldworks, meaning the defenses constructed in the field in the days or hours preceding a battle, were usually nowhere near as complex as the line of fortifications ringing Washington. Moreover, most fieldworks were never intended to be used after the close of the battle for which they had been built, and were therefore only temporary structures. The defenses of Washington, on the other hand, needed to last until at least the end of the war.

\textsuperscript{35} Floyd and CHEP, \textit{Historic Resources Study, Part 1}, p. 5:1.  
\textsuperscript{36} Field, p. 48.  
\textsuperscript{37} Floyd and CHEP, \textit{Historic Resources Study, Part 1}, pp. 4:53, 4:54; Cooling and Owen, p. 7; Leech, p. 112.  
\textsuperscript{38} Floyd and CHEP, \textit{Historic Resources Study, Part 1}, pp. 4:56-59; Field, p. 29.
Consequently, Barnard sometimes found it necessary to modify Mahan’s instructions in order to promote longevity.  

Most of the forts surrounding Washington functioned as enclosed earthworks that incorporated complete polygons of various dimensions and shapes. The profiles of these forts consisted of parapets (earthen walls) between 12 and 18 feet thick (Figure 8-1). Cannon and other artillery fired from the terreplein, the broad, flat area behind the parapet. The banquette ramped upward between the terreplein and the parapet, and soldiers stood atop the banquette while firing. The exterior slope of the parapet (facing outward toward the enemy) usually sloped downward at a 45-degree angle into a wide ditch. This sloped ground was typically sodded so as to prevent the earth from sliding. In some cases, however, the exterior slope dropped straight down into the ditch, forming another wall known as a scarp that had a revetment composed of wooden planks and vertical posts to support the parapet. The width of the ditch varied according to the width of the parapet, but was usually about six feet deep. On the far side of the ditch (again, outward toward the enemy) stood the counterscarp, which formed the ditch’s other wall. Located above and beyond the counterscarp was another flat, open space that functioned as a covered way. Additional infantry and artillery could be stationed along the covered way, with the infantry moving up another banquette to fire from behind the cover of the glacis, an earthen embankment that gradually sloped outward down to ground level. This slope helped make attackers more visible to the defenders behind the parapet. Military engineers often placed an abatis, an obstacle formed by cutting, sharpening, and tying together trees, at the far end of the glacis.  

Many of the forts also featured additional structures, most commonly guardhouses, magazines, and bombproofs. Guardhouses housed the soldiers on guard duty. Magazines protected the artillery shells and other ordnance stored at the fortifications, and bombproofs served as emergency safe points that sheltered defenders during artillery barrages. North of the Potomac, where timber was most abundant, tightly packed wood posts formed the walls and roofs of the magazines and bombproofs in forts. South of the Potomac, where timber was scarcer, they utilized wood frame construction. More rarely,
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**Figure 8-1:** Vertical Profile of a Fortification. Source: Cooling and Owens, p. 258.
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Figure 8-2: Civil War engineer drawing of Fort Marcy, typical of the large forts comprising the Civil War Defenses of Washington. Source: National Archives.

bombproofs were masonry structures. Regardless of the type, several feet of earth covered all magazines and bombproofs to shield against enemy fire.41 (Figure 8-3.)

The BATTERIES typically occupied the intermediate points between the FORTS to cover these areas with artillery fire. Batteries oftentimes closely resembled the forts, and all featured the same 12- to 18-foot thick earthen parapet. Closed batteries essentially amounted to smaller forts and, when armed, typically housed MAGAZINES. Open batteries generally did not include ditches as part of the EARTHWORKS. Armed batteries included the same types of artillery as the forts, but usually in fewer numbers and smaller calibers.42

Ordnance rolls provide a long list of the artillery pieces used during the course of the war, ranging in size from small six-pounder field guns to massive 200-pounder Parrot guns. However, 24- and 32-pounder cannon on seacoast charges constituted the most common armaments. The BATTERIES and BLOCKHOUSES typically included fewer and smaller artillery pieces than the FORTS.43

Lines of RIFLE TRENCHES and COVERED WAYS spanned the gaps between the FORTS and BATTERIES or served as isolated segments in advance of these FORTIFICATIONS. Infantry, and in some cases artillery, took cover behind earthen embankments that rose 7 ½ feet in height. When used exclusively for infantry, the

42 Cooling and Owen, pp. 30-31.
43 Ibid., p. 34; Floyd and CHEP, Historic Resources Study, Part 1, p. 6:18; Field, p. 32.
Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks

TRENCHES measured five feet wide; and when also used by artillery, enlarged to eight feet in order to provide sufficient space to move the guns down the line and get them into firing position.\textsuperscript{44}

Military roads passed in the rear of the fortifications and crossed all of the preexisting country roads leading to Washington and Alexandria. Barnard deemed it vital that these roads remain open and passable at all times, but many deteriorated quickly and constantly needed repair. The first military roads, constructed in the fall and winter of 1861-62 along the Arlington Heights, proved particularly treacherous, especially in wet weather, when they were barely passable. Barnard, however, lauded an especially good 5 ½-mile section of road constructed north of the city in September 1862. It linked a series of fortifications beginning with Fort Sumner, near the Potomac River, and ending with Fort Stevens (ROCR), to the east of Rock Creek. This “very excellent road” measured 45 feet wide, incorporated “substantial bridges,” and featured a “full, rounded surface.” Ditches along the sides and culverts crossing underneath kept it well drained and dry.\textsuperscript{45}

Building and Maintaining the Forts

Union soldiers supplied most of the manpower needed for the construction and maintenance of the fortifications. They endured difficult, often exhausting work: chopping down trees, digging trenches, cutting roads through the

\textsuperscript{44} Cooling and Owen, p. 31.
\textsuperscript{45} The “very excellent road” that Barnard reported on may correlate with the present-day Military Road, NW. The current road generally follows the route of the original Civil War military road in this area of the city, but subsequent construction and development has most likely altered its course to an unknown degree. Ibid., pp. 34, 35; Floyd and CHEP, \textit{Historic Resources Study, Part 1}, pp. 5:11-12.
countryside, building BOMBPROOFS and MAGAZINES, resodding PARAPETS, patching leaks, and many other unpleasant physical tasks. A soldier’s life in the Washington defenses could also be as dull as it was backbreaking. Many soldiers wanted to fight, and sought out transfers to other units on the front lines. As the war progressed and more and more able-bodied troops went into the field to replace casualties, the military labor pool in Washington shrank, and the Army engineers began to look elsewhere for workers.46

Some of this labor came from other military personnel: convalescents, conscripts, substitutes, military prisoners, and ex-Confederates. Unfortunately, most of these men proved either unable or unwilling to do good work, prompting the Army to employ civilians. Civil engineers occupied the top positions; other skilled jobs included superintendents, clerks, draftsmen, foremen, carpenters, masons, and blacksmiths. Common, or unskilled, laborers rounded out the group. However, as the war continued, volunteerism and the draft diminished the civilian workforce, prompting the military engineers to broaden their scope and hire former slaves.47

Throughout the Civil War, slaves fled the Confederacy and moved north to claim their freedom. Washington, D.C. soon became a logical destination for several reasons. First, it was the southernmost major city remaining in the Union. Second, its free black community encouraged African American slaves to move toward the city. Third, the District of Columbia Emancipation Act became law on April 16, 1862, more than eight months before President Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation went into effect on January 1, 1863. Legally, the D.C. Emancipation Act freed slaves within the District but did not free any escaping slaves that arrived within its borders. However, this provision proved almost impossible to enforce and the refugees came surging in.48

By the end of the war, as many as 40,000 escaped slaves made their way to Washington, and these runaways became known as both freedmen and “contrabands.”49 Contraband is a legal term used to describe property that is possessed or transported illegally. During the Civil War, the United States used the concept of contraband property to resolve questions about the legal status of African Americans who escaped slavery in the Confederacy and fled to Union territory or sought protection from Union troops. By designating slaves who escaped from the Confederacy as contraband, the United States freed itself from any obligation to return them to their owners without challenging the Fugitive Slave Law or the institution of slavery within the Union. After being designated as contraband, fugitive slaves were legally declared free.50

Many self-emancipated slaves sought refuge near various Civil War FORTIFICATIONS in and around Washington and some worked in the construction and maintenance of the defenses (Figure 8-4). Consequently, they provided a boon to the local war effort, but many contrabands also endured discrimination and mistreatment. Whereas the lowest-paid white laborer earned $1.00 per day, the ex-slaves received only 40 cents, when they were paid at all. During the summer of 1862, a group of

46 Floyd and CHEP, Historic Resources Study, Part 1, pp. 4:30-32; Cooling and Owen, pp. 17-18.
48 Berlin et al., pp. 164-166; Smithsonian Anacostia Museum, pp. 70-71, 78-80.
49 Janke, p. 100.
50 Berlin et al., pp. 15-16; Floyd and CHEP, Historic Resources Study, Part 1, fn. p. 4:25.
contrabands worked for more than two months without pay, leaving them destitute. This type of mistreatment reinforced the need for Washington’s tight-knit and self-supporting free black community, which pulled together to care for the needs of this huge influx of former slaves. African American churches, relief societies, and benevolent organizations were particularly active in providing aid.

Maintenance and repairs to the fortifications took place throughout the war, with some required daily. During the year 1864, Barnard’s men devoted most of their efforts to upkeep and improvement chores. This constant vigilance was needed for a number of reasons. Many of the construction materials, most notably wood, sod, and earth, were perishable and prone to decay. Natural elements, especially water, caused many of the problems. Heavy rains, snow, and the freezing and thawing of ice led to leaks, wet ammunition, rusting screws, rotting walls, and inundated roads. Human action, and error, also led to damage. Soldiers negligently trampled over earthworks or removed portions of the timber defenses to burn as firewood, though in most cases the soldiers took a great deal of pride in keeping the FORTIFICATIONS in good condition.

A Test of the Defenses

During the course of the Civil War, Confederate General Robert E. Lee personally led two unsuccessful invasions of the North. The first came on the heels of the Union defeat at the Second Battle of Manassas in late August 1862 and culminated with the Battle of Antietam on September 17. The second began when Lee’s Army of Northern Virginia crossed the Potomac River in June 1863 en route to the pivotal confrontation at Gettysburg. In both cases, the Union Army of the Potomac successfully imposed itself between the Confederates and Washington. The city’s fortifications also served as an effective deterrent, as Lee chose not to challenge its defenses. Complacency reigned as the authorities in Washington deemed the city secure, but the real
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test of the defensive system would come one year later at the Battle of Fort Stevens, fought July 11-12, 1864.  

During the spring and early summer of 1864, Ulysses S. Grant, newly appointed as the commanding general of the Union Army, engaged Lee in a series of battles of attrition intended to grind the Confederates into submission by inflicting more casualties than they could replace. Although sound, this strategy also led to massive Union casualties, and the Army of the Potomac soon required all available reinforcements to refill its depleted ranks. Most of the well-trained soldiers garrisoning Washington’s FORTS went out to reinforce Grant’s men, who were just beginning a nine-month siege of the Confederate stronghold at Petersburg. This mobilization included nearly 18,000 experienced artillery gunners. Officers overseeing the Defenses of Washington looked for competent replacements, but mainly found convalescing men capable of light duty, Quartermaster troops, semi-invalid members of the Veteran Reserve Corps, and poorly trained state militiamen activated for 100-day terms of service. With so few regular soldiers remaining to protect the city, War Department clerks also took up arms and went out to man the defenses. In total, a skeleton force of some 9,000 troops, many of whom were either ill-trained or physically diminished, stretched out across a line of FORTIFICATIONS that, under ideal conditions, should have contained as many as 37,000 able-bodied, veteran soldiers.  

Both Lee and the Confederate government recognized the opportunity before them and sought to test Washington’s defenses for a variety of reasons. The Union siege of Petersburg stood out as the most pressing factor, and the Confederates hoped that a demonstration against Washington could open up another front and induce Grant to come to the city’s aid. Moreover, with the fight going increasingly poorly for the South since Gettysburg, the Confederate leadership became anxious for a significant victory that would change the trajectory of the entire war. Washington might be taken, the U.S. government dispersed, and President Lincoln and other political leaders captured. Such an attack would shock the war-weary North and terrify the local D.C. population. Public opinion could swing away from Lincoln in the upcoming presidential election and toward another candidate willing to negotiate a peace that recognized the sovereignty of the Confederate States.  

Acting toward this ultimate goal, Lee dispatched a raiding force of approximately 12,000 to 15,000 men under the command of Lieutenant General Jubal Early in late June 1864. Known as the Army of the Valley, Early’s force moved north and met with virtually no opposition before encountering a hastily organized Union defense to the south of Frederick, Maryland, along the Monocacy River, on July 9. The Confederates prevailed, but the Battle of Monocacy delayed Early’s march toward Washington by a day. This time proved precious, as Grant rushed three divisions back to reinforce the capital. They began arriving around noon on July 11. At almost the same time, the main body of Early’s army arrived on the outskirts of Washington from the north via the 7th Street Road (today Georgia Avenue NW) and advanced on Fort Stevens (ROCR). Heavy rifle and cannon fire erupted from the FORT, with supporting artillery blasts coming from Forts DeRussy (Rock Creek Park, ROCR) and Slocum (ROCR) on either side of Fort Stevens. A smaller Rebel cavalry force also came under FİRE from Forts Bayard (ROCR), Simmons,
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Mansfield, and Reno (ROCR). The barrages, combined with the summer heat and fatigue from fighting at Monocacy and then enduring the march to Washington, slowed the Confederate attack. They eventually closed to within 50 yards of Fort Stevens, but fell back after the timely arrival of the first Union reinforcements. Early’s men then fanned out and attempted to penetrate the defenses at various points between Forts Reno and Totten (ROCR). Experiencing little success, they retired for the night.

Early intended to resume the attack on Fort Stevens at daylight on the 12th, but the remainder of Grant’s reinforcements arrived overnight, and when morning dawned Early “found the parapet lined with troops.” Recognizing that the odds were now against him, he cancelled the attack and “decided to give up all hopes of capturing Washington.” Early did not, however, immediately withdraw his force. Instead, Confederate skirmishers and sharpshooters took up positions about 1,200 yards in front of Fort Stevens and set about “systematically wounding or killing anyone who exposed themselves within the fort.” The fighting became intense by mid-afternoon and continued until after dusk. The battlefield proper stretched out a mile from Fort Stevens but skirmishing and artillery fire extended out into the

![Figure 8-5: 3rd Massachusetts Regiment, Heavy Artillery, at Fort Stevens, 1865. Source: Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division.](image)
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Maryland countryside. The entire line of forts and batteries beginning with Fort Bayard to the west and ending with Fort Bunker Hill (ROCR) in the east contributed to the defense of Washington during the Battle of Fort Stevens. (Figure 8-5)

Several high-ranking officials came out to Fort Stevens to witness the fighting first hand. Secretary of State William Seward and Secretary of the Navy Gideon Wells viewed the battle on July 11, as did President and Mrs. Lincoln. The president’s personal bodyguard, Company K of the 150th Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, participated in the Battle of Fort Stevens, the only combat these men saw during the war. They numbered among the few regular Union soldiers available before Grant’s reinforcements arrived and therefore greatly added to the strength and skill of the defenders. Lincoln returned to Fort Stevens on July 12, where he ascended the parapet to view the battle. Thus exposed, he became a target for Confederate sharpshooters, marking the only time a sitting U.S. president has come under direct fire during wartime.

Early withdrew during the night of July 12-13, 1864, ending the sole engagement involving the Civil War Defenses of Washington. Casualty reports vary greatly. One source gives the total for both sides at 874 men injured and killed; another lists 573 Union and 500 Confederate casualties. A more recent study states that 59 Union soldiers were killed and 145 wounded.

Immediately after the Battle of Fort Stevens, the victorious defenders buried the fallen soldiers in temporary graves on the battlefield. A short time later, Quartermaster General Montgomery Meigs selected a permanent resting place for the Union dead, and it is probable that he also designed the subsequent cemetery. Meigs chose a small one-acre parcel of farmland approximately 600 yards northeast of Fort Stevens, near the area where the heaviest fighting occurred. A few weeks after the battle, the Army exhumed the bodies of 40 Union soldiers and reinterred them at the site, then referred to as the “Soldier’s Burial Ground on the Battlefield in Front of Washington.” The War Department later designated it Battleground National Cemetery (ROCR).

After the Battle of Fort Stevens, the Confederates never again threatened Washington or the federal government, losing their last, best chance at winning the war. Barnard’s fortifications held, the national capital survived, and Lee surrendered to Grant at Appomattox on April 9, 1865. When word of Lee’s surrender reached Washington, its forts and batteries fired their artillery in celebration. A line of cannon
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salutes ran round and round the fortifications, lasting for several hours. This triumphant barrage marked the fortifications’ last military action of the Civil War.  

Disposition, Memorialization, and Suburbanization: 1865-1930s

Disposing of the Civil War Defenses of Washington

On April 29, 1865, Lt. Colonel Barton S. Alexander, then in charge of the Washington defenses, received orders to suspend operations and collect and preserve engineer equipment. The federal government began formulating plans to abandon the fort system, but Alexander recommended retaining the most important works in the interest of future security. The War Department initially accepted his suggestion and on June 23, issued orders to maintain 25 forts and batteries. However, as more and more enlisted men departed, manpower shortages necessitated further reductions. By September, only 11 forts and one battery remained under government control, and the disposition of the fortifications continued in the coming months. The Army officially discontinued the Defenses of Washington on April 30, 1866, and at that time retained only three defensive works: Fort Whipple, Fort Foote, and Battery Rodgers.

Of all the Civil War Defenses of Washington, Fort Whipple, on the Virginia side of the Potomac adjacent to Arlington National Cemetery, is the only fortification that the Army has occupied to the present day. The government purchased the land containing the fort in January 1864, as part of the federal acquisition of the Arlington estate. By March 1866, it served as a military prison and in March 1869 it became the headquarters of the nascent Army Signal Corps. By 1872, new construction, mostly for a signal school, had already “removed most of the vestiges of the Civil War period fortifications.”

The Army constructed Battery Rodgers, on the west bank of the Potomac, and Fort Foote, on the east bank, to guard the water approaches to Washington and Alexandria. Because of their strategic
importance, the military engineers considered these two fortifications the most vital components of the entire defensive system. Battery Rodgers remained in use for a few years, but budgets cuts necessitated its abandonment after 1870. The War Department acquired title to the land occupied by Fort Foote in 1872-73, and it remained garrisoned until November 10, 1878. Major W. K. King conducted artillery trials for a new carriage of his own design at Fort Foote in 1869 and 1871. King’s carriage served as the prototype for the subsequent hydraulic-recoil disappearing carriage developed later in the century.  

The Army retained the fort until after World War I, but it fell into disrepair as early as the 1870s.  

As the government abandoned the fortifications, most of the fort sites reverted back to the rightful landowners. However, according to one historian, “Restoring the land was only part of the problem. Besides losing control of their land during the war, the owners had suffered additional financial loss because they were unable to cultivate their fields. Many had lost even more money because the Army destroyed fence rails, trees, and other property.” During the war, some of the owners filed claims against the government for the occupation, use, and damage of their lands, and numerous future suits remained possible after the fighting ceased. In order to expeditiously liquidate these cases, the Army generally offered the fortifications themselves as recompense. This conveyance included the buildings and fixtures, cut timber, BOMBPROOFS, MAGAZINES, and stockades, but not cannons, ordnance, or related war materials. Many of the dispossessed landowners accepted these terms but others persisted in seeking monetary awards. The government settled some of these remaining claims relatively quickly, but a few lagged on for decades.  

In some instances, the federal government did not return fortification lands to their pre-war owners and instead auctioned off these properties. The United States chose this course of action when the rightful owner was either unknown or unavailable, or if the owner had been a known Confederate sympathizer. Profits from these auction sales totaled more than $15,000.  

With the majority of the fort lands back in private ownership, the physical remains of the defenses quickly began to disappear from the landscape. These losses greatly hampered future efforts to preserve the sites as parks. Farmers filled in ditches and leveled PARAPETS. Forts turned to pastureland. Builders removed timber and masonry from walls, BOMBPROOFS, and MAGAZINES and reused them in new construction projects. ABATIS became convenient firewood. The miles of RIFLE TRENCHES and military roads gradually gave way to development, and portions of the latter became part of the D.C. street system. The current Military Road travelling through Rock Creek Park is a vestige of the original Civil War military road, although its course has been somewhat realigned and the roadbed enlarged. Nature also began to take back the land. Shrubs and bushes had already overgrown many of the sites by the mid-1870s, and
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trees followed before the end of the century. Rain and frost turned those buildings left standing to ruin, giving the scene an eerily picturesque quality.  

(Figure 8-6.)

Memorialization and Commemoration

During the Reconstruction era that followed the end of the Civil War, the surviving forts and battlefields where so many soldiers died remained highly visible and contentious reminders of the conflict that had divided the country. Consequently, early efforts, both nationally and locally, focused on mourning the dead, celebrating the sacrifice and valor of the soldiers, and reconciliation— not the preservation of sites and materials. Congress did not move to protect the first five major battlefields of national importance, Antietam, Vicksburg, Shiloh, Gettysburg, and Chickamauga and Chattanooga, until the 1890s. Less obviously important sites, including the Civil War Defenses of Washington, did not garner significant national attention until later in the 20th century.

Monuments honoring the courage of the living and the sacrifice of the dead became the earliest means of memorializing the Civil War. Nationally, the first monuments often appeared on battlefields soon
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after the fighting ceased. Shortly after the war ended, the veterans themselves erected many of these memorials. Later on they were often aided by the federal government, their home states, and associated organizations. There are several such monuments located within the Civil War Defenses of Washington, all of which relate to the Battle of Fort Stevens.

Congress established the U.S. National Cemetery System in 1867 to provide suitable resting places for Union soldiers in recognition of their military service. The War Department acquired Battleground National Cemetery (ROCR; NRHP, 1980) in 1868, and constructed a masonry superintendent’s lodge designed by Quartermaster General Meigs in two phases between 1871 and 1873. The lodge at Battleground National Cemetery was one of the earliest national cemetery lodges built according to standardized plans developed by Meigs. During the 1880s, the War Department installed three cast iron tablets with stanzas from Theodore O’Hara’s poem, “The Bivouac of the Dead,” in the cemetery. These plaques are another example of standardized features in national cemeteries, as similar plaques inscribed with stanzas from the poem were also installed at many other properties within the national cemetery system. By 1876, white marble headstones replaced the wooden boards originally used to mark the 40 Union gravesites at Battleground National Cemetery. In 1936, the number of Union burials increased to 41 with the internment of Battle of Fort Stevens veteran Major Edward R. Campbell. The federal government closed Battleground National to future burials at that time. The first monument erected at Battleground National Cemetery to honor the defenders of Fort Stevens was constructed in 1891 and dedicated to the 98th Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry Regiment. Three additional monuments followed: the 122nd New York Volunteer Infantry Regiment (1904), Company K of the 150th Ohio National Guard (1907), and the 25th New York Volunteer Cavalry Regiment (1914).

Fort Stevens (ROCR) also served as a site for commemorating the battle fought there in July 1864. On November 7, 1911, officials unveiled a rough stone boulder atop the parapet at the supposed location.
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where President Lincoln stood during the battle (Photo #3).91 In 1920, the Associated Survivors of the VI Army Corps installed a bronze bas-relief on the face of the boulder depicting Lincoln under fire.92 On September 20, 1936, the Daughters of the Union Veterans of the Civil War dedicated a second memorial at Fort Stevens in honor of the Grand Army of the Republic (GAR), the largest and most influential Union veterans association.93

In addition to the monuments and associated structures erected to serve as permanent Civil War memorials, veterans often gathered at battlefields and cemeteries to commemorate the events that occurred there and pay respects to their deceased brethren. The first such commemorative gathering involving the Civil War Defenses of Washington took place in 1870, when the GAR held its annual encampment in the city. The group conducted special ceremonies at Fort Stevens and reprised these exercises when the GAR returned to Washington in 1892, 1902, 1915, and 1936.94 Annual ceremonies also took place at Fort Stevens and Battleground National Cemetery on Memorial Day, Flag Day, and July 11, the day chosen to commemorate the battle. Flag raisings, the laying of flowers and wreaths, patriotic songs, commemorative speeches, and the reading of the Gettysburg Address were typical features of these services.95

**Figure 8-7:** Circa 1900 photograph showing marble headstones at Battleground National Cemetery with “Bivouac of the Dead” tablet in foreground. *Source: Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division.*
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Growth and Suburbanization of Washington, D.C.

The population of Washington, D.C. ballooned during and immediately after the Civil War. During the years 1861-65, the District’s population grew from 75,000 to 120,000, and reached 131,700 by 1870. The arrival of so many new residents ignited a real estate boom, and commercial and government expansion spurred even more population growth. Land speculation became a highly profitable business, and property values within the city limits quickly spiked. Consequently, people began to look northward toward the District’s outlying farms and country estates for cheaper real estate. Much of the city occupied low-lying, marshy ground prone to malaria and yellow fever scares, and exacerbated the effects of the hot summer sun and oppressive humidity. The “heights” around the city were comparatively cool and comfortable, further fueling the demand to move beyond the city borders. Wealthy citizens established large estates in the outlying rural areas of the District. Speculators began buying out the large landowners, betting that they could turn a profit by subdividing the properties. Farms and fields became neighborhoods and subdivisions during the late 19th century, and Washington expanded beyond the borders of L’Enfant’s city. This development further threatened the remaining Civil War Defenses of Washington.

The expansion offered new economic possibilities for all Washingtonians, but African Americans probably experienced the greatest increase in quality of life. Between the years 1860 and 1870, the white population of the District increased by 45 percent. During the same time span the black population rose by an astonishing 203 percent. Because freed slaves and contrabands constituted the vast majority of this migration, most members of Washington’s black population did not own property or possess a permanent source of income at the close of the Civil War. In the immediate postwar period, many of the abandoned fortifications became “prime targets for squatters, mostly poor freedmen who could not find shelter” elsewhere. With the assistance of Washington’s established African American community, particularly the churches, relief societies, and benevolent organizations, these former slaves found employment and better lodging. The government also founded the Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen, and Abandoned Lands, commonly known as the Freedmen’s Bureau, on March 3, 1865. “Administered by the Army, the Bureau attempted to oversee the rehabilitation of freedmen and other refugees by helping them obtain food, clothing, housing, and education.” Despite the daunting challenges, conditions improved and by 1867, African Americans comprised about one-fifth of Washington’s landowners.
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During the real estate boom that followed the Civil War, new African American enclaves sprang up in the vicinities of the fortifications, “where those fleeing slavery had clustered for protection and the possibility of work.” 102 African American communities developed at Fort Reno, Battery Kemble, and the Barry Farm freedmen’s village near Forts Stanton and Carroll. A large number of freedpeople settled in temporary camps near Fort Reno in northwest Washington. In 1869, the heirs of the owner sold the fort and surrounding area to developers, who in turn subdivided the property into buildable lots and resold them at affordable prices, reportedly as low as $25. The resident black population proved a ready market, and by the turn of the twentieth century African Americans accounted for one-third of the area’s population. 103

Prior to the Civil War, William D. C. Murdock owned 1,000 acres of land near the northwest corner of the District of Columbia, including the site of Battery Kemble. He “lost farmland, timber, and stone quarries when the government took his land” to construct the battery and he fell heavily into debt. Consequently, Murdock sold his land in 1872 in order to pay off his creditors. Freedmen squatting around Battery Kemble purchased three- to five-acre plots at a price of approximately $80 per acre. Murdock, who formerly owned ten slaves, may have also sold or given them land. Some of the adjacent owners also sold land to the freedmen, and a “vibrant African American Community grew up around Battery Kemble.” 104

In 1867, the Freedmen’s Bureau acquired title to a 375-acre tract southeast of the Anacostia River between Forts Stanton and Carroll. The Bureau parcelled out the land and resold 359 one-acre lots to African American for between $125 and $300. The price included sufficient lumber to build a simple two-room house. Many settlers also worked to clear the land, with their pay going toward the purchase of their property. Profits from the sale of these lots helped to finance the establishment of Howard University, which offered collegiate education to African Americans. The official name of this new African American settlement was Potomac City, but it became known as Barry Farm after a former landowner. By 1869, nearly 500 families lived in Barry Farm, creating an eclectic mix of laborers, craftsmen, shop owners, and professionals. 105

Although there are scant physical remains of the establishments created by and for African Americans at Reno City, Battery Kemble, and Barry Farm, the extant Civil War defenses provide a tangible link with this important facet of local African American history. African Americans continue to inhabit many of the neighborhoods of Washington, D.C. that once contained these enclaves. The National Park Service is currently conducting research in the hopes of uncovering new information regarding the lives of freed people within the District of Columbia.

Connecting and Preserving the Forts: Fort Drive, 1893-1917

Urban Park Planning Trends in Late 19th- and Early 20th-Century America

The history of urban parks in the United States began in 1858 with the adoption of a plan for New York City’s Central Park submitted by Frederick Law Olmsted, Sr. and Calvert Vaux. The duo is properly considered the first professional landscape architects and their celebrated plan, entitled the “Greensward,” called for the creation of a large municipal park located at what was then the periphery of the city.\(^{106}\) It was to be landscaped in the popular romantic-pastoral fashion that had gained widespread acclaim in America during the previous two decades with the advent of the rural cemetery movement and could further trace its design lineage back to the royal hunting grounds and private estates of 18th-century European nobility.\(^{107}\) Additional designs for similar urban parks soon followed in the same vein as that of Central Park. Fairmount Park (1859 – Philadelphia), Prospect Park (1860 – Brooklyn), Jackson Park (1869 – Chicago), and Golden Gate Park (1870 – San Francisco) rank amongst the earliest and best-known examples, but by 1900 hundreds of these municipal parks were located across the country and could be found in such smaller cities as Buffalo, Kansas City, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, and Omaha.\(^{108}\)

In addition to creating the first urban park, Olmsted and Vaux also coined the term “parkway” circa 1868 to describe the handsome boulevard they designed as a grand approach road for Brooklyn’s Prospect Park. Initially named Jamaica Parkway and soon redesignated Eastern Parkway, the inspiration for this new concept stemmed from the model of the European connector boulevard, specifically the pleasure drives constructed in and around Paris during the mid-19th century.\(^{109}\) Olmsted and Vaux designed Jamaica Parkway as a “260-foot-wide avenue combining elements of the park, park [carriage] drive, park footpath, and residential-commercial street,” but except for the planting of trees, the result bore little resemblance to the idea of a parkway in the modern sense of the word, i.e. a scenic road intended primarily for the use of recreational motor vehicles running through an area preserved or specially designed and maintained as parkland.\(^{110}\) Olmsted came somewhat closer to this definition during his work on Boston’s Emerald Necklace (1878-1895), another proto-parkway designed to connect Franklin Park with the Charles River and Boston Common via a ten-mile-long stretch of developed parkland.
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running through the Arnold Arboretum, Jamaica Pond, and the Back Bay Fens. The Emerald Necklace thus became “one of the nation’s first and most completely developed urban park systems.” During the last decades of the 19th century into the first decades of the 20th it became increasingly common for landscape architects to think in terms of entire city park systems rather than individual municipal parks. Park boulevards created to facilitate horse-drawn carriages and pedestrian traffic continued to function as the primary connecting corridors between the major park units until the construction of New York’s Bronx River Parkway (1911-1925) ushered in the automobile-centered age of parkway design.

Plans necessarily varied by location and designer, but most urban parks and city park systems shared the naturalistic focus first envisioned at Central Park. During this time period, landscape architects and city planners designed and developed large parks as idealized versions of nature carefully constructed to provide a suitable location for quiet contemplation, relaxation, musical concerts, bird watching, picnicking, walking, horseback riding, and other similarly wholesome means of physical and mental recreation. Put another way, such a setting “was supposed to simulate nature or the countryside” while occupying a conceptual middle ground “between the wildness of pure nature and the finite and civilized nature of the city.” Moreover, “By affording urban residents opportunities to enjoy the physical and psychological benefits of nature close at hand, park systems extended the promise of a new form of metropolitan landscape that combined the best attributes of city and country.” Park roads, water features, and similar design elements usually featured curved or asymmetrical forms rather than straight lines and rigid geometry so as to better imitate a truly natural environment. Planners often entirely omitted such obviously artificial contrivances as buildings and benches. When deemed absolutely necessary, they made sure to screen these structures with trees and construct them of such materials as native stone and rough-hewn timber so as to limit their visual impact and stress their connection to the overall naturalistic design of the park.

Moreover, by the 1890s, American popular opinion regarding the design and use of city parks also expanded to include a wider range of recreational pursuits including team sports, children’s playgrounds, and other such examples of active, exuberant exercise. Within Washington, D.C., the Army Corps of Engineers, the government entity then responsible for overseeing planning and development projects pertaining to the District’s federally owned lands, largely embraced this change under the belief that providing additional public recreational spaces would help assuage a variety of societal ills, most notably the rising tide of lower-income children forced to play in dirty and dangerous

111 Fábos Landscape Planning and Greenway Symposium; Newton, p. 300.
112 Carr, pp. 34, 37; Spirn, p. 206.
113 Newton, p. 597.
city streets for want of proper parks. As early as 1890, Congress passed legislation allowing for the temporary construction of playgrounds on the Washington Monument grounds and the Ellipse south of the White House. In subsequent years, “Old and new parks were outfitted with tennis courts, baseball diamonds, swimming pools, sandboxes, croquet grounds, and golf courses. Washington was, in fact, in the process of pioneering urban recreation. Moreover, with construction in 1917 of a sloping sandy beach on the shores of the Tidal Basin, the reclaimed Potomac Park system offered the most elaborate experiment in recreational park functions.”

The Army Corps of Engineers largely concentrated its efforts on improving areas within L’Enfant’s old city, particularly inside the monumental core. This approach stemmed from two basic factors. First, the central city possessed the greatest concentration of federally-owned land, and second, despite the rising tide of suburbanization and rural development occurring in outlying sections of the District of Columbia, the majority of its residents still lived or worked inside the boundaries of the original Washington City. Thus by the close of the 1915 fiscal year, the Army Engineers oversaw a system of 48 parks and playgrounds offering various outdoor sports facilities and children’s recreational facilities created and maintained on public land, the vast majority of which were located within the city’s central core. Most outlying areas within the District, including the future location of the planned Fort Drive and Fort Circle Parks, did not as yet posses these types of planned parks and public recreational amenities.

**Initial Efforts to Preserve the Fort Parks**

The rapid pace of suburbanization in the District of Columbia during the late 19th century led to distinct pockets of new developments that bore little or no relationship to one another or to the original city plan. Individual developers created subdivisions according to whatever road configuration was quickest and cheapest in a particular location, and gave almost no thought to linking these new neighborhoods to each other or with the old city. This negligence resulted in an ad hoc assemblage of streets that did a poor job of connecting all of these disparate elements, and made transportation onerous and time-consuming. By the 1890s, the issue had become a serious nuisance. In order to rectify this problem, on March 2, 1893, Congress passed “An act to provide a permanent system of highways in that part of the District of Columbia lying outside of cities.” This law authorized the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, a three-member panel appointed by the president to administer the District’s affairs in lieu of a mayor, to create a street system that extended the L’Enfant plan into the outlying areas of Washington, D.C. The commissioners also enjoyed some latitude to plan for additional corridors not reflected in the L’Enfant plan, provided that they did not interfere with the primary objective of linking the old city with the new developments. Five years of planning and debate ensued, during which time the commissioners broached the idea of constructing a “Fort to Fort Drive” connecting several of the extant Civil War defenses. In 1896, Engineer Commissioner William H. Powell reported that the proposed Fort Drive would be approximately five miles long and run between Anacostia Park and Fort Stevens (ROCR). The surviving remains of all of the fortifications along this line were to be preserved and linked by a “magnificent speedway, 130 feet wide.” This version of Fort Drive appeared on the approved
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119 Gutheim and Lee, pp. 148-49.
120 Ibid., p. 149.
122 Harrison, p. 43.
highway map as originally released in 1898, but is absent from subsequent updates to the plan.\footnote{\textsuperscript{123}}

(Figure 8-8)
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While the term “Fort Drive” evidently originated with Powell, he evidently codified a concept that had already begun to gain traction in Washington by that time. As early as 1869, a popular guide to the city included this pertinent passage: “About two miles outside of Washington, and completely encircling the city, is a chain of fortifications, completely connected by a military-road, forming a boulevard, which, by the aid of trees and shrubbery, judiciously cared for, would be equal to the famed drives surrounding the city of Paris.” This reference to Parisian pleasure drives further illustrates the major influence that the French boulevards held in the earliest years of American parkway design. Three years later, in April 1872, Senator Francis P. Blair, Jr. expounded upon this idea in testimony given before the House of Representatives Committee for the District of Columbia. He considered the improvement of the existing military roads to be of the “greatest value” and advocated the development of a “romantic, picturesque drive” originating near Fort Totten, proceeding westward to Fort DeRussy, and then following the course of Rock Creek south to its junction of the Potomac.

The Senate Park Commission Plan of 1902

Although the notion of preserving the Civil War Defenses of Washington and constructing a connecting roadway between them was nothing new, by the turn of the 20th century no federal action had occurred. At the same time, despite its status as the national capital, Washington’s park system was significantly underdeveloped compared to Boston, New York, Chicago and other major American cities, and even lagged behind that of smaller municipalities such as Minneapolis, Buffalo, and Kansas City. One proposal to improve parkland within the District of Columbia was to preserve the fortifications as parks and connect them via a parkway.

The year 1900 marked the centennial of the national capital moving to Washington from Philadelphia, and this anniversary prompted an interest in civic improvements within the District. The U.S. Congress held legal authority for the planning and development of Washington, D.C., and so this challenge rested with the legislative branch. In 1901, Senator James McMillan, Chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, received Senatorial approval to employ experts to develop a plan and make recommendations for improving the parks, public buildings, and public spaces in Washington. Thus the Park Improvement Commission of the District of Columbia, commonly known as the Senate Park Commission or the McMillan Commission, was born. The four commission members, Daniel Burnham, Charles McKim, Augustus Saint-Gaudens, and Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., constituted the preeminent professionals within their respective fields of architecture, sculpture, and landscape architecture. Whereas most development in Washington since L’Enfant had been atomistic, the commission worked toward a coordinated, complementary design based on scale, composition, and unity.

The Senate Park Commission’s plan for Washington, submitted to Congress in 1902, is widely regarded as one of the seminal documents in the history of American city planning. As a prime example of the City Beautiful movement, the plan aspired to promote public welfare, civic virtue, social harmony, economic growth, and an increased quality of life through park planning and naturalistic design. City Beautiful
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practitioners sought to induce social reform through pleasant, functional, and inspirational design. They shunned the creation of beauty solely as an aesthetic exercise and instead promoted beautification as a way of encouraging a sense of collective wellbeing and shared identity within urban populations. This focus on betterment reflected the larger national context of Progressivism, a reform-minded movement in its ascendency at the turn of the 20th century that targeted a wide range of societal ills ranging from child labor to the wanton destruction of America’s natural resources. Both Progressivism and the City Beautiful also recalled the urban parks movement that began in the mid-19th century as a response to the increasingly undesirable and harmful living conditions within major metropolitan areas. Reformers demanded improved sanitation systems and better housing for the poor, but also “strenuously advocated the creation of parks” as a means of countering the “enervating and unhealthy urban environment” and to “help alleviate the squalor and misery of crowded and disease-ridden neighborhoods.”

The Senate Park Commission’s plan for Washington therefore held a social component, but it was also a masterwork of functional design. Speaking pragmatically, the commission repeatedly stressed that its primary objectives were to update and enhance the L’Enfant Plan and to expand it beyond the old city boundaries via a modern system of parks and parkways encompassing the entire District of Columbia and extending into Maryland and Virginia. Elements of the plan pertaining to the Civil War Defenses of Washington fell into the latter category.

The commission recommended that the federal government acquire 17 fortification sites as parkland, encompassing a total area of approximately 556 acres. These included: Batteries Kemble (ROCR) and Parrott, and Forts Baker, Bunker Hill (ROCR), Chaplin (NACE), Davis (NACE), Dupont (NACE), Howard, Mahan (NACE), Reno (ROCR), Ricketts (NACE), Sedgwick, Slemmer, Stanton (NACE), Stevens (ROCR), Thayer, and Totten (ROCR). They also urged Congress to act expediently, before “the pick and shovel of the improver” made it “forever too late.”

According to the commission, three fortifications, Batteries Kemble (ROCR) and Parrott and Fort Reno (ROCR), warranted preservation chiefly because of their sublime views. The batteries were located in the northwest corner of the District and looked south over a beautiful valley sloping down to the Potomac. Both had “escaped the development pressures that were rapidly transforming the city’s environs” and would therefore make ideal parks. The commissioners likewise singled out the site of Fort Reno, located northeast of Batteries Kemble and Parrott, because it occupied “the highest point in the District, 425 feet above tide level,” and commanded “remarkably wide views in all directions.” Unfortunately, new construction destroyed the last remaining vestiges of the Civil War-era Fort Reno
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The commissioners recommended that the government acquire a 70-acre tract of land comprising the fort site and surrounding area in order to keep the views and vistas open and prevent any additional development. (Figures 8-9 and 8-10)

Figures 8-9 and 8-10: Circa 1902 views looking northeast and west from Fort Reno.
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The Senate Park Commission’s interpretation of Fort Drive largely coincided with the previous proposal by the D.C. commissioners and represented an outer parkway circuit linking the remaining 14 fortifications deemed worthy of preservation. They also included ancillary spurs designed to provide access to Battery Kemble and Fort Reno. 135 Taken as a whole, Fort Drive “would afford a delightful suburban excursion of considerable scenic and historic interest.” 136 It was to run between Forts Stevens and Stanton, but the then-deplorable condition of the Anacostia River posed a significant geographical obstacle. The commissioners described the area surrounding the river as an unhealthy swamp, and noted that conditions were particularly bad during low tide. As a solution, they proposed to reclaim the “Anacostia flats,” but because this work constituted the single most ambitious part of their plan and would no doubt take a considerable amount of time to complete, the commissioners broke Fort Drive into northern and eastern sections with the river as the dividing line. 137

The northern segment would take advantage of the high summits present in that part of the District and connect Fort Stevens, Totten, Slemmer, Bunker Hill, and Thayer. The commissioners again returned to the topic of views, judging them to be “impressive in proportion to their commanding military positions,” especially those looking north toward the countryside. For this reason the forts were “well worth acquirement as future local parks, in addition to any claim that their historical and military interest may afford.” The views from the eastern fortifications, Forts Mahan, Chaplin, Sedgwick, Dupont, Davis, Baker, Stanton, Greble, and Ricketts were even more impressive: “With the Anacostia and the Potomac below and the city of Washington spread out beyond and the hills of Virginia in the distance, these are the most beautiful of the broad views to be had in the District.” The commissioners endorsed the route of Fort Drive that appeared in the 1898 highway map, but determined that the width of the roadway should be increased beyond the planned 90 feet, which was the same width as H Street in the city. 138 They “realized that it would be unrealistic to acquire and develop the broad leafy corridors allotted to the major parkways, but suggested the drive be wider and more attractively landscaped than ordinary city streets.” 139

The turn of the 20th century was a transition period in concepts of parkways, and the Senate Park Commission’s plan for Washington reflected this period in parkway development. During the previous three decades, American parkway design moved beyond the initial consciously formal model of the Parisian boulevard, but had not yet arrived at the modern understanding of the parkway as a landscaped park with a road running through it. New York’s Bronx River Parkway, constructed 1911-25, is generally referred to as the prototype for parkway design and has long been considered by many professionals to be the first “true” parkway. This distinction is predicated on such distinguishing factors as variable topography, changing width of roadway, gentle curves, attractive but unostentatious planting, and the exclusion of non-recreational traffic. 140 In short, the Bronx River Parkway became the standard bearer because it so fully embraced the naturalistic character that soon became synonymous with parkway design.
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Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks

The Senate Park Commission recommended both formal and more naturalistic parkways in its plan for Washington. L’Enfant’s city demanded a formal treatment, whereas the outlying portions of the District were less urbanized and therefore better suited to a naturalistic style that reinforced the sylvan character of the countryside. Because the proposed Fort Drive would occupy picturesque high ground in a remote location, the commissioners clearly envisioned it as a naturalistic parkway. Hence their scheme forms an important link in the evolution of American parkway design. Even more importantly, “Fort Drive exemplified the dual concerns for scenery and historic preservation that played an underappreciated role in turn-of-the-century park-making efforts.”

Indeed, it stands as one of the earliest proposals to link historic sites via a dedicated roadway. Although expanded and modified over the coming decades, the plan for Fort Drive and the fort parks always remained firmly rooted in the aegis of the Senate Park Commission.

The Senate Park Commission submitted their plan for Washington in January 1902, but Congress did not approve the plan as a single action. Instead, work proceeded in a piecemeal fashion for several decades, with each project contingent upon its own enabling legislation and source of funding. Many park planning initiatives within Washington’s monumental core, and several beyond, were successfully implemented during the first half of the twentieth century. However, the acquisition and preservation of the fortification sites, and the development of Fort Drive, stalled as bill after bill to authorize and fund these projects died in Congress.

So why did Congress not immediately act to preserve the fortifications and establish Fort Drive? As outlying and largely isolated components of the commission’s plan, they had relatively little effect on the overall scope of work and would have been obvious candidates for exclusion once funding became a problem. Likewise, most of the fortifications and the entire run of the proposed Fort Drive were located in economically disadvantaged sections of north and east Washington primarily populated by African Americans. While the commissioners were “conspicuously silent on race matters,” it is not unreasonable to believe that some members of Congress placed a low priority on allocating money for improvements in these areas of the District. Finally, a great many Civil War sites throughout the nation had yet to be preserved, and government officials deemed other locations more worthy of protection than the Civil War Defenses of Washington. Secretary of War Elihu Root held this position and specifically believed that the battlefields of Fredericksburg, Salem Church, Chancellorsville, the Wilderness, and Spotsylvania Court House were better candidates for preservation as parkland than Fort Stevens or any other fortification around Washington.

Early Preservation Efforts

While Congress dragged its feet, grassroots initiatives emerged to protect the fortifications ringing Washington. Preservation efforts began shortly after the end of the Civil War and in many cases coincided with memorial and commemorative activities. In January 1867, Major Nathaniel Michler, the
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Army Engineer officer in charge of the public buildings and grounds of Washington, D.C., noted that the fortifications had already “become historical” and afforded “extensive views” of “picturesque scenery” from their parapets. He recommended preserving several of the northern forts as part of a “grand national park.” After much planning and legal wrangling, Congress did indeed establish just such a park. Authorized in 1890, Rock Creek Park (ROCR) spans more than 2,000 acres and includes the sites of Fort DeRussy, Battery Rock Creek, Battery Kingsbury, and Battery Sill. The earthworks of the former two fortifications are well-preserved, and fragments of Battery Kingsbury remain.

As Michler indicated, the public was interested in both the historical value of the fort system and the opportunities for scenic beauty that it offered. Nationally, the late 19th century saw a surge in efforts to preserve and commemorate Civil War sites. Locally, by the 1890s conscientious citizens had become increasingly concerned about the destruction of Washington’s fortifications resulting from the actions of private landowners and suburban real estate developers. Fort Stevens (ROCR) suffered the same detrimental effects as the other Civil War Defenses of Washington, but as the most famous fort it received the lion’s share of the attention. The Grand Army of the Republic (GAR), additional veterans organizations, and local neighborhood groups all endorsed the preservation of Fort Stevens. The governors of several states authored letters of support. Newspaper articles got the word out, and editorials championed preservation efforts. As early as 1900, the Washington Board of Trade recommended establishing parks at other fort sites as well. Soon advocates sought to establish a battlefield park in connection with Forts DeRussy (Rock Creek Park, ROCR) and Reno (ROCR), and eventually across the entire line of northern defenses from Fort Totten (ROCR) to Fort Reno. Several of the rifle pits linking the fortifications were still in good condition and could also be saved.

Congress considered numerous bills to designate Fort Stevens (ROCR) a national military park, but despite the public support, rejected the necessary legislation. Similar bills seeking to create public parks at other fort sites, including Fort Reno (ROCR) in 1904 and Fort Thayer in 1906 and 1908, also failed. Development destroyed Fort Thayer a short time after the second attempt to protect it failed. Congress would not allocate funds for the purchase of Fort Stevens and most other fortifications for several more years, but in 1912 the preservationists finally succeeded in getting the first bit of legislation passed. That January, the East Washington Heights Citizens’ Association submitted a resolution calling for Forts Davis (NACE) and Dupont (NACE) to be preserved as public parks. On June 24, a new law went into effect that called for the condemnation of the necessary land to acquire the parks and “provide a connecting pathway between them.” The legislation also appropriated funds to pay for the land and by 1916 a total of 16.55 acres were under federal ownership. However, no additional property had been acquired and no portion of Fort Drive constructed as of April 1917, when the United States’ entry into World War I halted most non-military planning efforts within the District of Columbia.
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Fort Foote (NACE) was re-activated for military use as a training area for gas service testing by the Army Engineer School.¹⁵¹

**Fort Drive: Redesigns, Acquisitions, and Partial Implementation, 1917-1950**

**Field Surveys, Proposals, and More Failed Bills**

Although the acquisition of the fort sites and development of Fort Drive made very little progress during World War I, Army Engineer Colonel William Hart did conduct a reconnaissance survey in 1917. In the 15 years since the submission of the Senate Park Commission’s plan, ongoing development continued to threaten the fortification sites and at least one, Fort Thayer, had been completely destroyed by new construction. On July 30, 1919, Colonel Clarence S. Ridley, the Officer in Charge of Public Buildings and Grounds in the District of Columbia, advocated submitting a new bill to Congress calling for the preservation of the remaining Civil War fortifications as public parks and the construction of Fort Drive. Ridley also recognized the need to restudy and revise the proposed parkway design to respond to the existing conditions on the ground.¹⁵²

The D.C. Board of Commissioners introduced Ridley’s bill to Congress on November 19. The bill proposed that the commissioners undertake a survey and create an updated plan for Fort Drive “to provide a continuous parkway of suitable width connecting the sites of the following old forts – Greble, Carroll, Ricketts, Stanton, Wagner, Baker, Davis (U.S. owned), Dupont (U.S. owned), Chaplin, A[n unnamed] Battery, Mahan, Bunker Hill, Totten, Slocum, Stevens, De Russy [sic], Bayard, B[attery]. Kemble, B[attery]. Vermont (U.S. owned), and B[attery]. Parrott.” The bill therefore sought to increase the number of fortifications serviced by Fort Drive from the 14 identified by the Senate Park Commission to a total of 20.¹⁵⁴ It is significant as the earliest known proposal to call for an unbroken stretch of parkway running from Battery Kemble, at the far northwest corner of the District, to Fort Greble in the far south. The bill finally passed in January 1925, five and a half years after being introduced.¹⁵⁵

During this long delay, various powerful business and civic groups sought to push the Fort Drive project forward on their own volition. On October 21, 1919, the Washington Board of Trade of the District of Columbia, which had been heavily involved in city planning since before the time of the Senate Park Commission, adopted a resolution calling on Congress to take action on the matter. Then in 1923,


¹⁵³ Military records consistently refer to Fort Ricketts as a fort, and it was garrisoned throughout the war. However, its unenclosed design is similar to that of a battery, and this fact led it to be incorrectly referred to as “Battery Ricketts” for many years after the Civil War. This National Register nomination uses the correct designation of Fort Ricketts except where the name appears in quotations taken from historic sources.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 3:3. Battery Vermont is no longer extant. Additionally, three fortifications called out for preservation in 1902 were excluded from the bill of 1919: Forts Thayer, Slemmer, and Sedgwick. Fort Thayer is known to have been destroyed by this time, and Forts Slemmer and Sedgwick may have been similarly affected by development.
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Frederic A. Delano, President of the American Civic Association (later the American Planning and Civic Association) helped form the Washington Committee of 100 on the Federal District. This committee included many prominent District residents, with Delano, the uncle and namesake of future President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, chief among them.\(^\text{156}\) The Committee of 100 supported the creation of Fort Drive and in 1924 used its influence to introduce a Congressional bill, “Providing for a comprehensive development of the park and playground system of the National Capital.” Unlike the D.C. commissioner’s bill, then still languishing in political gridlock, this legislation passed into law on June 6, 1924, and established a new organization, the National Capital Park Commission (NCPC), as the entity responsible for overseeing the comprehensive development of the city’s park system. In April 1926, Congress expanded the scope of the NCPC’s authority to include the “power to acquire, via purchase or condemnation, lands in the District of Columbia for city planning initiatives such as parkways, playgrounds, and parks.” In order to reflect this additional authorization, the Congress reestablished the NCPC as the National Capital Park and Planning Commission (NCPPC).\(^\text{157}\)

The National Capital Park and Planning Commission Establishes Fort Drive and the Fort Parks

In the nearly 25-year interim between the Senate Park Commission and the establishment of the NCPPC, Congress and social reformers began to take action on a variety of social and practical issues in Washington, D.C., ranging from the elimination of slums and squalid alley dwellings to the construction of the Lincoln Memorial on the National Mall, but progress was usually slow and threatened by disorganized, piecemeal development. Under the leadership of the NCPPC, the city would finally benefit from a single, unified planning group that embraced the dual responsibilities of functional design and public welfare.

The NCPPC therefore became the successor to the Senate Park Commission. The presence of Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr. as one of the four ex officio NCPPC members appointed by President Calvin Coolidge provided a tangible link between the two groups. Frederic A. Delano served as the first chairman, and in addition to his considerable political influence brought valuable experience to the role through his leadership of previously successful city planning efforts in Chicago and New York City.\(^\text{158}\)

Almost immediately after its founding, the NCPPC began to review and update the plan of 1902 in order to bring it up to date with current conditions. As part of this process, city planner James C. Langdon submitted a detailed plan for Fort Drive in 1925. It called for a continuous, unbroken roadway wider than standard city streets and recommended a minimum width of 140 feet.\(^\text{159}\) Langdon’s plan was apparently not adopted, most likely because the members of the NCPPC had yet to come to a consensus on a number of key points concerning the appearance, form, and route of Fort Drive. The minutes to their meeting held on June 18-19, 1926, record that the commission agreed that the drive should be “more attractive than ordinary city streets” and that access should exclude commuters, commercial vehicles, and other non-recreational traffic. However, a “considerable discussion” ensued as to “the
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future policy relative to [the] acquisition of desirable Fort tracts and the character of drive or boulevard connecting them.\textsuperscript{160}

The choice between dedicated parkway and surface streets stands out as the single most important design decision that the NCPPC needed to make regarding Fort Drive, and there was no obvious answer. The dedicated parkway clearly won out in terms of aesthetics and visitor experience, but would also be an extremely expensive undertaking. When the Senate Park Commission originally endorsed the Fort Drive concept, the development of the fort sites and surrounding landscape was relatively limited, making it feasible to construct a dedicated parkway between the fortifications. Even so, they warned that the development pressure was sure to rise, and that the acquisition of the forts and connecting rights-of-way needed to be accomplished quickly.\textsuperscript{161} This advice proved prescient, as between the years 1901 and 1925 the population of the District of Columbia increased by 70 percent. The addition of so many people in such little time spurred a large amount of new construction beyond the borders of the old city that further threatened the integrity of the remaining Civil War defenses. What’s more, the assessed land values in the District increased 240 percent over the same period, making it much more expensive to acquire the necessary properties.\textsuperscript{162}

On the other hand, most of the surface streets were already in place, and those that needed to be built could be constructed at a fraction of the cost of the dedicated parkway. Moreover, there would be no need to acquire the lands between the fortifications, resulting in even more savings. On March 10, 1924, Captain J. E. Wood, Assistant to the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, reported that a de facto version of Fort Drive already existed and entailed 39 miles of city streets, all of which were “in good condition for motor travel” and made a “pleasant drive no part of which is habitually congested.”\textsuperscript{163} The NCPPC members needed to determine whether or not the cost savings were worth abandoning their vision of a dedicated, naturalistic parkway to connect parks containing the Civil War forts design principles.

In order to make an informed decision, the NCPPC retained Charles W. Eliot II to develop a comprehensive report describing the two options in detail. Eliot II was the nephew and namesake of famed landscape architect and pioneer city and regional planner Charles Eliot. The elder Eliot is best known for his leading role in designing and developing the Boston Metropolitan Park System, a plan that served as a model for the Senate Park Commission’s design of Washington. Eliot II enrolled in Harvard University’s Graduate School of Landscape Architecture in 1923, where he studied professional city planning. Upon his graduation, Eliot found employment in the Olmsted Brothers landscape architecture firm, where he worked under Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr. on plans for several Massachusetts towns. During this time he gained an appreciation for the public value of historic sites, an insight that proved very useful after he was appointed a staff member of the NCPPC in 1926. Although only 27 years of age, Eliot’s education and professional experience qualified him to serve as the commission’s in-house city planner. He was later promoted to staff director and then director of planning for the NCPPC. During the early years of the commission, Olmsted and Eliot led many of the initiatives, including the

\textsuperscript{160} National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Meeting Minutes, June 18-19, 1926, p. 4 [hereafter, NCPPC Meeting Minutes].
\textsuperscript{162} Gutheim and Lee, p. 140.
\textsuperscript{163} Quoted in Floyd and CHEP, \textit{Historic Resources Study, Part 2}, p. 3:5.
redevelopment of the National Mall and the introduction of neighborhood recreational centers, with the
former dictating the scope of work and the latter drafting the plans and authoring accompanying
reports.\textsuperscript{164}

Elliot’s report on Fort Drive is an example of his early work for the commission, and as such it should be
assumed to have been created under Olmsted’s supervision and according to his guidelines. Submitted
in February 1927, the report built upon the previous plan submitted by Langdon in 1925, and
incorporated minor changes to avoid locating the route of the parkway option through newly built
houses.\textsuperscript{165} Elliot prefaced the report by stating that the “historic interest attaching to the ‘Defenses of
Washington’ and the remarkable views obtainable from the old Forts has led to a demand that these
sites should be held by the public for park purposes and that a connecting drive should be built between
them.”\textsuperscript{166} He then presented two different options for the planning and development of Fort Drive.

The first possibility called for the creation of the Fort Drive via “specially treated” city streets. Under this
model, Fort Drive would be incorporated into Washington’s general street system, but differentiated by
extra-wide lanes and “distinctive” planting. It would also exclude commercial and commuter traffic and
be restricted solely to “pleasure vehicles.” According to Elliot, the total distance to be traversed by Fort
Drive via city streets would come to 20.8 miles, “of which 16.3 miles is along existing or proposed streets
already of sufficient width to serve the purposes in view.” He estimated that it would cost an additional
$43,391 to acquire the land necessary to widen the remaining 3.5 miles of streets to a minimum of 120
feet. Elliot also noted that a segment of Major Barnard’s Civil War-era system of military roads remained
in the form of Military Road NW, which bisected Rock Creek Park and “has not only its name but its
original purpose to recommend it as a connecting link between the forts.”\textsuperscript{167}

The second option for Fort Drive entailed the construction of a new, dedicated parkway separate from
the city’s general street system. Elliot described this alternative as a “park drive” so as to emphasize its
recreational character, and noted that it would incorporate wide rights-of-way, varied topography,
curving road segments, and the inclusion of preexisting woodlands. The parkway option was slightly
longer than the city streets option and covered a distance of 22.8 miles within the District. Moreover,
Elliot further proposed an additional segment orientated south into Maryland that would extend Fort
Drive to Fort Foote (NACE) and Fort Washington.\textsuperscript{168} He summarized the entire route as follows:

Starting from the splendid woods skirting the Receiving Reservoir the Fort Drive would traverse
a wooded valley and ridge to Battery Kemble, thence past Fort Reno to and through upper Rock
Creek Park with its historic Fort De Russy [sic], reaching the still more historic Fort Stevens on
the eastern side, thence Fort Slocum, Fort Totten, Fort Bunker Hill, the very striking and
exceptional view at Fort Lincoln, crossing the Anacostia River, and including Fort Mahan, Fort
Sedgwick, Fort Dupont, Fort Davis, Fort Baker, Fort Stanton, and reaching the Potomac River

\textsuperscript{164} Gutheim and Lee, pp. 172, 194, 195, 202, 224.
\textsuperscript{165} Floyd and CHEP, \textit{Historic Resources Study, Part 2}, p. 3:5.
\textsuperscript{166} Charles W. Elliot II, “Fort Drive: Plan for a Parkway Connecting the Civil War Forts and Encircling the City of
\textsuperscript{167} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 2, 3, 4.
\textsuperscript{168} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 2, 4 11.
again at Fort Carroll. There is reached the prospective river drive with its continuous view of the Potomac, passing Fort Greble, Fort Foote, and terminating at Fort Washington.169

Eliot also included extensive quotations from a letter written by F. G. Coldren in support of the parkway option. Coldren was a prominent local attorney and member of the Washington Board of Trade. He took an active interest in city planning and attended numerous NCPPC meetings. Eliot and Coldren agreed on several key points. First, that visual interest was an essential aspect of any successful parkway project, and that “straight lines and level ground should be avoided rather than sought.” Changing topography and “long, safe, sweeping curves” allowed new sights to “appear at every turn.” The two men also strongly believed that a parkway should remain in keeping with the surrounding area and reflect and enhance its unique sense of place. To them, a parkway should not be “something gaudy or flashy, or even suggesting so far as can be avoided, the handiwork of man,” and certainly not an attempt at “artificial, structural beautification.” Instead, the ideal parkway was one that incorporated “the preservation or reproduction of what Nature so bountifully bestowed” on the landscape. Coldren’s and Eliot’s effusive elucidations read like a primer on naturalistic parkway design, a planning principle that garnered broad national support following the completion of New York’s Bronx River Parkway in 1925. They further argued that if these principles were applied to Fort Drive, it “would constitute by all means the most striking feature” of Washington, D.C.’s entire park system.170

The great cost to acquire the land and build the roadway stood out as the biggest impediment to the parkway option. Eliot calculated the fair market value of all the properties at $914,806, and estimated $2,000,000 as the actual sum required to gain title by purchase or condemnation. At first blush, when compared against the $43,000 expenditure needed to run Fort Drive through city streets, the parkway seemed lavish and wasteful. Eliot, however, cautioned against making this comparison because the two alternatives were so fundamentally different. He reasoned that if the streets were to be used, Fort Drive would become “nothing more nor less than a name attached to specially chosen streets of little more than usual width. These streets may be restricted to pleasure vehicles, and the street trace may be arranged somewhat differently from what is customary in the District but the connection of the Forts will be a series of streets with angles and straight lines just the same.” Conversely, the parkway would provide “a park connection between the forts – linking them and the larger parks of the District together into a park system. Seen in this light, is the difference in cost between a connection by streets and a park driveway an unreasonable expense?"171

After deliberation, the NCPPC decided that the benefits of constructing Fort Drive as a parkway justified the additional cost. The commissioners formally approved the parkway concept on November 18, 1927.172 They seemed most impressed by this option’s potential for commanding views, pleasantly wooded scenery, and a relaxing yet visually interesting pleasure drive. But the commission did not lose sight of the obvious historic significance of the Civil War fortifications. Rather, they implicitly recognized that each extant fort site was important and worthy of preservation in its own right, but the whole was greater than the sum of its parts. An individual fortification was only one piece of the larger puzzle that, once assembled, illustrated the collective history of the Civil War Defenses of Washington. During the
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war, the fortifications functioned as one interconnected unit, and the NCPPC determined that their primary “historic interest” still rested in their mutual attachment.\textsuperscript{173} Visitors travelling between the forts via the Fort Drive would be able to understand and appreciate this connection, even though the parkway did not follow precisely the same route as the original military roads (Figure 8-11).

In 1929, the NCPC renewed its commitment to realizing Eliot’s plan for Fort Drive by stating that once completed it “would constitute the most striking and famous parkway in this part of the country.”\textsuperscript{174} Although Eliot’s overall vision of the parks and parkway was never fully realized, his integrated concept for Fort Drive outlasted his actual involvement with the project, as he stopped working for the NCPC in 1933.\textsuperscript{175} His inclusive view of the park and parkway model allowed the Fort Drive plan to evolve and embrace such diverse aims as urban recreational use, neighborhood redevelopment, and environmental conservation, all of which gained traction as planning objectives in the coming decades.

Eliot’s holistic approach toward the intricate and complicated task of knitting together the myriad Fort Park sites into a cohesive parkway placed Eliot squarely at the vanguard of American city planning and foreshadowed his later career success. In 1928, a year after submitting his plan for Fort Drive, he executed the first statewide open space plan in the United States for the Open Space Commission for the Governor of Massachusetts.\textsuperscript{176} The statewide plan included the Bay Circuit, a “broad, green corridor of over 250km [155mi], which encircled the Boston metropolis and connected major wetlands and drainage systems of this region.”\textsuperscript{177} The Bay Circuit proved particularly novel in that it would link fifty towns and suburbs via a system of parks and open spaces that did not make strong divisions between the recreational, environmental, and functional values and uses of the landscape.\textsuperscript{178} Although the Bay Circuit plan languished in economic limbo for several decades, “Eliot’s vision was so powerful and so logical, that agencies have rediscovered its relevance three times [in the 1950s, 1980s, and 1990s] and have already built numerous trails in this corridor, connecting communities and ecological resources throughout the state.”\textsuperscript{179} Consequently, Eliot’s Bay Circuit plan is often heralded by academics, planners, and landscape architects as the first serious attempt at greenway planning, an urban design ideal that came into its own in the 1970s. His work on Fort Drive, on the other hand, is not common knowledge and is typically overlooked. Nonetheless, there are striking similarities between the two projects, and Eliot’s experiences relative to Fort Drive clearly influenced his design of the Bay Circuit.

\textsuperscript{177} Gutheim and Lee, p. 219.
\textsuperscript{176} Fábos Landscape Planning and Greenway Symposium.
\textsuperscript{174} NCPC, \textit{Annual Report} (1929), p. 26, quoted and referenced in Finnigan, p. 63.
\textsuperscript{173} Fábos, p. 325.
With Eliot’s vision for Fort Drive established and approved by the NCPPC, Congressional appropriations for land acquisition, which had been practically nonexistent since the time of the Civil War, began coming in. The NCPPC received its first such appropriation on March 3, 1925, about a year before Eliot started working on his plan, and began acquiring land shortly thereafter. The NCPPC acquired most of the Civil War fortifications and connecting rights-of-way for Fort Drive between 1926 and 1932.
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181 The NCPC acquired the first property specifically earmarked for Fort Drive on April 11, 1927. This parcel was located in the southeast quadrant of the District and part of the Shepherd Parkway section, an aspect of the overall city planning models dating back to the Senate Park Commission. However, the Shepherd Parkway was never developed and the National Park Service is unsure how its name came into being. It was possibly named after Alexander Robey Shepherd the Territorial Governor of the District from 1873-74 and leader of the D.C. Board of Public Works that inaugurated a variety of improvements throughout Washington. Floyd and CHEP, Historic Resources Study, Part 2, pp. 3:4, 3:5, 3:7; Finnigan, pp. 59, 64-67, 71, fn. 159; Fort Stanton Park Land Acquisition

Figure 8-11: Still image from silent film showing the route of Eliot’s parkway plan for Fort Drive. Source: National Capital Park and Planning Commission, The Future Park System for Washington and Its Environs.
The vast majority of these acquisitions occurred as a result of the passage of the Capper-Cramton Act on May 29, 1930, which laid the foundation for much of the present park and parkway system in and around the national capital. This law provided federal matching funds for parkland acquisition in the D.C. metropolitan area with the goal of creating a regional system of parks and parkways. Congress authorized a total of $16 million for land acquisition within the District and an additional $13.5 million in the adjoining areas of Maryland and Virginia. The act also included the proposed acquisition of Fort Foote (NACE) with the intent of incorporating it into a regional parkway system that would link Fort Drive and the George Washington Memorial Parkway via Fort Washington.182

An important organizational change also occurred around this time, when on June 10, 1933, President Franklin D. Roosevelt transferred the jurisdiction of all federally owned lands within the District of Columbia to the National Park Service (NPS).183 Under this new arrangement, the NPS took over responsibility for the design and construction of facilities, as well as the day-to-day management and upkeep of the properties. The NCPPC remained the sole agency vested by Congress with the authority to purchase or otherwise acquire land within Washington, D.C. on behalf of the federal government, and also retained general planning oversight on development projects, including Fort Drive.

Although the NCPPC and NPS enjoyed a generally friendly relationship, the overall effectiveness of the NCPPC began to suffer in the 1930s due to a steady decrease in Congressional funding during the Great Depression.184 The Capper-Cramton Act provided the necessary funds to keep planning projects temporarily alive, but the act only provided for funding to be used for the purchase of lands, not the development of these lands. Thus, by mid-decade “the depression drastically cut funds for additional Fort Drive and fort land acquisition.”185 The need to save money was at the heart of several important changes made to Eliot’s plan in the 1930s. By 1935, economic realities necessitated that his parkway model make use of several preexisting city streets, including Nebraska Avenue NW, Military Road NW,
Broad Branch Road NW, and Eastern Avenue NE. Three years later, the NCPPC stated that they accepted the practice of utilizing city streets "where the character of adjoining private development is of a high standard or of institutional character." In order to accommodate these changes, the NCPPC altered and slightly enlarged the route of Fort Drive to a total distance of approximately 23.5 miles. Reportedly, all but one mile of this land was under federal ownership by 1937 and Eliot’s modified version of Fort Drive was set to link 16 fortifications within the District of Columbia: Battery Kemble (ROCR), Battery Parrott, Fort Bayard (ROCR), Fort Reno (ROCR), Fort DeRussy in Rock Creek Park (ROCR), Fort Stevens (ROCR), Fort Slocum (ROCR), Fort Totten (ROCR), Fort Mahan (NACE), Fort Chaplin (NACE), Fort Dupont (NACE), Fort Davis (NACE), Fort Stanton (NACE), Fort Ricketts (NACE), and Fort Carroll and Fort Greble in Shepherd Parkway (NACE). At that time, the government owned all of these fortification sites except Forts Chaplin, Greble and Ricketts. However, without question the most dramatic change made to Eliot’s plan was the extreme reduction of the minimum roadway width from 120 feet to only 40 feet.

Recreation, Construction, and the Civilian Conservation Corps

From its inception, the NCPPC recognized the paramount importance of adding additional public parks, playgrounds, and associated recreational facilities within the District of Columbia and expanding this system outward into the new subdivisions and residential enclaves located beyond the borders of the old city and monumental core. The Commission further stressed the need to make these amenities readily accessible to all District residents and in 1930 set a goal that any residential subdivision of at least 25 acres would receive land to be used for park and playground purposes. At the same time, the NCPPC adopted an ambitious program promoted by Olmsted and Eliot to combine these planned recreational facilities with public school and library construction to be developed within a new larger concept termed the “neighborhood center.” The NCPPC planned to construct between ten and twenty such centers and locate them throughout Washington, D.C. so that residents of any given neighborhood would be no further than a quarter mile from the nearest center. Within each of these clusters, “children and adults would be brought together and the family unit thus strengthened. Community life would also benefit from the attraction of entire families to a common focus. . . . To provide the combination of educational and recreational facilities, the plans of the commission were coordinated with those of the District for new public schools and branch libraries.”

The Commissioners also identified Fort Drive as a park project of special interest and evidently intended to construct some of the planned neighborhood centers in coordination with the development of Fort Drive. At the very least, the large amount of land acquired as part of the Fort Drive project would have provided ample space for the construction of recreation centers, schools, and libraries, with plenty of
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room left to build the parkway and preserve the extant fortifications. The collections of the National Capital Region of the National Park Service contain several plans dating from the late 1920s to the 1940s that illustrate designs for educational and recreational facilities in the immediate vicinities of several extant Civil War fortifications, including Forts Chaplin (NACE), Davis (NACE), and Reno (ROCR), and Battery Kemble (ROCR). The latter is particularly illustrative and identifies the planned locations for swings, see-saws, a slide, sandbox, and a council ring or campfire circle.\textsuperscript{194} Plans showing proposed recreational development of Forts Dupont (NACE) and Mahan (NACE) dated 1929 and 1930, respectively, identify such features as playgrounds, athletic fields, picnic groves, bridle paths, and even a golf course.\textsuperscript{195}

Unfortunately, the sudden onset of the Great Depression effectively killed the NCPPC’s energetic development objectives. Only three of the planned neighborhood centers were actually constructed at this time, although the National Park Service later joined the D.C. government in pursuing this recreation/education model through the 1960s.\textsuperscript{196} The Depression severely limited the ability of the federal government to hire the necessary professionals to improve the fort parks and connecting parkland corridors. However, members of the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) provided a welcome source of labor and succeeded in completing a variety of projects within the historic district, including the construction of select recreational facilities, trash removal and general cleanup, clearing unwanted vegetation, and grading and building a segment of the Fort Drive parkway. The contributions of the CCC significantly increased progress on the fort parks and inaugurated the first major era of on-the-ground development within the historic district.

In 1935, CCC workers operating out of a camp in Fort Dupont began construction of Fort Drive in the southeast quadrant of Washington, D.C. By October 1937, they had graded and paved the segment of Fort Drive (Section L, now Fort Davis Drive (NACE)) running through Fort Davis Park and Fort Dupont Park (NACE).\textsuperscript{197} The CCC workers constructed stone headwalls and culverts; cleared brush, trees, and roots from the right-of-way; and seeded grass and planted new vegetation along the freshly graded land. In a related project undertaken at the same time, the CCC built Fort Dupont Drive as a secondary parkway leading to Fort Drive via Fort Dupont Park. The Works Progress Administration added a short section of Fort Drive near Fort Reno (ROCR) sometime prior to August 1938.\textsuperscript{198} (Figures 8-12 and 8-13)

\textsuperscript{194} “Fort Kemble Community Recreation Center,” January 1934 (NPS National Capital Region Map Database, File No. 832_80177).
\textsuperscript{195} The 1929 plan for Fort Dupont Park is reproduced on page 83 of Robinson & Associates, Inc. \textit{Fort Dupont Park Historic Resources Study} (prepared for National Park Service, National Capital Region, 2004). David Lowe, Cultural Resources Geographic Information Systems Specialist, Heritage Documentation Programs, National Park Service, provided information regarding plans for Fort Mahan.
\textsuperscript{196} The three realized centers were Banneker Recreation Center, located near Howard University, Eckington Center, and McKinley Center. Gutheim and Lee, p. 203.
\textsuperscript{197} Previous scholarship has stated that the CCC workers graded between seven and 10 miles of Fort Drive in the vicinity of Fort Dupont and Fort Davis, but this assertion apparently rests on a contemporary newspaper account and cannot be substantiated via CCC or National Park Service records. The current Fort Davis Drive only runs approximately 1.2 miles, and the CCC graded an additional stretch of approximately 0.3 miles southwest of Pennsylvania Avenue SE. Historic aerial photographs show no additional segments of graded roadway along the Fort Drive route.
Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks
Name of Property

Multiple counties, DC, MD, VA
County and State

Figure 8-12: CCC workers grading Fort Drive Section L, 1935. Source: National Capital Parks-East, National Park Service.

Figure 8-13: Section L after grading, 1935. Source: National Capital Parks-East, National Park Service.

Conservation Corps Activities in the National Capital Region of the National Park Service, Historic American Buildings Survey No. DC-858 (National Park Service, 2004), pp. 30-31; Robert M. Coates and R. M. Schenck, comps., Inventory of Work Accomplished by CCC Camps Under the Jurisdiction of National Capital Parks, October 19, 1933 to January 1, 1942, National Park Service (1942), p. 7, File 885.01, Box 2844, Records of the National Park Service, Record Group 79, National Archives and Records Administration. A short road of less than a tenth of a mile in the northeast part of the city between Taussig Place and 2nd Street northeast of Archbishop Carroll High School is also designated Fort Drive on the Washington, D.C. street plan. This street is not federally owned and is therefore not included in this National Register nomination. However, it is located near the correct alignment for the historic Fort Drive, and further research is needed to determine whether or not it was constructed as part of the Fort Drive project.
CCC workers provided the manpower for several improvement projects at the fort parks. They constructed picnic grounds at Fort Mahan Park (NACE), Fort Bunker Hill Park (ROCR), Barnard Hill Park (ROCR), and Fort Dupont Park (NACE). They built wooden picnic tables and benches at all of the picnic grounds, and stone or brick fireplaces/camp stoves at Barnard Hill and Fort Dupont. They added drinking fountains with pipes inside hollowed logs at Fort Bunker Hill and Fort Dupont. All of the picnic tables and benches, fireplaces/camp stoves, and drinking fountains were designed in the rustic style typical of National Park Service architecture in the 1930s and 1940s. The construction of the picnic grounds at Fort Mahan and Barnard Hill also entailed a large amount of grading in order to develop the hillsides as usable land. Additionally, the CCC workers built a 400-person capacity outdoor amphitheater complete with a stone stage at Fort Bunker Hill, erected a sea wall at Fort Foote (NACE), and installed comfort stations, bridle paths, a council ring or campfire circle, and a children’s play area at Fort Dupont.

General cleanup and maintenance work also took place at all of the aforementioned parks as well as Fort Davis Park (NACE), Fort Stanton Park (NACE), and Fort Totten Park (ROCR). Typical activities involved disposing of trash, cleaning dumps, landscaping, grading and seeding slopes, planting native vegetation, constructing walks, grubbing stumps, clearing dead trees, and removing brush and other undesirable plant growth. The most extensive tree and brush removal project occurred at Fort Dupont Park, where the CCC men cleared a 31-acre swath of land in preparation for the construction of a nine-hole golf course that opened in 1948. (Figure 8-14)

Figure 8-14: Drawing of stone fire pits for the Pine Woods Picnic Area at Fort Dupont Park, ca. 1935. Source: National Archives, Record Group 79.

Davidson and Jacobs, pp. 31-32, 39, 41, 88, 96, 98, 99, 102. Landscape features constructed by the CCC remain intact in Barnard Hill Park, which is included within the historic district boundary. However, since there are no countable resources in the park, it is not listed in the inventory in Section 7 of this nomination.
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At Fort Stevens (ROCR), the CCC undertook a $25,000 restoration project of the historic fort (Figure 7-10). Workers rebuilt the western portion of the parapet, including the ditch, banquettes, gun platforms, and revetment (the covering that provides additional support for the parapet wall). The gun platforms and revetment “were constructed of concrete logs and timbers to simulate the original log construction.” The decision to use concrete came from the fact that it would last much longer and need to be repaired or replaced less frequently than wooden members.203 The CCC men also built a non-functional replica of the underground powder magazine and seeded and sodded three acres of parkland. Finally, they added 400 feet of gravel walks. The CCC finished the work at Fort Stevens in 1938, and it is the only such fortification restoration project in the Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District.204

Inspired by the previous CCC work and facing a funding shortfall, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia applied for a $1,080,000 grant from the Public Works Administration (PWA) for Fort Drive construction on August 17, 1938. However, despite the NCPPC providing documentation in support of the application, the PWA refused the request.205 In December 1939, NCPPC Chairman Delano authored a letter “pleading for more legislation to be passed similar to that of the 1930 Capper-Cramton Act.”206 With no such legislation forthcoming, the NCPPC was once again forced to reinterpret and adjust its plans for Fort Drive. The need to trim the cost of the project, by now a familiar refrain, played a major part in this change, but there was also a second key factor that forced the NCPPC’s hand. Rising traffic congestion in and around Washington necessitated major transportation improvements to handle greater numbers of automobiles moving at a high rate of speed.

Rise of the Car Culture and Its Effects on Planning for Fort Drive

At the turn of the 20th century, the automobile was a rare novelty for the rich, and city and park planning focused on pedestrian, carriage, and streetcar traffic circulation. Planners enjoyed the luxury of being able to focus their talents on creating scenic beauty, visual interest, and other aesthetic elements without the need to facilitate high volumes of automobile traffic. Such was the mindset of the Senate Park Commission when they laid out Washington’s park system in 1902. Fort Drive was rooted in this earlier age, where a parkway was first and foremost a park. Restricted only to recreational traffic, the parkways were to be grand, sweeping, curving, and wooded retreats that gave visitors a respite from the hustle and bustle of everyday life. They were also meant to be experienced at low speeds. With the rise of America’s car culture, this design paradigm became increasingly impractical and outdated.

The first Model T rolled off Henry Ford’s production line in 1908, touching off a surge in car ownership and traffic that eventually curtailed plans for Fort Drive as a solely recreational parkway. The Model T was mass produced and inexpensive, making it possible for most middle-class Americans to purchase a car for the first time. Consequently, automobile ownership boomed across the country during the first three decades of the 20th century, and the national capital was no exception. Automobile ownership in the District of Columbia quadrupled between 1920 and 1930, and “consequences of this growth and

204 Ibid., 3:7; Coates and Schenck, p. 16; Davidson and Jacobs, pp. 41, 44, 103. The gravel walks no longer exist.
206 Finnigan, p. 78.
change in travel habits were felt in every sector of life. By 1925, auto transportation was fully ingrained in Washington. The city was experiencing the first of its now legendary traffic jams as commuter routes in and out of the central core received heavy use. Parking shortages were also becoming a serious nuisance. As a result, the NCPPC was forced to spend a good deal of its time widening streets to accommodate more and more cars, planning new roads in order to alleviate congestion, providing greater numbers of parking spaces, and passing the required regulatory and zoning changes to make all of this possible. “The automobile was at the foundation of Washington as a metropolitan city verging on a regional city. Other functional issues – housing, parks, highways, and siting of public buildings – now hinged on the spatial dimensions afforded by this most private mode of transportation.” Seen in this light, Charles Eliot II’s 1927 parkway plan for Fort Drive was much more applicable to the past than the future. Throughout the 1930s, the NCPPC repeatedly modified this plan, primarily for reasons of economy, but also with an eye towards the ever increasing numbers of cars, trucks, and busses travelling about the city. By 1940, this traffic congestion was so severe that more substantial change in the plans for Fort Drive was needed.

Between 1940 and 1950, several new plans for Fort Drive aimed to resurrect the project by adapting it to fit the needs of the modern city. All shared two overarching objectives: reduce the cost of construction and increase automobile capacity to ease traffic congestion. Ultimately, none of these plans were implemented, but their designs are nonetheless significant as the successors to the 1902 Senate Park Commission plan and the 1927 Eliot plan. Together they provide a telling example of the evolution of parkway design over the first half of the 20th century.

On April 3, 1940, the NCPPC hired Jay Downer as a consultant to update Eliot’s 1927 plan for Fort Drive. Downer previously served as engineer to the Westchester County, New York Park Commission and was one of the principal designers of the Bronx River Parkway, which influenced future plans for Fort Drive. Since the 1920s, he had also consulted on several other parkway projects in the Washington, D.C. area, including Mount Vernon Memorial Parkway and Suitland Parkway, and participated in the early planning stages of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway.

Downer estimated the cost to complete the Fort Drive project at $12-$15 million and offered a new plan that “embodied a limited access, four-lane divided parkway” that would function as an “outskirt bypass” and relieve downtown traffic congestion. He sacrificed some scenic beauty and character in order to cut costs and provide for an increase in traffic flow, but his plan for Fort Drive was still very much a parkway. It included 54 grade separation structures, namely bridges and tunnels, that freed the drive from street-level intersections and allowed it to function as one continuous, unbroken roadway.
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Downer’s plan also illustrated the new qualities of modern parkway design: fewer curves, the elimination of at-grade crossings, and one-way lanes divided by a median. The Baltimore-Washington Parkway, which opened as a connecting corridor between the two cities in 1954, is a prominent example of a parkway developed during this mid-century time period and with these tenets in mind.\textsuperscript{214} It emerged as “transitional roadway” that bridged “early parkway concepts with those of later freeways and interstate highways.” Downer’s streamlined plan for Fort Drive likewise straddled this line.\textsuperscript{215}

The NCPPC approved Downer’s plan in November 1940, and on December 3, 1941, obtained Congressional approval for an increase in the gasoline tax to help pay for the construction of the drive. However, four days later, Japan attacked the United States at Pearl Harbor, and all non-military construction ceased. Fort Drive stalled in the planning stages once more.\textsuperscript{216} As during World War I, very little progress took place concerning Fort Drive or the fort parks during World War II. However, during the war the Officer Candidate School at Fort Washington used Fort Foote (NACE) as a training post and Battery A of the 89\textsuperscript{th} Antiaircraft Artillery Command occupied a 51-acre tract of land within Fort Dupont Park (NACE).\textsuperscript{217} Local residents planted Victory Gardens at Fort Reno Park (ROCR), in Reservation 494 between 8\textsuperscript{th} and 9\textsuperscript{th} Streets NW, in Reservation 499 (Photo #2) near Fort Stevens (ROCR), and in Reservation 497 between North Capitol Street NE and New Hampshire Avenue NE. Victory Gardens provided fresh produce in order to prevent food shortages during wartime.\textsuperscript{218}

On October 24, 1944, the National Park Service and the District of Columbia signed a memorandum of agreement for the development of two sections of Fort Drive: MacArthur Boulevard NW to Nebraska Avenue NW and Military Road NW to a point east of 14\textsuperscript{th} Street NW. NPS Associate Director A. E. Demaray was optimistic that work would begin soon, but when construction estimates came in at $32-$37 million, the District Commissioners withdrew their funding. The projected cost of Fort Drive equaled the total funds available to the District for major highway improvements over the next 12 years. These high dollar amounts also led District Budget Officer Walter Fowler and District Assessor Edward Dent to co-author a report in January 1947 that called on Congress to abandon Fort Drive and allow the lands acquired for the project to be used for “more practical purposes.” They argued that few residents were actually aware of Fort Drive, and that the project was too costly and impractical to warrant future funding. The District Commissioners concurred and advocated selling off the 1,253 acres of parkland comprising Fort Drive to private developers.\textsuperscript{219}

The Fowler-Dent report caught the NCPCC off guard, but they refused to give up on Fort Drive. During its January 1947 meeting, the NCPCC passed a resolution vowing to “continue to press for an orderly, progressive development of the parkway and roadway, and vigorously oppose any legislation looking to
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its abandonment.”\textsuperscript{220} The NCPPC also reiterated its “opinion and judgment that the Fort Drive was a noble and practical concept; that it has been before the public and before Congress for many, many years and received the approval of both; [and] that it is more needed than ever before.” Regarding the ongoing problem of automobile traffic, the commission added that “Fort Drive, being in effect a limited access circumferential dual roadway, will increasingly serve as an essential part of the thoroughfare system channeling to its proper destination with little friction a flood of traffic which otherwise would be forced unwillingly and obnoxiously through already congested streets of the city.”\textsuperscript{221}

Although the NCPPC stuck to their guns, the Fowler-Dent report caused the commission to reevaluate Fort Drive. They instructed their staff landscape architect, Thomas C. Jeffers, to conduct a history of the project, including its legal basis, and make modifications to Downer’s plan that “would require a minimum of construction and still serve the essential purposes for which the drive was conceived.”\textsuperscript{222} Jeffers submitted his initial report, entitled “The Fort Drive: A Plan for Minimum Construction and Minimum Cost” in March 1947. It provided a section-by-section breakdown of the least amount of work necessary to develop a roadway linking the Civil War fortifications. Jeffers recommended using temporary connecting roads in some places and existing city streets in others, and omitted as many grade separation structures as possible because of their high cost.\textsuperscript{223} The commission then directed him to draft a new plan for Fort Drive along these lines and identify those grade separation structures deemed necessary.\textsuperscript{224}

Jeffers submitted his updated plan, which he titled “The Fort Drive Express Parkway,” on June 18, 1947, and the NCPPC approved it two days later. However, this plan was a parkway in name only, as it relied heavily on the use of city streets and included as many as 38 intersections.\textsuperscript{225} It was, in essence, the exact opposite of what Charles Eliot had envisioned for Fort Drive 20 years earlier. The cost of the new plan was estimated to be about $16 million, a far cry from the $35 to $37 million estimated by the District, but still far more money than was available. Consequently, the NCPPC determined that “the Drive could be built in sections as the need arises.”\textsuperscript{226} Even with this gradual approach to construction, the commission was still unable to secure Congressional funding for the project.\textsuperscript{227} The land, however, remained under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service and was not sold off as recommended in the 1947 Fowler-Dent report.

\textsuperscript{223} Floyd and CHEP, \textit{Historic Resources Study, Part 2}, p. 3:8; Jeffers, “The Fort Drive Express Parkway.”
\textsuperscript{224} Finnigan, p. 82; NCPPC Meeting Minutes, April 17-18, 1947.
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Early in 1950, President Truman addressed a letter to the NCPPC requesting that the year’s efforts focus on making Washington, D.C. “the best planned city in the world.” The NCPPC responded later that year with a new comprehensive plan entitled “Washington: Present and Future.” Traffic congestion was the first, and arguably most important, issue addressed. A network of circumferential and radial roadways was to form the skeleton of a new regional thoroughfare plan. The circumferential roadways would be arranged as three concentric rings spaced one mile, three to five miles, and six to 10 miles from the White House. Fort Drive was to serve as the intermediate ring, facilitating access to the outlying areas of the District while the inner ring carried traffic around the central core and the outer ring served as a bypass around the city. (Figure 8-15)

For the first time in its long planning history, Fort Drive was viewed in purely utilitarian terms with little to no regard for its historic value or scenic attributes. An increased emphasis on economic frugality and traffic mobility demanded such a sacrifice. Ultimately, the thoroughfare plan was not implemented, but the conceptual transition of Fort Drive from a parkway to a modern expressway marks an important turning point in its history. The thoroughfare plan also stands as the last serious attempt to develop Fort Drive as a roadway. Future efforts would focus solely on its role as urban parkland.

From Fort Drive to Fort Circle Parks: 1948-1972

National Park Service Mission 66-Era Recreational Facilities

After the end of World War II in 1945, the National Park Service continued construction of various recreational facilities in the fort parks in response to increased demand for recreational facilities during the economic boom that followed the end of the war. Construction of the nine-hole golf course in the northern part of Fort Dupont Park (NACE), begun with CCC labor in 1940, finished in 1947 and opened to the public one year later. The course operated until 1972, when it closed due to local pressure and financial instability. The NPS built the current Fort Dupont Park Activity Center in the late 1940s to serve as the clubhouse for the golf course. It was designed by Pielstick & Syme Associates and opened in time for the 1950 golf season. The Randle Picnic Area at Fort Dupont Park and the picnic area adjacent to the Fort Dupont earthworks were also added in the 1950s, as was the comfort station near the earthworks. The comfort station was built in 1954 according to the plans created by William M. Haussmann and William A. Dennin of the National Capital Office of Design and Construction. The attached picnic shelter was added as an extension of the comfort station in 1958-1959. (See Photo #21 and Figure 8-16.)

---
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The National Park Service designed and constructed several neighborhood recreation centers near the fort parks to meet post-war demands. According to the terms of a 1948 agreement, these facilities were then placed under the management of the District of Columbia Department of Recreation. In anticipation of the Home Rule Act of 1973 that restored an elected city government for Washington, D.C., the NPS began transferring oversight and ownership of the recreation centers to the District of Columbia Department of Recreation as early as 1968. Because the NPS no longer manages these recreation centers, they are not included in the expanded Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District, although they were designed by the National Park Service and occupied federal lands at the times of their construction.

The NPS added only a handful of facilities to the fort parks as part of the its Mission 66 program. Mission 66 was a billion-dollar, Congressionally funded program that operated from 1956 to 1966 and enabled the NPS to improve, modernize, and expand its facilities throughout the United States in order to better serve the increasing number of visitors to the National Parks during and immediately after the 50th anniversary of the Service’s founding in 1966. Buildings and structures erected as part of the Mission 66 program typically incorporated modernist architectural elements into what became known as the “Park

---
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Service Modern” style, characterized by open floor plans, flat roofs, low and horizontal profiles, stone veneers or textured earth-tone concrete facades, and painted steel columns.\textsuperscript{236} Though constructed after the end of Mission 66, the comfort stations at the Ridge and Randle picnic areas in Fort Dupont Park (NACE) are typical of Mission 66 architecture in the historic district.\textsuperscript{237} Scattered water fountains date to this period as well. Although the Mission 66 program resulted in few tangible improvements to the parks, its ideals would shape the parks’ development in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

A Renewed Interest in Park Planning

In the latter half of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, historic preservation and environmental conservation emerged as important forces in the planning and development of parkland in D.C. and its suburbs. Specifically, the Fort Drive corridor came to be viewed as an integral part of Washington’s park system. In 1952, Congress reorganized the NCPPC as the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) and “established it as the central planning agency for the federal government in the National Capital Region, with its current form and functions. Congress also reiterated its charge to NCPC to preserve the region’s important natural and historic features.”\textsuperscript{238} The National Park Service retained responsibility for design, construction, and maintenance.

During the early 1950s, highway development threatened Fort Marcy (GWMP), located in Virginia, across the Potomac River from Battery Kemble (ROCR). Fort Marcy had remained in the possession of a single family for nearly 90 years following the end of the Civil War, and was one of the most well-preserved fortifications at the time of its sale in 1953. In 1956, proposals for widening Virginia Route 123 endangered the fort, and concerned local citizens spoke out in favor of its preservation. “In June 1957, one of these individuals, Mrs. R. F. S. Starr, learned that the Virginia Highway Department was starting work at the fort. She contacted a Fairfax County Supervisor, drove to the site, and parked her car in front of the bulldozer’s blade to halt further destruction.”\textsuperscript{239} In response, Fairfax County and the federal government agreed to split the cost to purchase Fort Marcy and preserve it as a public park. The site opened to the public under NPS management on May 18, 1963. It is the last of the Civil War Defenses of Washington to be acquired by the federal government, and contains not only the fort but related outworks and trenches as well.\textsuperscript{240} Because of its location within the George Washington Memorial Parkway, Fort Marcy was not integrated into the Fort Circle Parks system until after 1970, but it represented an important addition to the National Park Service’s collection of Civil War fort sites.

During the 1950s, the Colonial Dames of America, a patriotic organization, installed dedicatory plaques mounted on boulders at several of the fortifications, and the NPS added interpretive plaques to several
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forts to commemorate the Civil War centenary (1961-1965). (See Photo #6.) The centenary of the war led to an increased interest in the Civil War Defenses of Washington, and more people began seeking out the sites. During this time the NPS restored eroded portions of the parapet and magazine at Fort Stevens, where events were being held to commemorate the battle and President Lincoln’s presence during the fighting.\textsuperscript{241} Civil War cannons were also installed at Forts Stevens, Marcy, and Foote. The passage of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 provided a legal mandate for federal agencies to engage in historic preservation, removing any lingering doubt as to whether or not the fortifications were to be protected against future development.

By this time there was also a growing appreciation for the woodland character of the parkland acquired over the previous 40 years for Fort Drive. Nationally, the late 1960s and early 1970s saw a significant rise in natural resource conservation and environmental stewardship amongst the general population. Locally, the Fort Drive parkland constituted a large portion of the land in the District of Columbia that had escaped the urbanization and development pressures of the late 19\textsuperscript{th} and early 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries. In the century since the Civil War, it had mostly reverted back to its natural state and was largely dominated by forests, “including some of the oldest and most impressive in and about the federal city.”\textsuperscript{242} Additional habitats included meadows, grasslands, and wetlands, and this variety supported an abundance of diverse plant and animal life. With the onset of the environmental movement and an increased national awareness of the importance of natural resource conservation, the lands acquired for Fort Drive and the fort parks were seen as important biological assets as well as recreational and historical resources.

At the same time, “President Johnson’s Great Society initiatives, including the War on Poverty, Beautification, and Model Cities programs, focused national resources and established regulations aimed at improving the quality of life for all Americans.”\textsuperscript{243} One of the most celebrated aspects of the Great Society centered on the need for all Americans to have ready access to parks and public recreation areas near their homes. For Washington, D.C. in general and the Fort Circle Parks in particular, this amounted to a familiar refrain. The fundamental goal of every iteration of the Fort Drive and Fort Parks concept was to provide a place of recreation and leisure within the national capital. This goal echoed through the parks’ origins in the urban parks movement of the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century, the rise of the Progressive movement and the seminal Senate Park Commission plan at the turn of the 20\textsuperscript{th}, Eliot’s parkway vision of Fort Drive, the NCPPC’s desire to place parks within arm’s reach of all D.C. residents prior to the Depression, and recreational development by the CCC, and culminated with the rising tide of environmental conservation and historic preservation toward mid-century.

The Fort Park System

It was against these contextual backdrops that the National Park Service formally transformed Fort Drive into the “Fort Park System” in the 1960s. By mid-decade, the NPS, under the leadership of Director George B. Hartzog, Jr., “focused on expanding recreational areas and improving educational and
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entertainment programs in parks, especially in inner cities.” Within Washington, there emerged an increasing realization that the lands originally acquired for construction of the Fort Drive would better serve the Washington, D.C. population in their current capacity as public open space. The time had come to finally remove the parkway/highway component of the plan entirely and allow the Fort Parks to stand on their own merit.

This idea crystallized in a 1965 report authored by the urban planning consultant firm of Fred W. Tuemmler and Associates. They began with a summary of the project’s long, tumultuous history:

Thus, the Fort Drive which started with a beginning concept of a ‘wooded road – a picturesque circuit of the Capital’ constituting ‘the most striking feature of the park system’ changed first to a design concept of which the Bronx River Parkway in Westchester County, New York was the prototype and gradually to a more streamlined facility to meet the design criteria of the present-day multi-laned, limited access highway.

The firm argued that the most recent proposal to construct a modern freeway along the course of Fort Drive bore very little resemblance to the project’s original purpose of providing an enjoyable means of visiting the historic Civil War fortifications and taking in Washington’s pleasant scenery.

Tuemmler’s report eliminated the roadway entirely and instead centered on the continued preservation of the fort parks and connecting rights-of-way as urban parkland, a key aspect of the overall concept dating all the way back to the Senate Park Commission Plan. In order to emphasize this focus, the report renamed Fort Drive the “Fort Park System.” It went on to provide “the NCPC with condition assessments on each fort and surrounding parkland,” with 15 Civil War sites to be included as destination points in the new Fort Park System. Some 30 miles of walking, hiking, and biking trails would be substituted for the long planned but little-built roadway. If the NCPC still desired a vehicular parkway, it should be limited to the section east of the Anacostia, where the city’s land values were the least expensive and the condemnation of any additional land would be the easiest and cheapest. Such a parkway could also incorporate those segments that had already been constructed through Fort Davis Park (NACE) and Fort Dupont Park (NACE).

Tuemmler’s report planned for comfort stations, neighborhood centers, and historical interpretation, furthering the longstanding aim of providing public recreation and educational amenities within the parks. It also proposed complete restoration of Forts Stevens (ROCR), Totten (ROCR), and Dupont (NACE) and the establishment of a Civil War museum. Despite gaining the support of local newspapers, the public, and the NCPC, a lack of money halted the implementation of this plan. Only two miles of trails in Fort Dupont Park were built as a direct result of Tuemmler’s work.
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This lack of funding did not, however, diminish the interest in reinterpreting the purpose of the 1,276 acres of land comprising the fort parks and connecting right-of-way. In 1968, the National Park Service adopted a Master Plan that expanded upon Tuemmler’s proposal. Although this document changed the name of the landscape from the “Fort Park System” to the “Fort Circle Parks” in order to emphasize the circular arrangement of the Civil War defenses around Washington, the focus remained squarely on the public’s use of the space as urban parkland. The primary goal of the Master Plan, which served as the basis for all NPS work on the Fort Circle Parks until adoption of the present Management Plan in 2004, was the establishment of recreational and interpretative programs in the parks. A major facet of this work entailed the creation of a 23-mile continuous stretch of pedestrian and bicycle trails running along the ribbon of parkland originally acquired for the development of Fort Drive. For the first time, however, all regular vehicular traffic was prohibited outright, excepting along those few segments of Fort Drive that were already built.

The shift from a Fort Drive parkway or highway to the park system model of the Fort Circle Parks served as a recommitment to the park component of the original Senate Park Commission Plan, as well as a means of following through on the work within the parks inaugurated by the CCC. The National Park Service realized that the forts and connecting ribbon of parkland held value nationally as destinations for visitors venturing beyond the monumental core of the city. They also recognized that the greensward held value as parks at the city and local neighborhood levels because much of the route passed through or near areas of the city in need of greater access to public recreational spaces.

Furthermore, the Master Plan revisited the familiar themes of historical interpretation and preservation, the conservation and enjoyment of natural resources, and the incorporation of sites for both passive and active recreation. The 1968 Master Plan was the first planning document for the parks to identify these three types of use as management categories and endeavored to use this means of organization to better serve the public.

The visitor will be exposed to opportunities for active and passive recreation as well as historical and natural history interpretation. The thread that is to tie the circle of forts together will be a contiguous bikeway and foot trail, inviting the local resident and District of Columbia visitor to use the facilities.

The foundations and revetments of many of the forts have returned to dust. However, their past existence may have served even a greater purpose, by serving as a catalyst for early government action to reserve this green belt for recreational purposes. This plan takes note of this earliest expressed intent, by linking a wide variety of recreational experiences into a single management unit. . . .

---
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At a time when the plague of urban decay threatens every large city, the unique opportunity to provide high quality recreational experiences close at hand to the user is a rare one, indeed.\textsuperscript{254}

The creation and adoption of the 1968 Master Plan also coincided with an important emerging trend in urban planning in the United States: the “greenway” model. Generally speaking, a greenway is any corridor of parkland or other protected open space maintained for the purposes of conservation, recreation, and the use of non-motorized transportation.\textsuperscript{255} This concept had its roots in the park systems of the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century and the broad approaches to urban open space planning that crystallized in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century, but surpassed its predecessors in that it sought to provide people with access to recreational open space near their homes and workplaces and ascribed equal value to the presence of natural and cultural resources.\textsuperscript{256} With its directive to provide interpretation and recreation in the ring of forested land running between Washington’s historic Civil War fortifications, the Fort Circle Parks system stands out as an early and archetypical example of the greenway movement.

In order to meet these various planning objectives, the National Park Service envisioned a large number of interpretive themes, programs, and recreational features. Beyond the hiker/biker trail, the NPS proposed historical interpretation at the sites of each of the Civil War forts and batteries, rangers to educate visitors about the Civil War and the flora and fauna of the parks, day and overnight camps, playgrounds, picnic facilities, cultural programs, interpretive centers, recreational gardens, sports fields, and some 70 “neighborhood parklets” to “provide a variety of passive and active recreational opportunities to the residents of the many neighborhoods through which this thin ribbon of parkland passes.”\textsuperscript{257}

Several construction and development projects did take place within the Fort Circle Parks according to the precepts of the 1968 Master Plan. By 1971, the NPS had built several miles of a continuous hiker/biker trail (NACE) that would ultimately connect Forts Mahan, Chaplin, Dupont, Davis, Stanton, and Ricketts. This trail was subsequently designated as a national recreation trail.\textsuperscript{258} Additional recreational facilities were also constructed in the late 1970s and 1980s, including the Fort Dupont Ice Rink, as well as football fields, baseball diamonds, and tennis and basketball courts at the park. Likewise, Fort Reno (ROCR) received a bandstand, picnic shelters were built at several parks, and “tot lots” located at Forts Stanton (NACE) and Totten (ROCR).\textsuperscript{259} Many more planned recreational structures were, however, never realized due to lack of funding. Nonetheless, by 2012, the NPS had built an additional five miles of connecting hiking and biking trails between the forts east of the Anacostia River, and incorporated hiking and biking routes through the city to the remainder of the Civil War fortifications.
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The latter routes largely follow the course of the Fort Drive right-of-way acquired in the early to mid-20th century, making use of sidewalks and footpaths along the way. 260 (See Map #17.1.)

Today, the Fort Circle Parks have achieved many of the goals originally laid out more than a century ago. The federal government has acquired extant Civil War fortifications and preserved them as public parks. A line of parkland connects these sites, allowing them to be correctly interpreted as the system of defenses that protected the national capital during the Civil War. Within the right-of-way, the hiking and biking routes have replaced the planned roadway, but the net result is much the same. Visitors seeking out the sites for their historical interest or looking for a respite in the wooded surroundings and natural scenery may do so just as the Senate Park Commission, Charles Eliot II, and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission intended. Visible from many places within Washington, D.C. and beyond its boundaries, this ribbon of green has become one of the defining features of the park system of the national capital.

SIGNIFICANT DATES

1861-65: The Defenses of Washington were constructed to protect the national capital from Confederate attack. The fortification system encompassed 68 forts, 93 batteries, three blockhouses, 20 miles of rifle trenches, and more than 32 miles of military roads.

1861-65: During the Civil War as many as 40,000 contraband slaves fled the Confederacy to Washington, D.C, benefitting from the support of the resident free black population. Some settled in camps near the fortifications ringing the city and provided labor for construction and maintenance.

1864: The Battle of Fort Stevens took place on July 11-12.

1865-66: The U.S. government returned the vast majority of the fortifications of Washington to private owners and the earthworks’ physical condition almost immediately deteriorate from neglect or redevelopment.

1868: The U.S. government acquired legal title to Battleground National Cemetery.

1902: The Senate Park Commission report included Fort Drive as a key component of the future design and development of Washington, D.C. At this time, it was envisioned as a pleasure drive connecting points of historic significance via an attractive parkway to be travelled by carriages. Views and scenery were also emphasized.

1912: Congress passed the first legislation for the protection of the former Civil War defenses of Washington. This legislation led to the purchase of Forts Dupont and Davis as public parks.

1916: The U.S. government acquired the first two fort parks, encompassing the Civil War fortifications of Forts Davis and Dupont.

1926: Congress authorized the National Capital Park and Planning Commission (NCPPC) to plan a park system for the Washington, D.C. region and acquire land on behalf of the U.S. government. The acquisition of the individual fortification sites (but not the right-of-way for Fort Drive) began almost immediately.

1927: The NCPPC approved a plan for Fort Drive made by city planner Charles W. Eliot II. Eliot eschewed the use of city streets in favor of developing a picturesque, gently curving parkway with an abundance of visual interest.

1929-32: The NCPPC acquired the majority of the lands comprising the fort parks and right-of-way for the planned Fort Drive. The passage of the Capper-Cramton Act in 1930 made much of the necessary funding available, however the Great Depression and World War II prevented the funds for the actual construction of the drive from ever becoming available.

1933: The National Park Service took over the management of federally owned parkland in Washington, D.C., including the fort parks and the Fort Drive right-of-way. This responsibility included design, construction, and maintenance. The NCPPC retained responsibility for the purchase and acquisition of federal lands for park purposes within the District of Columbia, and also maintained overall planning authority.

1934-38: Workers from the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) conducted various projects relating to Fort Drive, Fort Stevens, and park improvements.

1940-53: The NCPPC replaced Eliot’s plan for Fort Drive with a succession of new plans designed to cut the cost of the project and increase automobile capacity.

1957-63: The federal government acquired Fort Marcy, which was threatened by development, and opened it as a public park under NPS management. It was the last of the Civil War fortifications around Washington acquired by the U.S. government.

1965: Planning consultant Fred Tuemmler developed a plan by which the fort sites and connecting rights-of-way acquired for Fort Drive would be re-designated the “Fort Park System” and maintained as public urban parkland with no new roadway construction. This plan called for a vast system of hiker-biker trails, recreation centers, comfort stations, and points of historical interpretation, but only a few miles of trails were built as a direct result of Tuemmler’s work.

1968: The NPS adopted the *Fort Circle Parks Master Plan* (revised and updated in 2004) as the guiding document for all future work concerning the fort parks and connecting parks acquired as Fort Drive right-of-way. This plan stressed the importance of natural resource conservation, historic preservation, and public recreation.

1971: The first segment of the Fort Circle Park Hiker-Biker Trail was completed.
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George Washington Memorial Parkway (GWMP)

Section A (Fort Marcy Park), Map #2
Expanding previously listed area

A portion of U.S. Reservation 404 in Virginia, including the previously listed area and adding all of parcels 113-003 and 113-005 in Fairfax County; parcels 113-001 and 113-002 in Arlington County; and a portion of parcel 113-006 in Arlington and Fairfax Counties. The parcel or reservation boundaries form the historic district boundary, except on the west, where the boundary extends south from and in line with the western boundary of parcel 113-006 where it abuts the Dogwoods at Langley subdivision.

Section B (Pimmit Run Bridge Abutment and Military Road), Map #3
New section

The boundary of Section B, located within U.S. Reservation 404 in Arlington County, Virginia, is shown on Map #3.
Sections 9-end page 151
Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks

Name of Property: Multiple counties, DC, MD, VA

Section L (Fort Drive – Fort Reno Park to Battery Broad Branch), Map #10
In the northwest quadrant of the District of Columbia, U.S. Reservations 397 and 573 and the portion of U.S. Reservation 515 lying between Connecticut Avenue NW, Nebraska Avenue NW, and the Peruvian Embassy grounds (DC Square/Lot #2282-0808).

Section M (Battery Broad Branch), Map #11
The portion of U.S. Reservation 515 located between Broad Branch Road NW, 27th Street/Old Swart Road NW, and 29th Street NW in the District of Columbia.

Section N (Rock Creek Park), Map #12
Section N is located entirely within Rock Creek Park (U.S. Reservation 339) and includes the previously listed area around Fort DeRussy. North of Military Road NW, the western boundary of Section N is defined by Oregon Avenue NW and the property line of U.S. Reservation 339 (Rock Creek Park). The northern boundary runs along the south bank of an unnamed stream between Oregon Avenue NW and Rock Creek, following portions of the Western Ridge Trail and the remnants of Milkhouse Ford Road. Rock Creek forms the eastern boundary, except at the intersection of Military Road NW and Joyce Road NW, where the boundary follows the northeast side of Joyce Road NW until the bridge over Rock Creek.

Rock Creek also forms the eastern boundary of the portion of Section N that lies south of Military Road NW. At the southern end of Section N, the boundary extends due west from Rock Creek to Ross Drive NW, then continues south along the west side of Ross Drive NW until it reaches a gully. The boundary then follows the gully northwest until turning north to meet the ridge where White Horse Trail is located. The boundary then leads north from White Horse Trail to the intersection of Military Road NW and the entrance ramp from Ross Drive NW.

Section O (Battle of Fort Stevens Archeological Site), Archeology Map #7
Section O is situated within U.S. Reservation 339 in the northwest quadrant of the District of Columbia. The section boundary is the same as the boundary for the Battle of Fort Stevens Archeological Site (DC Site #51NW163, ASMIS #ROCR00056.000), and is depicted on Archeology Map #7.

Section P (Battleground National Cemetery), Map #13
U.S. Reservation 568 in the northwest quadrant of the District of Columbia. The boundary of Section P is identical to the boundary defined in the individual National Register listing for Battleground National Cemetery.

Section Q (Fort Drive – Rock Creek Park to Barnard Hill), Maps #13 & #14
Expanding and clarifying previously listed area
U.S. Reservations 345, 346, 347, 348, 358 (including the previously listed area around Fort Stevens), 435 (see below), 451, 494, 497, 499, 528, and 544 (including the previously listed area around the Fort Totten earthworks) in the northwest and northeast quadrants of the District of Columbia, excluding the portion of Reservation 451 transferred to and occupied by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority for the Fort Totten Metro Station. Section Q encompasses all of Fort Slocum Park (U.S. Reservation 435), whose contributing status and National Register boundary were unclear in the 1974 and 1978 nominations. These nominations included Fort Slocum Park, but did not define a boundary.

Section R (Fort Bunker Hill Park), Map #14
Previously listed
U.S. Reservation 443 in the northwest quadrant of the District of Columbia.
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Sections S, T, U, V, W, X, and Y (Fort Drive – Barnard Hill to Fort Lincoln), Map #15 New section
The discontinuous sections of U.S. Reservation 520 that are located along the southwest side of Eastern Avenue NE between Randolph Street NE and Bladensburg Road NE in the District of Columbia, excluding the parcel on the north side of Perry Street NE.

National Capital Parks East (NACE)

Section Z (Fort Drive – Anacostia Park to Fort Mahan Park), Map #16 New section
The portion of U.S. Reservation 523 bounded by U.S. Reservation 343 (Anacostia Park), Jay Street NE, Mayfair Terrace NE, Kenilworth Avenue NE, Lee Street NE, and 40th Street NE in the District of Columbia.

Section AA (Fort Drive – Fort Mahan Park to St. Elizabeths Hospital), Maps #16, #17, and #18 Expanding previously listed areas
Section AB is located in the northeast and southeast quadrants of the District of Columbia and encompasses the following U.S. Reservations, portions of which were previously listed in the National Register:

- the portion of U.S. Reservation 523 that is adjacent to 42nd Street NE between Hunt Place NE and Grant Street NE (Map #16);
- U.S. Reservation 475, including the previously listed area (Fort Mahan Park, Map #16);
- U.S. Reservation 500 between Benning Road NE and Ridge Road SE (Map #16);
- U.S. Reservation 609, including the previously listed area (Fort Chaplin Park, Map #16);
- U.S. Reservation 405, including the segment west of Minnesota Avenue SE and the previously listed area (Fort Dupont Park, Map #17);
- U.S. Reservation 336, including the previously listed area (Fort Davis Park, Map #17);
- U.S. Reservation 518 between Massachusetts Avenue SE and Reservations 412 and 575 (Maps #17 and #18);
- U.S. Reservation 412, excluding the areas under the jurisdiction of the D.C. Water and Sewer Authority and including the previously listed area (Fort Stanton Park, Map #18);
- U.S. Reservation 575, including the previously listed area (Fort Ricketts Park, Map #18); and
- U.S. Reservation 519 between Reservations 412 and 575 and the Hayden-Johnson Recreation Center (Map #18).

Section AB (Shepherd Parkway), Map #19 Expanding previously listed areas
A portion of U.S. Reservation 421 in the southeast and southwest quadrants of the District of Columbia, including the previously listed areas surrounding Fort Greble and Fort Carroll. The expanded boundary encompasses the part of U.S. Reservation 421 that lies east of the Anacostia Freeway (Interstate 295) between the federal property formerly occupied by St. Elizabeths Hospital and the intersection of Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue SW and Joliet Street SW.

Section AC (Bald Eagle Hill), Map #19 New section
In the southwest quadrant of the District of Columbia, U.S. Reservation 561 and the portion of U.S. Reservation 421 bounded by U.S. Reservation 561 and the District of Columbia/Maryland border.

Section AD (Fort Foote), Map #20 Previously listed
A portion of U.S. Reservation 404M lying in Prince George’s County, Maryland, encompassing the former Fort Foote Military Reservation that was transferred to the NPS in 1931 (Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital, General Order No. 432, November 6, 1931) and corresponding to
Resources Not Under National Park Service Jurisdiction

The boundary for the Fort Lincoln Battery (previously listed) was not re-assessed as part of this update.

Boundary Justification (Explain why the boundaries were selected.)

The boundary of the Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District includes all U.S. Reservations owned and managed by NPS that are associated with either the Civil War Defenses of Washington or the development of the Fort Circle Parks and proposed Fort Drive. Areas that were acquired for the park system are excluded from the district if they meet one of the following criteria:

- all or part of the reservation is too small to be recognized as park land, or
- the reservation is not adjacent either to a fort park or to a roadway that was intended to be incorporated into the proposed Fort Drive.

Based on these criteria, one reservation was excluded from the district in its entirety: U.S. Reservation 587, a 0.05-acre triangle bounded by Nebraska Avenue NW, 45th Street NW, and Rockwood Parkway NW. This reservation is not adjacent to any other federal land associated with Fort Circle Parks and is too small to be recognizable as park land.

Justification for Discontiguous District

The Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District meets the criteria for a discontiguous National Register historic district because both currently and historically, its resources are geographically separate and the space between the resources lacks significance. As a result, visual continuity is not critical to the resources' historic significance.

In their original arrangement and configuration, the forts and batteries in the Civil War Defenses of Washington were geographically separate. Roads, narrow rifle trenches, and covered ways linked the fortifications, but most of the land between the earthworks remained under civilian ownership and was not incorporated into the system of military fortifications. In the century after the end of the Civil War, urban and suburban development filled much of the area between the earthworks.

Individually, many of the surviving forts and batteries are historically significant and retain sufficient integrity to meet the criteria for listing in the National Register for their association with the Civil War Defenses of Washington. Collectively, the discontiguous earthworks in the historic district more effectively illustrate the overall configuration and operation of the Civil War Defenses of Washington than do any of the individual earthworks.

Likewise, the discontiguous historic district is consistent with the development of the Fort Circle Parks during the period of significance. Because of limited funding and the rapid pace of development in the District of Columbia in the 20th century, the federal government could not acquire all of the land for Fort Drive and the fort park system at the same time. As a result, when the bulk of the land acquisition for
the parkway and parks ended in the mid-20th century, the Fort Circle Parks was a collection of
 discontinuous parkland separated primarily by urban and suburban development. Thus, a discontinuous
 historic district accurately reflects and conveys the Fort Circle Parks’ appearance during the period of
 significance.

Justification for Boundaries of Individual Areas within the Discontiguous District
The boundaries for most areas of the discontinuous historic district correspond to the boundaries of the
 associated U.S. Reservation(s) that the federal government acquired for the Fort Circle Parks or because
 of their association with the Civil War Defenses of Washington; these areas are listed below, along with
 the relevant reservation numbers. Some of the U.S. Reservations in the historic district are themselves
discontiguous because the federal government acquired the land piecemeal and was not always able to
assemble the parcels needed to create continuous strips of park land. In the list below, discontinuous
reservations that lie entirely within the historic district are marked with an asterisk (*):

- Section F (Battery Kemble Park and Fort Drive – Palisades Park to American University, ROCR, Map
  #7), U.S. Reservations 521 (previously listed) and 530;
- Section G (Fort Drive – Ward Circle, ROCR, Map #9), U.S. Reservations 542* and 572;
- Section H (Fort Bayard Park, ROCR, Map #8), U.S. Reservation 359 (corresponds to previously
  listed boundary);
- Section I (Fort Drive – Ward Circle to Tenley Circle, ROCR, Map #9), U.S. Reservations 330B and
  330C;
- Section J (Fort Drive – Tenley Circle to Fort Reno Park, ROCR, Map #10), U.S. Reservations 398,
  399, and 542*;
- Section L (Fort Drive – Fort Reno Park to Battery Broad Branch, ROCR, Map #10), U.S. Reservations
  387, 515*, and 573;
- Section M (Battery Broad Branch, ROCR, Map #11), U.S. Reservation 515*;
- Section P (Battleground National Cemetery, ROCR, Map #13), U.S. Reservation 568 (corresponds to
  previously listed boundary);
- Section R (Fort Bunker Hill Park, ROCR, Map #14), U.S. Reservation 443 (corresponds to previously
  listed boundary);
- Section AB (Shepherd Parkway, NACE, Map #19), U.S. Reservation 421* (includes previously listed
  areas); and
- Section AC (Shepherd Parkway and Bald Eagle Hill, NACE, Map #19), U.S. Reservations 421* and
  561.

Sections G, I, and J are comparatively small areas along Nebraska Avenue NW. These areas are included
in the historic district because of their historical association with the Fort Circle Parks and because
collectively, they mark Nebraska Avenue NW as the planned connecting route between Fort Reno Park
(Section K) and Battery Kemble Park/Fort Drive – Palisades Park to American University (Section F).

Isolated sections of rifle trenches and military roads are included as discontinuous areas within the
historic district boundary because when seen in the context of the larger system of fortifications, they
convey the historic circulation patterns among the fortifications and the defensive positions between
the forts. In addition, the presence of above-ground earthworks suggests the possibility of potentially
valuable archeological resources.
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Section A (Fort Marcy Park, GWMP), Map #2
Section A includes the previously listed area and expands the boundary to encompass Civil War earthworks and military roads in the vicinity of Fort Marcy that have been identified since 1978. The boundary extends to the nearest full or partial parcel boundary.

Section B (Pimmit Run Bridge Abutment & Military Road, GWMP), Map #3
The boundary encompasses the bridge abutment, as well as the graded area that is a remnant of the approach to the bridge. The boundary extends to the opposite bank of Pimmit Run, which represents a critical component of the abutment's setting that enables it to be recognized as a bridge abutment.

Section C (Gulf Branch Rifle Trench, GWMP), Map #4
The earthworks are located along a ridge above the northwest bank of Gulf Branch, which forms the southeastern boundary and marks the end of the high ground. The northwest boundary was drawn to include the surviving earthworks and lines up with to the northwest edge of the overpass for the George Washington Memorial Parkway, which crosses over the earthworks. The northeast and southwest boundaries of Section C correspond to the boundary lines of U.S. Reservation 404.

Section D (Spout Run Rifle Trench, GWMP), Map #5
The boundary of Section D encompasses all known remnants of the Civil War earthworks. The northern boundary is defined by Spout Run Parkway, which marks a change in land use and elevation. On the east, west, and south, the boundary extends to nearest NPS property line.

Section E (Reservoir Battery #2, ROCR), Map #6
The boundary for Section E includes all known above-ground and archeological resources related to Reservoir Battery #2 and generally encloses the high ground that historically provided the battery with views of the Potomac River and the Georgetown Reservoir. This elevated vantage point was integral to Civil War military engineers' decision to build a battery in this location. The north, east, and south boundaries correspond to the reservation boundary. Part of the southern boundary also follows a steep embankment above a former roadbed. The western boundary is associated with a corner of the reservation boundary and crosses through a small valley to the northwest of the high ground occupied by Reservoir Battery #2.

Section K (Fort Reno Park, ROCR), Map #10
Note: Earlier National Register nominations for the historic district included Fort Reno Park but did not define a boundary.
The boundary for Section K encompasses the corridor of land within the park that the federal government acquired for the proposed Fort Drive (U.S. Reservations 515 and 542), as well as the park land immediately surrounding that corridor (part of U.S. Reservation 470). The northern part of Fort Reno Park (part of U.S. Reservation 470) is excluded from the Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District because it lacks historic resources associated with the district's areas of significance and because land transfers in the middle of the park disrupt its visual coherence. Most of the portion of Fort Reno Park that lies north of Donaldson Place NW, DeRussy Street NW, and Fort Drive NW is occupied by a reservoir and a school (Alice Deal Middle School) that are unrelated to the historic district's development as a system of parks. In addition, including the northern part of U.S. Reservation
Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks

470 in the historic district would create a “donut hole” in this section because the land associated with the reservoir and school is not under NPS jurisdiction and is surrounded on all sides by Fort Reno Park.

Section N (Rock Creek Park, ROCR), Map #12
The boundary of Section N includes the previously listed area around Fort DeRussy and is expanded to encompass all known resources and landscape features associated with the Civil War Defenses of Washington. North of Military Road NW, the historic district boundary generally corresponds to the boundary of the documented Fort DeRussy cultural landscape (CLI #600259), except at the northwest corner, where the historic district boundary follows the unnamed stream in order to encompass all of the high ground occupied by Fort DeRussy. To the east, Rock Creek represents a natural geographic boundary and marks the eastern edge of the high ground. Milkhouse Ford is included because its strategic importance during the Civil War makes it a significant component of the landscape surrounding Fort DeRussy. Military Road NW, which forms part of the southern boundary, follows the same route as a Civil War military road, but no longer retains integrity to the Civil War era.

South of Military Road NW, the boundary encompasses all known Civil War resources and generally follows notable topographical features. The northeastern boundary follows and encompasses a segment of Joyce Drive that follows the historic route of Military Road.

The areas of Rock Creek Park surrounding the historic district, including the areas between Sections N and O, retain many of the topographical features that contributed to its military importance, but the landscape otherwise retains little else of its Civil War appearance. Immediately before the war, scattered farms occupied the area. During the war, the U.S. military cleared the land in front of the forts in order to have an unobstructed view of approaching troops. In contrast, much of the land to the north, south, and west is currently forested. The Rock Creek Golf Course also lies between Sections N and O, disrupting the landscape between these two sections.

Military actions related to the Battle of Fort Stevens took place to the north of Section N, but this area was not evaluated as a battlefield landscape as part of this nomination.¹

Section O (Battle of Fort Stevens Archeological Site, ROCR), Archeology Map #7
The boundary of the site (DC #51NW163) was determined by archeologists from the Louis Berger Group, Inc. based on the concentration of military artifacts recovered through surface observations and shovel tests completed between 2002 and 2006. The location of the concentration of bullets is consistent with shots fired at the Confederate line during the Battle of Fort Stevens from a Union line in front of Fort DeRussy, and the presence of artillery shells is consistent with the firing range from the fort. See John Bedell, Stuart Fiedel, and Charles LeeDecker (The Louis Berger Group, Inc.), “Bold, Rocky, and Picturesque”: Archeological Identification and Evaluation Study of Rock Creek Park, District of Columbia, Volumes 1 and 2 (Washington, D.C.: National Capital Region, National Park Service, 2008).

Section Q (Fort Drive – Rock Creek Park to Barnard Hill, ROCR), Maps #13 and #14
Section Q comprises federal reservations acquired for the proposed Fort Drive and encompasses the previously listed areas around the Fort Totten and Fort Stevens earthworks. The area including and immediately surrounding the Fort Totten Metro Station was excluded because the NPS transferred jurisdiction over this area to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

Sections S, T, U, V, W, X, and Y (Fort Drive – Barnard Hill to Fort Lincoln, ROCR), Map #15
Acquired as part of an effort to incorporate Eastern Avenue NE into the planned route of Fort Drive, these discontiguous components of Reservation 520 are associated with 20th-century park development in the historic district. The seven parcels that make up Reservation 520 in this area are sufficiently large and closely spaced to convey their function as part of a ribbon of parkland along an existing city street. The portion of Reservation 520 that is located on the north side of Perry Street NE, between 2876 Perry Street NE and 3004 Perry Street NE, is excluded from the historic district because residential construction interrupts the connection between this parcel and Eastern Avenue. Because it does not have a physical or visual connection to the planned route of Fort Drive, this parcel does not retain integrity to the historic district’s park development period.

Section Z (Fort Drive – Anacostia Park to Fort Mahan Park, NACE), Map #16
The boundary of Section Z corresponds to a discontiguous portion of U.S. Reservation 523 that was acquired for the route of the proposed Fort Drive between Anacostia Park and Fort Mahan Park. Other segments of Reservation 523 are included in Section AA and are discussed below.

Section AA (Fort Drive – Fort Mahan Park to St. Elizabeths, NACE), Map #16
The boundary of Section AB encompasses land that the federal government acquired for the creation of the Fort Circle Parks. The previously listed areas around the earthworks at Fort Mahan, Fort Chaplin, Fort Dupont, Fort Davis, Fort Ricketts, and Fort Stanton lie within Section AA. The discontiguous segment of Reservation 523 that is located near the center of the block bounded by 42nd Street NE, Hunt Place NE, Minnesota Avenue NE, and Hayes Street NE is excluded because residential construction separates it from the parkland along 42nd Street NE that is associated with the proposed Fort Drive.

Section AD (Fort Foote Park, NACE), Map #20
The historic district boundary at Fort Foote Park remains the same as defined in the 1978 National Register nomination and encompasses the land associated with the Civil War Defenses of Washington and the post-war military use of the fort. Fort Foote’s development as a park is associated with a proposed expansion of the George Washington Memorial Parkway into Maryland, rather than with the development of Fort Drive or the ring of fort parks around Washington, DC. Accordingly, the Davis Tract (National Park Service-National Capital Region Land Record No. 595, May 13, 1968) of Fort Foote Park is excluded from the historic district because it was acquired as part of an effort to expand the George Washington Memorial Parkway and is not directly associated with the military resources or with the development of the Fort Circle Parks.
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Additional Documentation

Submit the following items with the completed form:

- **Maps:** A USGS map or equivalent (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location.

- **Sketch map** for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources. Key all photographs to this map.

- **Additional items:** (Check with the SHPO, TPO, or FPO for any additional items.)

Photographs

Submit clear and descriptive photographs. The size of each image must be 1600x1200 pixels (minimum), 3000x2000 preferred, at 300 ppi (pixels per inch) or larger. Key all photographs to the sketch map. Each photograph must be numbered and that number must correspond to the photograph number on the photo log. For simplicity, the name of the photographer, photo date, etc. may be listed once on the photograph log and doesn’t need to be labeled on every photograph.

Photo Log

Name of Property: Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks Historic District

City or Vicinity: Washington, D.C. and vicinity

County: various State: DC, MD, VA

Sections 9-end page 159
Photographers:
Jonathan W. Pliska (#1, 4-6, 9-12, 14-15, 17-22) and Evelyn D. Causey (#2-3, 7-8, 13, 16)

Dates Photographed:
February 10-12, 2014 and November 20, 2014 (specific dates given below in descriptions of photographs)

Description of Photograph(s) and number, include description of view indicating direction of camera:

1 of 22 (Map #13)
View looking east from 5th Street NW into a section of Reservation 494 (Section Q (West Segment), ROCR) bounded by Missouri Avenue NW on the south and Madison Street NW on the north, showing urban parkland acquired as part of the planned Fort Drive. (2/11/2014)

2 of 22 (Map #13.2)
View looking southwest along Reservation 494 (Section Q (West Segment), ROCR) from 13th Street NW at Fort Stevens (ROCR), showing urban parkland acquired as part of the planned Fort Drive; a community garden is visible on the right. (11/20/2014)

3 of 22 (Map #13.2)
Fort Stevens (ROCR), looking northeast, showing reconstructed parapet and monument commemorating President Abraham Lincoln’s presence during the Battle of Fort Stevens. (11/20/2014)

4 of 22 (Map #2.2)
Interior of Fort Marcy (GWMP), looking east from the southwest bastion along cobblestone road towards sally port. (2/12/2014)

5 of 22 (Map #2.2)
View from interior of Fort Marcy (GWMP), looking northwest through artillery embrasure in west parapet. (2/12/2014)

6 of 22 (Map #12.1)
Fort DeRussy (Rock Creek Park, ROCR), looking northwest towards the exterior slope of the parapet and the sally port, showing National Park Service Civil War Centennial Monument. (2/11/2014)

7 of 22 (Map #20.2)
Interior of Fort Foote (NACE), looking northwest from north magazine and traverse towards mounted Rodman gun at northwest end of fort. (11/20/2014)
8 of 22 (Map #20.1)
Engineers’ storehouse (foreground) and wharf site (background) at Fort Foote (NACE), looking west towards Potomac River. (11/20/2014)

9 of 22 (Map #17.5)
Parapet and ditch on northeast side of Fort Davis (NACE), looking northwest. (2/10/2014)

10 of 22 (Map #11)
Battery Broad Branch (ROCR), looking southwest along parapet and exterior ditch. (2/11/2014)

11 of 22 (Map #12 and Archeology Map #6)
Battery Rock Creek (Rock Creek Park, ROCR), looking east along parapet, showing artillery embrasures and elevated location. (2/11/2014)

12 of 22 (Map #4.1)
North segment of Gulf Branch Rifle Trench (GWMP), looking northeast towards Potomac River (visible in background), showing parapet (on right) and elevated location. (2/12/2014)

13 of 22 (Map #20.2)
South magazine at Fort Foote (NACE), looking northeast. (11/20/2014)

14 of 22 (Map #2.2)
View looking south along trail (in foreground) near Fort Marcy (GWMP), towards Civil War-era road trace. (2/12/2014)

15 of 22 (Archeology Map #6)
Covered way (Rock Creek Park, ROCR), looking west, showing zigzag configuration. (2/11/2014)

16 of 22 (Map #13.4)
View of Fort Totten Park (ROCR), looking north from parking area, showing elevated location; earthworks and National Park Service Civil War centennial marker are visible on the right. (11/20/2014)

17 of 22 (Map #17.5)
Fort Davis Drive (NACE), looking southwest along the roadway where it passes through Fort Davis Park, showing Fort Davis earthworks on the left. (2/10/2014)

18 of 22 (Map #10.1)
Fort Drive NW (ROCR), looking south from Fort Reno Park (ROCR), showing one of the constructed segments of the proposed Fort Drive and adjacent green space. (2/11/2014)
19 of 22 (Map #17.3)
Fort Dupont Park (NACE), looking west along remnant of golf course fairway, showing Summer Theater and Activity Center (former golf clubhouse). (2/10/2014)

20 of 22 (Map #16.2)
Sports field at Fort Mahan (NACE), looking north, showing elevated location and cleared area that was likely created by the Civilian Conservation Corps for use as a picnic area. (2/10/2014)

21 of 22 (Map #17.4)
Picnic area adjacent to Fort Dupont earthworks (NACE), looking northwest towards comfort station and picnic shelter. (2/10/2014)

22 of 22 (Map #17.5)
Fort Circle Park Hiker-Biker Trail – Central Segment (NACE), near Fort Davis Park, looking north. (2/10/2014)

**Paperwork Reduction Act Statement:** This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C.460 et seq.).

**Estimated Burden Statement:** Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 100 hours per response including time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Office of Planning and Performance Management, U.S. Dept. of the Interior, 1849 C. Street, NW, Washington, DC.
Civil War Defenses of Washington/Fort Circle Parks

Multiple counties, DC, MD, VA

Name of Property

County and State

Latitude /Longitude Coordinates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Coordinates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section A: Fort Marcy Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] 38.935765°, -77.127784°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] 38.936025°, -77.126883°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] 38.934650°, -77.123223°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] 38.932087°, -77.119994°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] 38.931374°, -77.119364°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6] 38.929574°, -77.121404°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[7] 38.929079°, -77.123393°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[8] 38.929048°, -77.124548°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[9] 38.932685°, -77.129334°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[10] 38.934990°, -77.128219°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section B: Pimmit Run Bridge Abutment &amp; Military Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.929374°, -77.118212°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section C: Gulf Branch Rifle Trench</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.925061°, -77.114572°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section D: Spout Run Rifle Trench</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.898923°, -77.087693°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section E: Reservoir Battery #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.908243°, -77.08529°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section F: Battery Kemble Park &amp; Fort Drive – Palisades Park to American University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] 38.930509°, -77.096092°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] 38.932458°, -77.092658°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] 38.932973°, -77.091231°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] 38.932075°, -77.091103°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] 38.923724°, -77.095214°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6] 38.921259°, -77.097455°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[7] 38.921249°, -77.098338°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[8] 38.922099°, -77.099203°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section G: Fort Drive – Ward Circle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.939046°, -77.085215°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section H: Fort Bayard Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.955389°, -77.091420°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section I: Fort Drive – Ward Circle to Tenley Circle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.943384°, -77.080951°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section J: Fort Drive – Tenley Circle to Fort Reno Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.946967°, -77.078658°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section K: Fort Reno Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section L: Fort Reno Park to Battery Broad Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] 38.959013°, -77.067021°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] 38.958823°, -77.064733°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] 38.957963°, -77.062061°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] 38.957364°, -77.062494°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] 38.953329°, -77.068676°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6] 38.953385°, -77.070178°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[7] 38.956159°, -77.069488°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section M: Battery Broad Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.957713°, -77.058426°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section N: Rock Creek Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[1] 38.963980°, -77.053408°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] 38.965285°, -77.051852°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] 38.965210°, -77.047995°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4] 38.964939°, -77.047336°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[5] 38.959671°, -77.040654°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[6] 38.957706°, -77.042178°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[7] 38.957314°, -77.043991°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[8] 38.961727°, -77.052671°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section P: Battleground National Cemetery
38.970716°, -77.026746°

Section Q: Fort Drive – Rock Creek Park to Barnard Hill
[1] 38.962832°, -77.036250°
[2] 38.963632°, -77.027177°
[3] 38.959775°, -77.023869°
[4] 38.960005°, -77.014350°
[5] 38.960000°, -77.006424°
[6] 38.945771°, -77.004805°
[7] 39.951773°, -77.000969°
[8] 38.952063°, -76.985998°
[9] 38.937912°, -76.967068°
[10] 38.938576°, -76.972091°

Section R: Fort Drive – Barnard Hill to Fort Lincoln
38.930906°, -76.958429°

Section S: Fort Drive
[1] 38.908115°, -76.952748°
[2] 38.908527°, -76.951123°
[3] 38.908146°, -76.949248°
[4] 38.906461°, -76.946405°
[5] 38.903710°, -76.94506°
[6] 38.903056°, -76.94466°
[7] 38.901707°, -76.945090°
[8] 38.905139°, -76.952810°
[9] 38.906971°, -76.953378°

Section T: Fort Drive
[1] 38.900517, -76.942763
[2] 38.895393, -76.948125
[3] 38.889638, -76.950333
[4] 38.882142, -76.962813
[5] 38.872523, -76.938400
[6] 38.865995, -76.952571
[7] 38.866204, -76.970393
[8] 38.860585, -76.983449
[9] 38.859158, -76.973417
[10] 38.851439, -76.980005

Section U: Fort Drive – Barnard Hill to Fort Lincoln
38.935441°, -76.987553°

Section V: Fort Drive – Barnard Hill to Fort Lincoln
38.937291°, -76.966585°

Section W: Fort Drive – Barnard Hill to Fort Lincoln
38.935783°, -76.964408°

Section X: Fort Drive – Barnard Hill to Fort Lincoln
38.934273°, -76.962551°

Section AA: Fort Drive – Fort Mahan Park to St. Elizabeths Hospital
[1] 38.900517, -76.942763
[2] 38.895393, -76.948125
[3] 38.889638, -76.946333
[4] 38.882142, -76.962813
[5] 38.872523, -76.938400
[6] 38.865995, -76.952571
[7] 38.866204, -76.970393
[8] 38.860585, -76.983449
[9] 38.859158, -76.973417
[10] 38.851439, -76.980005

Section AB: Shepherd Parkway
[1] 38.852231°, -77.005860°
[2] 38.848682°, -76.999709°
[3] 38.844865°, -76.997890°
[4] 38.820482°, -77.011158°
[5] 38.824111°, -77.016039°
[6] 38.828263°, -77.016248°

Section AC: Bald Eagle Hill
[1] 38.819145°, -77.009439°
[2] 38.819959°, -77.005354°
[3] 38.817932°, -77.005361°
[4] 38.814782°, -77.009506°
[5] 38.815840°, -77.010838°
[6] 38.817173°, -77.010369°
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Section AD: Fort Foote Park
[1] 38.773945°, -77.029981°
[2] 38.774269°, -77.028853°
[3] 38.768160°, -77.024867°
[4] 38.765224°, -77.024998°
[5] 38.764467°, -77.028091°
[6] 38.766053°, -77.029492°
[7] 38.767568°, -77.030169°
[8] 38.772951°, -77.030450°

Location Maps Showing Latitude/Longitude Coordinates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section A: Fort Marcy Park (GWMP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section B: Pimmit Run Bridge Abutment &amp; Military Road (GWMP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section C: Gulf Branch Rifle Trench (GWMP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section D: Spout Run Rifle Trench (GWMP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section E: Reservoir Battery #2 (ROCR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section F: Battery Kemble Park &amp; Fort Drive – Palisades Park to American University (ROCR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section G: Fort Drive – Ward Circle (ROCR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section H: Fort Bayard Park (ROCR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section I: Fort Drive – Ward Circle to Tenley Circle (ROCR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section J: Fort Drive – Tenley Circle to Fort Reno Park (ROCR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section K: Fort Reno Park (ROCR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section L: Fort Drive – Fort Reno to Battery Broad Branch (ROCR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section M: Battery Broad Branch (ROCR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section N: Rock Creek Park – Fort DeRussy &amp; Battery Rock Creek Areas (ROCR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section O: Battle of Fort Stevens Archeological Site (ROCR) – <em>NOT FOR PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section P: Battleground National Cemetery (ROCR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section Q: Fort Drive – Rock Creek Park to Barnard Hill (ROCR), West Segment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section Q: Fort Drive – Rock Creek Park to Barnard Hill (ROCR), East Segment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section R: Fort Bunker Hill Park (ROCR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sections S through Y: Fort Drive – Barnard Hill to Fort Lincoln (ROCR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section Z: Fort Drive – Anacostia Park to Fort Mahan Park (NACE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section AA: Fort Drive – Fort Mahan Park to St. Elizabeths Hospital (NACE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section AB: Shepherd Parkway (NACE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section AC: Bald Eagle Hill (NACE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section AD: Fort Foote Park (NACE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>