A Special Commemorative Issue

Celebrating 50 Years of Preserving Virginia’s History
Notes from the Director

Part I: Beginnings
A “New Preservation”: Creation of the National Historic Preservation Act
by Ronald D. Anzalone

Historic Preservation in Virginia & The Department of Historic Resources
by Margaret T. Peters

Profiles of DHR Directors
by Robert A. Carter

Part II: DHR Yesterday and Today
DHR's Archives:
Under One Roof, Information about VA’s Historic Resources
by Elizabeth Lipford

Virginia’s Historical Marker Program: Its History and Growth
by Jennifer Loux

DHR Collections, The Future of the Past: The Hatch Site
by Michael Barber

The Great Neck Excavations:
Partnerships and Field Schools Serve Virginia Archaeology
by Michael Clem

Partnerships in Preservation: Summerseat Revival
by John S. Salmon and Marc C. Wagner

Protecting Our Heritage Through Rehabilitation Tax Credits
by DHR Staff

Part III: Looking to the Future: Virginia’s Coasts
Architectural Survey of Virginia’s Coasts:
NPS, DHR & Local Communities Partner to Record Historic Resources
by Blake McDonald

Archaeological Resources on Virginia’s Coast:
Recording Cultural Resources on Shifting Shorelines
by Darrin Lowery

Coda:
DHR at a Glance: 50 Years by the Numbers
by DHR Staff, September 2016
Our Mission
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Notes from the Director

Julie V. Langan

2016 stands out as a special opportunity for reflection for the Department of Historic Resources (DHR) as we celebrate the 50th anniversary of the National Historic Preservation Act and the creation of a state preservation policy in the Commonwealth of Virginia. This milestone has prompted us to take stock of how our agency, as well as the preservation movement at large, has evolved over time and to appreciate and savor our accomplishments. This anniversary is not ours alone, but is shared by all who have ever been involved in efforts to preserve Virginia’s cultural resources. Together, we can be proud of our collective achievements and the integrity and efficacy of the core preservation programs that have been put in place to identify, evaluate and protect historic resources. While there is always much work left to be done, the last five decades of this relatively young movement built a rock solid foundation upon which we can continue to build well into the future.

All of us at DHR have been in a celebratory mood as we have planned for low cost, yet creative and meaningful ways to commemorate this jubilee year. In addition to a number of special events, this issue of Notes on Virginia, improvements to our website and the development of a plan for a digital version of the Virginia Landmarks Register publication, are legacy projects that will benefit the public in the years ahead. This one-time commemorative issue of Notes revives a popular publication that, due to budget constraints, has been dormant since 2009. An expanded digital version will be available online later this year.

Virginia has always been, and remains to this day, a national leader in the preservation movement. This stature derives in large part from a legacy of strong leadership and vision. In the late 1960’s, the General Assembly, which understood that history is one of the Commonwealth’s most valuable assets, had the foresight to put programs in place to protect our irreplaceable wealth of historic properties. Just as cultures evolve over time, so too has the Commonwealth’s own involvement and investment in our relatively young movement to preserve cultural resources. The rich and present history of the preservation movement in Virginia is eloquently summarized in Margaret Peter’s excellent overview, which begins on page 10. The overall mission of the Department “to foster, encourage, and support the stewardship of Virginia’s significant historic architectural, archaeological, and cultural resources” has guided and defined this agency’s work over the past fifty years. Through a combination of state and federal programs, we are committed to documenting, evaluating and protecting the full range of historic properties. This important work is undertaken by a “lean and mean” professional staff, each of whom contributes a strong academic background and depth of experience, as well as a passion for sharing Virginia’s rich history with the public. Putting history into context so that the public can understand and appreciate it is at the heart of what we do.

In the beginning, those associated with the preservation movement tended to focus on and appreciate attractive buildings, or buildings associated with our forefathers, over the many other types of historic resources of equal importance. As a consequence, we came to realize and appreciate attractive buildings, or buildings associated with our forefathers, over the many other types of historic resources of equal importance. As a consequence, we came to realize and appreciate it is at the heart of what we do.
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Part I: Beginnings

National Historic Preservation Act (1966)

Virginia’s Open Space Land Act (1966)

Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission to the Department of Historic Resources

Sincerely,

Julie D. Rangan
A “New Preservation”  
Creation of the National Historic Preservation Act

by Ronald D. Anzalone

Over the last century, as a counterpart to the creation and expansion of the National Park system, historic preservation in the U.S. has changed from a limited pursuit of preserving great houses and other major historic landmarks into a grassroots movement concerned with preserving communities and everyday places important to our past. In conjunction with this transformation, a public-private preservation partnership has developed involving all levels of government, the non-profit world, property owners, and businesses. Concerned citizens, preservation professionals, and elected officials regularly debate the breadth and depth of public preservation support as well as what to do to improve it. But the fact that nationally there are thousands of cities, towns, and counties with established historic districts, and that these places teem with enthusiastic volunteers, vibrant local government programs, and successful Main Street entrepreneurs, gives us hope.

While most preservation is indeed local, a game changer and principal factor in this change has been federal law—the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, which turns 50 this year. The law was passed by Congress in the mid-1960s at a time that saw widespread destruction of older buildings, neighborhoods, and other important cultural sites across the country through urban renewal, highway construction, and other public improvements. The NHPA signaled America’s commitment to preserving its heritage in spite of those trends. In the process, its key components helped point the way to a new covenant for preservation in America.

It is instructive to look back at those years—after all, preservationists are all about “historic context” to help evaluate historical significance. The year 1966 gave us the the Clean Water Restoration Act to combat pollution, as well as the TV debut of the sci-fi series Star Trek. It was a decade of Flower Power, antiheroes like Clint Eastwood, and the music of the Beatles, Rolling Stones, Beach Boys, Temptations, and the Supremes, among others, was playing on vinyl records and the radio.

More seriously, the country was gripped by upheaval, protest, and confrontation. The struggle for Civil Rights was in full swing, and the war in Vietnam rapidly escalated. For the first time, cigarettes carried an FDA notice: “Caution: cigarette smoking may be hazardous to your health.”

So within that context, how did a new approach to preservation come about?

While there were earlier private preservation efforts in Philadelphia, and at Mount Vernon, Monticello, and a few other landmarks, the earliest federal preservation law was the Antiquities Act of 1906. The law authorized the protection of antiquities on public lands (mostly in the west) along with presidential designation of national monuments. The Historic Sites Act of 1935 declared a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, buildings, and objects of national significance, and authorized the Interior Department to conduct several related programs. It was the foundation for today’s National Historic Landmark program as well as the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) and Historic American Engineering Record (HAER).

Congressional charter of the National Trust for Historic Preservation in 1949 provided official legitimacy for broad private preservation efforts. But neither this nor other statutes created a national rallying point for more comprehensive preservation or provided a means to integrate preservation into governmental planning or programs.

At the local level, in the 1920s there was the restoration of Colonial Williamsburg. Shortly thereafter preservation ordinances were passed in Charleston and New Orleans. The Charleston ordinance gave its purpose: “In order to promote the general welfare through the preservation and protection of historic places and areas of historic interest.” But although there were a few local efforts, there were neither strong incentives nor good models for preserving downtowns or neighborhoods.

After World War II, with a rapidly growing population, concern for modern infrastructure, and a need for housing, the United States began to make major investments in highways, urban renewal, and public works. Unfortunately, despite some tremendous accomplishments, federal projects and programs began to irrevocably change communities. Neighborhoods were demolished, historic buildings razed, archeological sites destroyed, bypasses cut through landscapes. In short, federal dollars were being used to destroy the nation’s history, and there wasn’t even a process in place to consider the impact. Billboards and other roadside clutter, along with sub-
and several federal agencies, began a study of Natural Beauty. "The message read to Congress on "Conservation and Restoration, the arts, and the humanities. First Lady "Lady Bird" Johnson began 1965 with a special message "Beautifying America," and President Lyndon Johnson began October 15, 1966.

The report called for a "new preservation" integrated with, rather than isolated from contemporary life, and went on to say:

If the preservation movement is to be successful…it must go beyond saving occasional historic houses and opening museums. It must be more than a cult of antiquarians. It must do more than revere a few precious national shrines. It must attempt to give a sense of orientation to our society, using structures and objects of the past to establish values of time and place…. This new preservation must look beyond the individual building and individual landmark and concern itself with the historic and architecturally valued areas and districts which contain a special meaning for the community…

To deal with these new problems will require a new conservation. We must not only protect the countryside and save it from destruction, we must restore what has been destroyed and salvage the beauty and charm of our cities. Our conservation must be not just the classic conservation of protection and development, but a creative conservation of restoration and innovation.

A White House conference on the subject was proposed, and the Highway Beautification Act was passed. These actions encouraged others to look into the related needs of historic preservation.

A special committee of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, with the National Trust and several federal agencies, began a study of American preservation. The resulting 1966 report, *With Heritage So Rich*, revealed the extent of loss and the breadth of public interest in preservation. This report influenced Congress to enact a strong new statute establishing a nationwide preservation policy—the National Historic Preservation Act, or NHPA.

The report called for a "new preservation" integrated with, rather than isolated from contemporary life, and went on to say:

If the preservation movement is to be successful…it must go beyond saving occasional historic houses and opening museums. It must be more than a cult of antiquarians. It must do more than revere a few precious national shrines. It must attempt to give a sense of orientation to our society, using structures and objects of the past to establish values of time and place…. This new preservation must look beyond the individual building and individual landmark and concern itself with the historic and architecturally valued areas and districts which contain a special meaning for the community…

In sum, if we wish to have a future with greater meaning, we must concern ourselves not only with the historic highlights, but we must be concerned with the total heritage of the nation and all that is worth preserving from our past as a living part of the present.

One motivation was to transform the post-World War II federal government from an agent of indifference or worse to a facilitator, an agent of thoughtful change, and a responsible steward for future generations. The law also provided support needed for state and local preservation efforts.

The NHPA was signed by President Lyndon Johnson on October 15, 1966. While it was recognized that national preservation goals could best be achieved by supporting states as well as local citizens and communities, it was also understood that the federal government must set an example through enlightened policies.

Key provisions included:

- A statement of national policy and direction to the federal government on policy implementation;
- A National Register of Historic Places which recognized properties of state and local as well as national significance;
- Statewide programs and State Historic Preservation Officers;
- Matching grants for states and the National Trust;
- An Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to advise the President and Congress, coordinate policies and programs, and advise on projects affecting historic properties; and
- Review of federal and federally-assisted undertakings affecting historic properties under Section 106 of the law.

Two policy statements contained in the original NHPA in 1966 are particularly telling—the Congress "finds and declares" that the spirit and direction of the Nation are founded upon and reflected in its historic heritage, and "the historical and cultural foundations of the Nation should be preserved as a living part of our community life and development in order to give a sense of orientation to the American people."

The federal role now would be to "provide leadership" for preservation, "contribute to" and "give maximum encouragement" to preservation, and "foster conditions under which our modern society and our prehistoric and historic resources can exist in productive harmony."

Section 106 of NHPA granted legal status to historic preservation in federal planning, decision-making, and project execution. Section 106 requires federal agencies to "take into account" the effects of their actions on historic properties, and provide the ACHP with an opportunity to comment. Through public consultation, Section 106 has evolved to ensure that citizens have a voice in these decisions.

Amendments in 1980 recognized "Certified Local Governments" for enhanced local involvement, along with federal agency requirements to integrate preservation into their missions. In 1992 amendments formalized the role and interests of Indian tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations, and established Tribal Preservation Officers.

In 2016, the NHPA celebrates its 50th anniversary. As the preservation community struggles with many issues, it needs to decide on priorities for the program's future so that it can continue to be effective, relevant, and responsive to our changing society's needs and aspirations.

Ronald D. Anzalone is director of the Office of Preservation Initiatives at the federal Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, where he has worked since 1980. A resident of Falls Church, Virginia, he chairs the city's Historical Commission. The opinions expressed in the article are the author's and do not represent those of the ACHP or the federal government.
Historic preservation has a long history in Virginia, thanks largely to the individual efforts of generations of women’s groups that strived to save the houses of Virginia’s heroes. The Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association of the Union was organized in the 1850s. The founding of the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities (APVA) in 1888 was motivated by the collapse of Powhatan’s Church in Williamsburg, and berhasil wealthy philanthropist John D. Rockefeller, Jr., to fund the restoration or reconstruction of historic buildings in that colonial capital. The Mount Vernon Ladies’ Association served historic properties all over Virginia, focusing on resources from Virginia’s colonial and antebellum periods. The Jamestown Island sites of the colonial church ruins, a graveyard, and a colonial fort and some Civil War earthworks, were acquired by donation from Edward E. Barney in 1893.

In 1926, the Reverend W.A.R. Goodwin, rector of Bruton Parish Church in Williamsburg, persuaded wealthy philanthropist John D. Rockefeller, Jr., to fund the restoration or reconstruction of historic buildings in that colonial capital. Thus was born Colonial Williamsburg, serving as a classroom for 18th-century history and spurring efforts to save or restore other historic buildings across the Commonwealth and the nation.

With the creation of the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission (predecessor to the Department of Historic Resources) in 1966, Virginia’s historic preservation program “took on a life of its own,” according to Junius R. Fishburne, Jr., historian and former VHLC director. “The state began to define historic properties as part of Virginia’s environmental treasure. The mandate to the fledgling agency was to identify, survey, and evaluate significant buildings, sites, and districts associated with the Commonwealth’s history. The new law authorizing the VHLC called for the publication of a Virginia Landmarks Register, an expandable official list of resources that reflected Virginia’s history. Beyond merely compiling a significant resource honor roll, the law directed the VHLC to provide tangible and technical help to owners of landmarks and to local governments. The Landmarks Register became an educational tool as well, informing the public that historic buildings had intrinsic value.” Later in 1966, the National Historic Preservation Act created, among other things, the National Register of Historic Places, a comparable national registry that would guide all levels of government as they coped with growth and development. Again, Virginia led the way.

James W. Moody, Jr.
Director, Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission, 1967–1972

James W. Moody, Jr. served as the first director of the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission from 1967 to 1972. A native of Oak Park, Illinois, graduate of Sewanee, and naval officer in World War II, Moody served as executive secretary of the Tennessee Historical Commission and administrator of Belle Meade Plantation in Nashville, before taking on the challenge of organizing a new preservation agency for the Commonwealth of Virginia in Richmond.

Moody recruited the Commission’s first team of historians, architectural historians and archaeologists, and warmly encouraged their professional development. During his tenure VHLC staff members visited and surveyed nearly 10,000 places in pursuance of their mandated goal to identify and record the principal historical, architectural and archaeological landmarks of the State. He formed a lasting partnership with the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) that produced measured drawings of many of Virginia’s most outstanding historic landmarks. The Commission listed 330 buildings and sites on the Virginia Landmarks Register. By July, 1972 the Commonwealth had received easements on seven historic properties.

Appointed as State Liaison Officer by Governor Linwood Holton in 1971, Moody helped create the role of State Historic Preservation Officer as administrator of federal funds granted to Virginia under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and nominee of Virginia historic landmarks to the National Register of Historic Places. In tandem with other State Liaison Officers he pioneered in identifying and addressing common problems faced by the states in working with the National Park Service and other federal agencies to implement statewide historic preservation programs under the 1966 Act.

Moody aimed to foster a spirit of cooperation between the VHLC and land developers, public and private. His efforts to achieve cooperation bore fruit in good working relationships with the Virginia Department of Highways (VDOT) in transportation project review and with the Anheuser-Busch Company in their development of the Kingsmill Plantation Tract. More contentious were conflicts over the demolition of a whole commercial block of iron-front buildings on East Main Street in Richmond, the proposed development of Richmond’s canal system, and the commission’s support for property owners opposing construction of state facilities in Green Springs, Louisa County—the agency’s first major controversy involving state-owned property.

When Moody relinquished his position in 1972, he took deep satisfaction in knowing that the commission stood on a solid footing in good working relationships with the states in working with the National Park Service and other federal agencies to implement statewide historic preservation programs under the 1966 Act. His work in historic preservation in the less stressful environment of Pensacola, Florida, served as director of the Pensacola Preservation Board until his retirement in 1986. He passed away in 1992.
The VHLC began its work in 1967 with a modest budget of $145,000 in offices on the 11th floor of the old 9th Street Office Building on Capitol Square, moving in 1973 to Morson’s Row, a 19th-century historic row house at 221 Governor Street. Stressing the importance of the new agency, legislators directed that representatives from the most respected statewide institutions serve on the new commission. Experts in history, historical architecture, landscape architecture, and archaeology were all included. The first chairman, Dr. Edward P. Alexander, was director of education and interpretation for Colonial Williamsburg. John Melville Jennings, VHLC’s vice-chair, was director of the Virginia Historical Society. Randolph Church, the State Librarian; Em Bowles Locker Alsop of the APVA; and Frederick Doveton Nichols, professor at the University of Virginia School of Architecture, represented their respective constituencies. Other members of the first VHLC were Stanley W. Abbott, landscape architect from Williamsburg; Marvin M. Sutherland, director of the Department of Conservation; Dr. Frederick Herman of Norfolk representing the American Institute of Architects, and William R. Seward of Petersburg.

The VHLC selected James W. Moody, a preservation professional from Tennessee, as its first director. Under the National Historic Preservation Act authorizing the National Register of Historic Places, the VHLC director also served as the State Historic Preservation Officer for Virginia, which gave Moody and his staff responsibility for running the federal program in Virginia. Virginia Landmarks Register criteria and all other historic preservation activity followed federal guidelines. Reviewing federal projects for their effect on historic properties, an activity mandated by the newly enacted federal legislation, fell to the VHLC, and in return, Virginia received federal funds to help defray its preservation program costs.

The VHLC developed property information files that became the heart of its work. The staff gathered historical, architectural, and geographic data from surveys conducted in the 1950s by the Historic American Building Survey Inventory, supplemented by historical information gathered in the 1930s by scholars working for the Works Progress Administration (WPA). VHLC staff visited many properties recorded in the Historic American Building Survey Inventory, photographing the buildings and marking them on U.S. Geological Survey maps. By July 1968, when the VHLC submitted its first report to the governor, the staff had visited historic buildings in every county in the state. Today, the VHLC’s successor agency, the Department of Historic Resources, maintains files on more than 183,200 buildings and archaeological sites across the state. These materials – maps, photographs, and historical data – collected in the course of surveying historic properties, have enabled nominations of thousands of buildings, sites, and structures for listing on the Virginia and National registers.
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The VHLC selected James W. Moody, a preservation professional from Tennessee, as its first director. Under the National Historic Preservation Act authorizing the National Register of Historic Places, the VHLC director also served as the State Historic Preservation Officer for Virginia, which gave Moody and his staff responsibility for running the federal program in Virginia. Virginia Landmarks Register criteria and all other historic preservation activity followed federal guidelines. Reviewing federal projects for their effect on historic properties, an activity mandated by the newly enacted federal legislation, fell to the VHLC, and in return, Virginia received federal funds to help defray its preservation program costs.

The VHLC developed property information files that became the heart of its work. The staff gathered historical, architectural, and geographic data from surveys conducted in the 1950s by the Historic American Building Survey Inventory, supplemented by historical information gathered in the 1930s by scholars working for the Works Progress Administration (WPA). VHLC staff visited many properties recorded in the Historic American Building Survey Inventory, photographing the buildings and marking them on U.S. Geological Survey maps. By July 1968, when the VHLC submitted its first report to the governor, the staff had visited historic buildings in every county in the state. Today, the VHLC’s successor agency, the Department of Historic Resources, maintains files on more than 183,200 buildings and archaeological sites across the state. These materials – maps, photographs, and historical data – collected in the course of surveying historic properties, have enabled nominations of thousands of buildings, sites, and structures for listing on the Virginia and National registers.

The VHLC began its work in 1967 with a modest budget of $145,000 in offices on the 11th floor of the old 9th Street Office Building on Capitol Square, moving in 1973 to Morson’s Row, a 19th-century historic row house at 221 Governor Street. Stressing the importance of the new agency, legislators directed that representatives from the most respected statewide institutions serve on the new commission. Experts in history, historical architecture, landscape architecture, and archaeology were all included. The first chairman, Dr. Edward P. Alexander, was director of education and interpretation for Colonial Williamsburg. John Melville Jennings, VHLC’s vice-chair, was director of the Virginia Historical Society. Randolph Church, the State Librarian; Em Bowles Locker Alsop of the APVA; and Frederick Doveton Nichols, professor at the University of Virginia School of Architecture, represented their respective constituencies. Other members of the first VHLC were Stanley W. Abbott, landscape architect from Williamsburg; Marvin M. Sutherland, director of the Department of Conservation; Dr. Frederick Herman of Norfolk representing the American Institute of Architects, and William R. Seward of Petersburg.

The VHLC selected James W. Moody, a preservation professional from Tennessee, as its first director. Under the National Historic Preservation Act authorizing the National Register of Historic Places, the VHLC director also served as the State Historic Preservation Officer for Virginia, which gave Moody and his staff responsibility for running the federal program in Virginia. Virginia Landmarks Register criteria and all other historic preservation activity followed federal guidelines. Reviewing federal projects for their effect on historic properties, an activity mandated by the newly enacted federal legislation, fell to the VHLC, and in return, Virginia received federal funds to help defray its preservation program costs.
The Branch House in Richmond, with 28 major rooms, was completed in 1919.
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of historic properties, particularly residential ones, were their owners. The legislation had been crafted so that easements carried appreciable financial benefits to the donors as well as the preservation benefit to the Commonwealth. In exchange for relinquishing the right to develop their property or tear down their houses, donors could count on several tax breaks. Because the perpetual easement restrictions generally reduced the fair market value of a property, the difference in value before and after application of an easement as determined by a real estate appraiser, could be taken as a charitable tax deduction on both federal and state income taxes.

In addition to providing tax benefits, the easements allowed for adaptive re-use of a property that was compatible with the preservation values being protected, under the rationale that new functions often instill new life into old buildings. For example, the Branch House, on Richmond's Monument Avenue described by the VHLC's then senior architectural historian, Calder Loth, as "one of the country's finest examples of the Tudor-Jacobean style," now houses the headquarters of the Center for Virginia Architecture and the Branch Museum of Architecture and Design.

The first easement forms for the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission and the Virginia Outdoors Foundation were drafted with simple, straightforward language that could be understood by laymen as well as lawyers. George Freeman made speeches on the garden club circuit throughout Virginia to explain the easements and their tax benefits to potential donors. Today, the easements are far more complex, in part because of ever-growing IRS regulations.

When, in 1969, Governor Mills Godwin accepted the easement for the 128-acre property, Old Mansion in Caroline County, which contained an important colonial mantelpiece, it was to preserve the land as well as the circa-1740 house. The family of the donor, Anne Maury White, had owned Old Mansion for many generations and wanted to save the plantation for future generations. The easement's viability was soon tested. When the Virginia Department of Transportation wanted to acquire a sizable portion of the Old Mansion property to build a highway bypass around Bowling Green because that was the cheapest alternative route, it asked the VHLC board to release the preservation easement on the land. The board held a public hearing at VDOT's request and concluded that it could not do so under the stringent criteria set forth in statute.

The highway segment was built elsewhere. Fortunately, the 1966 Open Space Land Act had addressed this potential threat to open space preservation—condemnation by state or local governments for alternative public purposes. At that time the threat appeared most likely to come from proposed new roads and highways. In hindsight, we can see that perpetual open space easements held by "public bodies" under that act also offer protection against efforts to destroy open space and historic structures by condemnation for urban renewal, a serious problem today in some other states.

The VHLC encountered its first major controversy involving state-owned property in the early 1970s, when the state bought 200 acres in rural Louisa County for a new prison facility. This provoked an outcry of opposition to what was viewed as a threat to the historic agricultural area known as Green Springs. The Green Springs area had been farmed since the 18th century.

Appointed by Governor Mills Godwin in 1977 and reappointed by Governor John Dalton in 1978, Tucker Hill was the first governor-appointed director and the first architectural historian to serve as SHPO. Joining the Commission’s staff at its formation, he had served as assistant director from 1972, and as a member of the APVA’s Advisory Board and the City of Richmond’s urban design committee. A Richmond native, Hill received his B.A. from the College of William and Mary and a Master’s degree in architectural history from the University of Virginia.

Under Hill’s leadership, the Commission gave new impetus to listing historic and prehistoric sites surveyed by the Virginia Research Center for Archaeology. He also boosted the registration of urban districts in order to encourage the use of federal rehabilitation tax credits. (Virginia had no state historic rehabilitation tax credit program.) Hill’s appointments to the Virginia State Review Board made it one of the most distinguished SRBs of any State Historic Preservation Office in the country. The Commission also accepted its first easements in architectural history from the University of Virginia.

During Hill’s final years as director, Congress changed the laws governing the federal preservation program, resulting in restructured federal preservation and rehabilitation tax credit programs. The Commission suffered serious funding problems brought on by reversion of its 1981 federal funds and the prolonged uncertainty over its 1982 funds, resulting in temporary layoffs of staff. In early 1982, Hill resigned to join the Valentine Museum as a consultant for researching and developing a permanent exhibition on Richmond’s history. When he departed, the Commission had listed over 900 historic places on the Virginia Landmarks Register, received on behalf of the Commonwealth easement donations on more than 80 properties, and certified 63 rehabilitation projects representing total rehabilitation expenses of over $13 million.

Hill passed away in 2010.

Tucker H. Hill
Director, Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission, 1977–1982

The Branch House in Richmond, with 28 major rooms, was completed in 1919.
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and retained much of its rural landscape and many historic farmhouses. Governor Linwood Holton, faced with local opposition led by landowner, attorney, and ardent preservationist Rae Ely, offered to withdraw the state’s proposal to build a prison if “the area could be preserved.”

In 1973, the VHLC responded to Governor Holton’s requirement by listing the Green Springs Historic District on the Virginia Landmarks Register and nominating it for the National Register of Historic Places. Stanley Abbott, a VHLC member, respected landscape architect, and advocate for the value of special rural landscapes in Virginia, strongly supported Green Springs’s registration as a historic landmark. To protect their holdings from being taken by the state for a new prison or devalued by its presence in their neighborhood, many landowners in the new district donated protective easements to Historic Green Springs, Inc., a Virginia nonprofit corporation. A measure of Green Springs’ significance was its recognition in 1974 as a National Historic Landmark. To protect their holdings from being taken by the state for a new prison or devalued by its presence in their neighborhood, many landowners in the new district donated protective easements to Historic Green Springs, Inc., a Virginia nonprofit corporation. A measure of Green Springs’ significance was its recognition in 1974 as a National Historic Landmark. The Green Springs Rural Historic District was listed on the Virginia Landmarks Register and National Register of Historic Places in 1973. It became a National Historic Landmark in 1974 and the focus of an important court case defining the legal meaning of historic district designation.

During a ceremony in July 2016 in Bowling Green to recognize the 50th anniversary of state’s first preservation easement, George Freeman was honored for his work in drafting Virginia’s easement legislation. L-R: Delegate Hyland F. “Buddy” Fowler Jr., Anne Freeman, George Freeman, and Marialuz Moreno Badia, owner of Old Mansion.
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restored their historic buildings involved the VHLC by 1981 more deeply in building technology, and the commission served as an important clearinghouse for good preservation practices. The federal tax credits stimulated interest in programs like the Virginia and national registers, because “income-producing” historic landmarks were eligible for tax credits. Interest in federal income tax credits grew after the General Assembly enacted legislation in 1996 that created a Virginia historic rehabilitation tax credit, which can be applied on rehabilitation projects involving either income or non-income generating properties listed on the Virginia Landmarks Register.

By the early 1980s, the VHLC’s workload had grown beyond the small agency’s capabilities. Local governments sought the VHLC’s guidance in developing local land use plans now that Virginia Code permitted planning for historic resources. Preservationists realized that the VHLC needed an organizational

until it ceased publication. [This commemorative issue of Notes on Virginia is the first published since 2009. –Ed.] The first landmarks register book was produced in 1976, a hard-bound illustrated volume containing a comprehensive list of properties enrolled as historic Virginia landmarks. A far larger third edition was published in 1986, followed in 1999 by a fourth edition. Today, the size of the landmarks register makes it financially impractical to publish a fifth edition, which of necessity would have to be broken into two or three volumes. The Virginia Landmarks Register is now maintained online, on DHR’s website. Other agency publications included A Guide to Virginia’s Historical Markers (1984) by Margaret T. Peters (updated in a 2007 third edition), and Virginia Landmarks of Black History (1995) by Calder Loth. For 13 years, the VHLC sponsored a program of instruction about Richmond’s architectural history for inner-city schoolchildren, a series that was adopted in several other localities.

The passage of a 1976 federal law providing income tax credits to those who

were eligible for tax credits. Interest in federal income tax credits grew after the General Assembly enacted legislation in 1996 that created a Virginia historic rehabilitation tax credit, which can be applied on rehabilitation projects involving either income or non-income generating properties listed on the Virginia Landmarks Register.

By the early 1980s, the VHLC’s workload had grown beyond the small agency’s capabilities. Local governments sought the VHLC’s guidance in developing local land use plans now that Virginia Code permitted planning for historic resources. Preservationists realized that the VHLC needed an organizational

H. Bryan Mitchell
Director, VHLC / Division of Historic Landmarks, 1982–1989

appointed by Gov. Charles Robb in 1982, and reappointed by Gov. Gerald L. Baliles in 1986, Bryan Mitchell brought considerable experience as an administrator and preservation planner to the director’s position. He had previously served as VHLC’s assistant director, as a legislative assistant to the Speaker of the House of Delegates, and as chairman of Petersburg’s Planning Commission, and a VCU instructor of historic preservation planning. A Virginia native and graduate of University of Virginia, Mitchell received his M.A. in political science from the University of Georgia in 1972.

Mitchell saw that Virginia’s need for an active, aggressive, missionary Landmarks Commission was greater than ever but its financial resources impeded its ability to do more. To improve service, he restructured the VHLC’s programs, first by merging the staff of its archaeological and architecture and history branches into new functional divisions, then by moving the archaeological staff, archives and collections to Richmond. Under a restructuring of the executive branch, the VHLC in 1985 joined other agencies to form a new Department of Conservation and Historic Resources within a new Secretariat of Natural Resources. While the Commission itself remained a governor-appointed board, VHLC became the Division of Historic Landmarks (DHL), in a new department incorporating five other agencies.

Despite the agency’s loss of independence, the years under the succeeding Baliles administration represented a time of optimism and hard work for the new DHL. The newly organized Preservation Alliance of Virginia persuaded Gov. Baliles to appoint a Study Commission on Historic Preservation in 1987 and earned gubernatorial and bipartisan support for implementing its key recommendations—most notably creating a Department of Historic Resources with its own Board of Historic Resources. This act authorized new staff positions and supported the new agency’s programs including its first regional office in Roanoke. It created a historic properties revolving fund; mandated DHR involvement with other environmental or cultural agencies; appropriated new funds for a threatened properties grant program, and over $5 million to address specific preservation needs.

Under Mitchell’s leadership, DHL launched the Virginia Certified Local Governments (CLG) Program and funded free design services for façade improvements in Virginia Main Street communities. The agency managed a robust state grants program, launched the first comprehensive survey of state-owned historic resources and took new and innovative approaches to registering historic properties and renewed interest in educating students to the values of historic preservation. Virginia witnessed the greatest investment in its history in renewal of its historic resources, spurred by a 25% federal investment tax credit for certified rehabilitations (lowered to 20% in 1986). The agency published Managing a Resource, which set out Mitchell’s vision of the agency’s role in promoting urban revitalization; a new guidebook on state highway markers; and a third edition of the Virginia Landmarks Register.

From 1989 to 1994 Mitchell served as deputy director of the new Department of Historic Resources and president of the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers. Following his state service, Mitchell had a distinguished career as chief for Heritage Preservation Services of the NPS, overseeing a broad range of NPS’s external preservation programs until his retirement in 2012.
advocate to lobby for more funding and staff. Leaders of several state groups joined forces to form the Preservation Alliance of Virginia, comprising the Historic Staunton Foundation, the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities (APVA), the Historic Richmond Foundation, and the Waterford Foundation, a group of Loudoun County residents organized to protect the tiny Quaker village of Waterford from expanding development and sky-rocketing land values in Northern Virginia.

In the spring of 1984, the first meeting of the new Preservation Alliance took place at Thomas Jefferson’s Monticello. Individuals, local historical societies, institutional organizations, local governments, and libraries were all invited to participate. Although the VHLC had always enjoyed strong support from prominent individuals, it could now call upon this statewide lobbying group to speak for preservation interests in the political arena.

Regrettably, Virginia’s entire environmental community suffered a serious blow in 1984, with historic preservation at the heart of the controversy. The state had developed a long-range plan for Capital Square in Richmond and wanted to demolish the historic buildings it owned on East Main Street. Estimated costs to demolish the buildings did not reach the level that under state policy triggered an automatic environmental impact review. The state believed it could proceed without any consideration of the historical value of the structures. Additionally, even though VHLC Chair Mary Douthat Higginson had publicly declared the buildings historically and architecturally significant, they had not yet been formally entered on the Virginia Landmarks Register.

Adjacent property owners in the Shockoe Valley, represented by the Shockoe Slip Foundation, filed a lawsuit alleging that the state had failed to consider its own policy to conserve its historic resources as articulated in its 1970 constitution. The legal question was whether the policy directives in the state constitution were “self-executing.” On January 18, 1985, the Virginia Supreme Court ruled that the constitution’s Article XI, section 1, was not self-executing, which meant that environmentalists could not depend on the language in the constitution alone to protect natural and historic resources from official state actions such as demolition. The buildings were torn down and replaced with a state parking garage.

In 1987, David J. Brown, then-director of Preservation Alliance, persuaded Governor Gerald L. Baliles to authorize a formal study of historic preservation in the Commonwealth. The first comprehensive evaluation of preservation of the built environment, the study recommended that VHLC become a full-fledged department in state government. A newly named Department of Historic Resources would carry out the same functions and retain the same mission, but would be placed on a level with the Departments of Conservation, Transportation, Health, and Taxation in the hierarchy of state agencies.

Hugh C. Miller served as the first director of the Virginia Department of Historic Resources and the first architect to fulfill the role of State Historic Preservation Officer. Appointed by Gov. Gerald L. Baliles in 1989 and reappointed by Gov. Douglas Wilder in 1990, Miller previously served as chief historical architect of the National Park Service, capping a twenty-eight-year career in preservation with the federal government. A Pennsylvania native and Fellow of the American Institute of Architects, Miller earned his bachelor’s degree in architecture from the University of Pennsylvania.

Miller defined comprehensive, high-quality survey of historic resources as the first goal of the agency. During his term, DHR provided support for surveys in twenty-five localities. DHR developed an innovative system of cost-sharing with local governments, whereby localities were invited to share the costs of survey in mutually agreed upon areas while the agency assumed administrative responsibilities. DHR completed and published its survey of all state-owned historic buildings and developed and implemented use of Integrated Preservation Software (IPS) to automate and exchange survey information.

The newly opened Roanoke Regional Preservation Office proved to be one of DHR’s most fruitful efforts during his term. Other accomplishments included expansion of Archaeology Week to Archaeology Month, development of archaeology teaching trunks and field schools, and publication of the book First People: The Early Indians of Virginia. With Gov. Wilder’s full support DHR expanded its work with Virginia’s African American community to recognize its heritage places with new highway markers, recognition of special landmarks, and publication of Virginia Landmarks of Black History. DHR launched Virginia Heritage Tourism Weeks for the first time and partnered with the Forestry Department to provide training to forestry officials and property owners to encourage inclusion of archaeological sites in management plans. DHR and VDOT also reached mutual agreement on timely review of all state-funded highway projects.

Leasing new space in Tobacco Row for DHR’s growing archaeological collection, DHR also expanded its curatorial and conservation staff and became more active in taking the collections to the public. The establishment of an independent department also required the development of a new fully functioning Division of Administration—which earned high marks from the Auditor of Public Accounts.

The major controversy of Miller’s term involved vehement opposition to the state designation of the Brandy Station and Bristoe Station battlefields. The battle ended with new state legislation requiring owner consent to any proposed state landmark designation and a mandated re-study of the two battlefield designations that resulted in the removal of both battlefields from the Virginia Landmarks Register. Nevertheless, DHR had affirmed that designated battlefield areas must include the larger terrain that defined the troop movements. With gubernatorial support Miller enlisted Virginia as an active partner in the American Battlefield Protection program and fired the opening shots in a long campaign to make the case for battlefield stewardship as a valuable tool for education, heritage tourism and conservation.

Miller resigned as director in 1994 to continue to pursue a fruitful career in historic preservation both as an architectural consultant in private practice and as a thesis advisor and adjunct professor at Goucher College in Baltimore.
The General Assembly later expanded the preservation easement program by requiring that historic properties receiving state grants of more than $50,000 be placed under a perpetual easement to the state. This requirement protects not only the landmark but also the public’s investment in its preservation. The law limited these grants to local governments or qualifying nonprofit organizations. This led to protection of a far broader assortment of buildings: courthouses, theaters, train stations, and even churches. By the end of 2006, these grants had resulted in more than 50 Virginia historic buildings being placed under easement protection. Today, easements protect the nationally famous James River plantations of Westover, Berkeley, Shirley in Charles City County and Tuckahoe, Thomas Jefferson’s boyhood home in Goochland County. Private easements have been donated on an historic sheet metal shop, a canal lock-keeper’s house, tobacco factories, gristmills, historic taverns, Civil War earthworks, a general store, and an almshouse. Virginia’s African-American heritage is guarded by several easements, including Madden’s Tavern in Culpeper County, Mount Moriah Baptist Church in Roanoke, the Dover Slave Quarter Complex in Goochland County; and some properties in the Jackson Ward Historic District in Richmond.

Virginia has secured, at minimal expense, permanent legal protection through perpetual easements of more than 600 privately and publicly owned historic places as of August 2016, representing the full spectrum of Virginia’s history and culture. The Commonwealth can take great pride in its many citizens who have voluntarily elected to appoin...
preserve important historic resources through the easement program. The values of these easements at the time at which they were given amounted to hundreds of millions of dollars. These acts of stewardship enable a rich and irreplaceable cultural legacy to be passed intact to future generations.

An unfortunate situation evolved in 1992-1993. Widespread growth in Northern Virginia had brought tremendous increases in land assessments. At the same time, a revived interest in saving historic Civil War battlefields conflicted with the inexorable development spreading from metropolitan Washington and Richmond. DHR and its Board of Historic Resources became convenient targets for attack by the foes of open space and historic preservation. These groups wanted to get top prices for their land, and that property rights when it certified as an “historic landmark” the site of the large battlefield around Brandy Station in Culpeper County. It was there that on June 19, 1863, the largest cavalry engagement of the Civil War took place. Another somewhat smaller battlefield area at Braxton Station in Prince William County had also been officially designated. It was where A.P. Hill suffered a disastrous defeat on October 14, 1863, a loss that ended Lee’s attempt to cut off Meade’s withdrawal from the Rappahannock River to Washington. Property rights advocates contended that historic designations imposed hardships on owners who wanted to get top prices for their land, and that historic designation made the historic Cool Spring Battlefield landscape, agricultural fields, and a monastery and retreat center owned and operated by the Community of Cistercians of the Strict Order.

Then DHR director Kathleen S. Kilpatrick speaks during a ceremony in 2010 at Chancellorsville to highlight battlefield land conservation and the Virginia Civil War battlefield preservation grant program. To meet Governors Tim Kaine’s and Bob McDonnell’s ambitious open-space land conservation goals in their successive administrations, Kilpatrick enlisted bipartisan legislative support working with Speaker of the House William Howell to get sustained funding for battlefield preservation. During the sesquicentennial of the war, through 66 easement donations, DHR helped to preserve approximately 7,387 battlefield acres, on lands associated with battles at Appomattox, Brandy Station, Cedar Creek, Chancellorsville, Cold Harbor, Petersburg, Winchester, and the Wilderness, among many others.

DHR’s longest-serving director, Kathleen S. Kilpatrick was appointed by four successive governors. A Sweet Briar College graduate, Kilpatrick arrived at DHR with extensive experience in federal and state cultural resource policy matters, serving from 1988 to 1993 in the U.S. Department of Interior, as a Special Assistant for Policy and Legislation to Virginia’s Secretary of Natural Resources. In 1996 she joined DHR as deputy director; in 2001, Gov. James Gilmore named her director. Kilpatrick built strong gubernatorial, secretarial, and bipartisan legislative support for DHR’s mission and programs, including successfully promoting Civil War battlefield preservation (see photo, opposite). A vital player in establishing Virginia’s rehabilitation tax credit (RTC), Kilpatrick brought entrepreneurs, businessmen and developers to preservation’s table. She touted the economic benefits of historic preservation and commissioned Virginia Commonwealth University in 2007 to study the state’s rehabilitation tax credits. That study, subsequently updated, consistently revealed that state RTCs leverage private investment to re-purpose historic buildings and generate billions of dollars in economic activity, while creating tens of thousands of jobs. The first woman to direct DHR, she spurred its staff to increase register listings of historic sites pertaining to women, African Americans, Virginia Indians, and other minorities. DHR also secured federal funds to create dozens of new highway markers for the same purpose.

She articulated the sustainable environmental benefits of preservation and rehabilitation, forging alliances between preservation and conservation groups and helped agencies understand that good stewardship of the built environment is key to good stewardship of the natural environment. Under Kilpatrick, DHR partnered with the National Park Service on many projects. Ahead of the 400th anniversary of Jamestown, DHR-NPS brought to publication John Smith’s Chesapeake Voyages, 1607-1609, and in 2013 an DHR-NPS agreement resulted in Virginia Indians at Werowocomoco. Through other partnerships, DHR also published Lost Virginia: Vanished Architecture of the Old Dominion, The Official Virginia Civil War Battlefield Guide, and a third edition of A Guidebook to Virginia’s Historical Markers.

While she was director, DHR advanced digitally. It launched a website; pioneered for Section 106 review a large-format, high-volume exchange system, ePIX; for historical resources mapping, research, and inventories, it harnessed internet and GIS-based technology, updated in 2013 to VCRIS.

When the U.S. Army announced a 2005 Base Realignment and Closure plan to decommission Fort Monroe, Kilpatrick led the arduous Section 106 process mandated by the post’s reversion from federal to state ownership in 2011. DHR worked with dozens of stakeholders to develop a detailed Programmatic Agreement to guide post-BRAC development of the National Historic Landmark, including creating design standards and protocols to safeguard Fort Monroe’s historic character and archaeology. Ever innovative, Kilpatrick forged a 2009 precedent-setting 106 mitigation agreement with the Army at Fort A. P. Hill, by which the Army purchased a preservation easement on 500 acres of an important NHL American Indian archaeological site at Camden Farm, the first off-post mitigation for the military. The Secretary of Defense recognized Kilpatrick-DHR with an award for the agreement, a model for other installations.

Kilpatrick supported research into, and preservation of Werowocomoco, the legendary site where chief Powhatan, Pocahontas and Capt. John Smith crossed paths. DHR funds and staff assisted with investigators into Werowocomoco’s significant archaeology. She also courted the property’s owners to bring the roughly 58-acre site under a preservation easement with the Commonwealth in late 2012. Nearly 13 years as DHR director, Kilpatrick resigned in late 2013 to become director of the Capitol Square Preservation Foundation. A forceful presence in preservation in Virginia and the nation, her legacy still unfolds today.
defeated one of the major purposes of the by Governor Douglas Wilder. Its enactment both the Senate and the House and signed with several environmentally sensitive leg-

Following unusually acrimonious debate, papers around the state supported the bill. Resulting in legal verbiage that confused the Landmark. Complex notification pro-

of a historic district for listing as a Virginia designation of their individual properties by a majority of owners to block designation as a "hortatory act" various interests groups rallied to persuade the General Assembly to change the existing law. A bill was passed that allowed landowners to block historical designation of their individual properties by filing a formal objection, and that allowed a majority of owners to block designation of a historic district for listing as a Virginia Landmark. Complex notification procedures were written into the legislation, resulting in legal verbiage that confused the process with zoning actions by local governments. Angry editorials in several newspapers around the state supported the bill. Following unusually acrimonious debate, with several environmentally sensitive legislatures strenuously opposing the proposed restrictions on DHR, the bill was adopted by both the Senate and the House and signed by Governor Douglas Wilder. Its enactment defeated one of the major purposes of the original 1966 legislation by undermining the value of the Virginia Landmarks Register as a non-regulatory honor roll of landmarks whose importance is measured by their intrinsic historic value. During the same session, the General Assembly in an action never taken before enacted legislation removing those two Northern Virginia Civil War battlefields from the Virginia Landmarks Register. In a sign of how things have changed since 1992, in the summer of 2015 the Department of Conservation and Recreation confirmed publicly that it was exploring the possibility of creating new state parks at Brandy Station and Cedar Mountain in Culpeper County. Moreover, the Civil War Trust as of May 2016 had preserved roughly 1,900 acres of the Brandy Station Battlefield, including acreage purchased with the assistance of grants from the Virginia Battlefield Preservation Fund and placed under easements with DHR's Board of Historic Resources. Many local officials now see heritage tourism as important to long-range economic development. In response to the news of a possible state park at Brandy Station and Cedar Mountain, Culpeper Board of Supervisors member Steve Walker told the Fredericksburg Free Lance-Star, "I think it's a great idea. It would draw more people to enjoy our multiple, different tourism sites in the county—wineries, distilleries, Civil War and Revolutionary War sites, and great restaurants." Clearly, while the Department of Historic Resources has experienced a handful of preservation setbacks during the 50 years since the legislation that gave rise to the agency, today it continues its quest to save the body of man-made resources that portrays our shared history. It has provided oversight and guidance for the rehabilitation of hundreds of historic buildings through preservation tax credits, resulting in millions of dollars of investment and revitalization of dozens of Virginia's cities and towns. It has indeed taken off with a vengeance and assumed a "life of its own."

Endnotes:

2. Lindgren, Preserving the Old Dominion..., 91–94 for a detailed description of this transaction.
3. www.history.org/Founding (Site of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation).
5. Virginia Code, § 10.1-2200 et seq.
8. Information from George C. Freeman, June, 2007.
12. U.S. v Blackman, 270 Va. 613 S.E. 2d 442(2005). See also discussion of this case in Chapter IV.
13. For a discussion of all the courthouses and city halls in Virginia that are listed or eligible for listing on the Virginia Landmarks Register, see John O. and Margaret T. Peters, Virginia's Historic Courthouses, (Charlottesville, 1995).
14. The first edition of the Virginia Landmarks Register was a small, soft bound volume produced in the early 1970s.
16. Virginia Reports, 228, September 1984-January, 1985, 678-679; other information provided by Robert A. Carter, now-retired Community Services Manager, DHR.
18. The language that spelled out the notification process was pulled from the section of the Code that spells out notice requirements for zoning actions that can only be done by a local government, not the state. While zoning actions do place restrictions on land use, historical designation does not. Also, the new law sponsors insisted that a "public hearing" be held prior to consideration of historic districts, again an action that was confusing because a "public hearing" usually calls for those appearing at the hearing to give their statements under oath. Prior to then, the public meetings were informational only, allowing the state agency, -- here the Department of Historic Resources – to provide information about the historic resources and to explain the process for historical designation.
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**DHR Partner Publications of Interest**

*Virginia Indians at Werowocomoco* (2015) and *John Smith’s Chesapeake Voyages 1607–1609* (2007) are both available from online book sellers, your local book store or through the University of Virginia Press.

**Publications Available Online or from DHR**

Go to the DHR website (www.dhr.virginia.gov) to download PDFs of three below.

- *DHR Partner Publications of Interest*
  - *John Smith’s Chesapeake Voyages 1607–1609* (2007)

*How to Research Your Historic Virginia Property* (left) is a great place to start for research. It, too, is available online for free.

*A Handbook and Resource Guide for Owners of Virginia’s Historic Houses* is only available in softcover from DHR, postage $3.

---

Above: These two architectural guides, one for “classic” architecture in Virginia up to 1940, and one for architecture since World War II through the present were compiled by DHR’s architectural historians.

*New Dominion Virginia, Architectural Style Guide* is available for free.

---

**Preservation 50**

1966–2016

*Our Legacy, Our Future*
DHR’s Archives

Under One Roof: Information about VA’s Historic Resources

By Elizabeth Lipford

From typewriters, paper topographic maps, strips of photographic negatives and color slides through floppy disks and the arrival of the Internet, digital images, and GIS, the DHR Archives have come a long way, evolving during the past 50 years, growing with the agency. It now contains a remarkable collection of records covering an array of cultural resources in Virginia. Indeed, it is an historic collection in its own right.

The passage of the National Historic Preservation Act and Virginia’s Open Land Act in 1966 led to the formation of the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission, predecessor agency to DHR. Among its first priorities, the VHLC was charged with identifying and nominating Virginia’s significant historic resources to a newly-created Virginia Landmarks Register and National Register of Historic Places. To meet that goal, commission staff, drawing on the survey work of others before them, obtained a complete copy of the Historic American Buildings Survey Inventory (HABSI) from the Virginia State Library. Compiled in the 1950s, the HABSI became a foundational collection of VLHC architectural survey materials.

Armed with cameras and a complete set of USGS topographic maps for Virginia, VHLC staff traveled throughout the Commonwealth to field-verify each HABSI property and select those worthy of nomination to the state and national registers. These early field trips also introduced local communities to the commission’s work and launched the task of identifying new properties for recordation. VHLC’s architectural historians Tucker Hill and Calder Loth developed an architectural survey form, which facilitated steady growth of survey files for individual properties. These early files gradually swelled into legal size envelopes, with photo sleeves, miscellaneous notes and correspondence, newspaper articles, and other information about each historic property. Those initial VHLC files bear a striking resemblance to subsequent hardcopy files housed in the DHR Archives today.

In 1973 the VHLC relocated to historic Morson’s Row (behind the Governor’s Mansion and Capitol Square), providing much needed space to store a growing architectural inventory. And grow it did. A federal grant in the summer of 1973 employed seventeen students and recent graduates to conduct architectural surveys across the state, adding hundreds of properties to the inventory for each geographic region of Virginia. Staff architectural historians also continued to conduct surveys and began encouraging and collaborating with local governments to survey their historic resources with an eye to preservation planning.

A notable archives expansion occurred in 1980 when the NPS started requiring that National Register historic district nominations include complete inventories of “contributing” and “non-contributing” resources in a register-listed district. Also, in the 1980s, VHLC hired architectural historians to conduct field work in regions of the state. These staff members carried out reconnaissance and intensive surveys in specific counties such as the one of Bath County that current DHR architectural historian David Edwards completed in 1979-1980.

With research comprising a large part of the agency’s work, the archives’ collections flourished in other ways. A significant addition came through receipt of a complete photocopied set of the Mutual Assurance Society (MAS) policies for Virginia. The MAS collection offered a trove of information on thousands of historic buildings, and propelled agency staff to...
undertake creating a county-city index for the MAS policies. A tedious task to complete, all the same, the MAS index allowed DHR staff to search for a historic property by accessing it through either a property or policy holder's name. Because of its significant research value, DHR gave a copy of the MAS index to the State Library, the repository of the original policies.

Photocopies of historic maps from various holdings, including the Virginia State Library, were also collected and indexed, mostly by former DHR employee Martha McCa-rtney, resulting in one of the largest collections of historic maps for Virginia. Additionally, the need for a collection of professional published source material for staff gave rise to the archives library. Virginia's renowned architectural historian Calder Loth recalls during the agency's early days then-senior historian Junius Fishburne scoured used book shops for any title pertaining to Virginia's history. Today, the library continues growing with the acquisition of newly published books about Virginia's resources along with unpublished academic reports and studies.

The 1966 legislation that established the VHLC also created the Virginia Research Center for Archaeology—but did not fund it. Regardless, VHLC began an archaeological program by hiring professional archaeological staff that networked with existing programs such as Colonial Williamsburg, the Virginia State Library, the College of William and Mary, and the National Park Service. The VHLC archaeological program gained notable visibility through a 1972 grant from Busch Properties, Inc., for a survey and salvage of the important colonial-era Kingsmill archaeological site in James City County. Finally catching the eye of the Virginia General Assembly, the Virginia Research Center for Archaeology was at last funded and officially opened in the Wren Building at the College of William and Mary in 1975 with one of its primary functions to inventory Virginia's archaeological sites.

Similarly to the origins of the architectural survey files, the archaeological survey files are built on work done decades before the advent of the VHLC. In 1947, Colonel Howard MacCord conducted the first methodical archaeological survey in Virginia with a grant from the Virginia Conservation Commission. In 1962, the Virginia State Library hired Col. MacCord after he retired from the military; he then developed the first archaeological survey form for Virginia sites. Systematic recordation of the state's archaeological sites continued under Col. MacCord's direction until his retirement in 1976, at which time survey forms for approximately 1,500 sites were transferred to the newly-opened Virginia Research Center of Archaeology—thus establishing a foundational collection of information about Virginia's archaeological sites.

In 1985 VHLC joined the Department of Conservation and Historic Resources as the Division of Historic Landmarks (DHL). That year marked another important archive's milestone when the Virginia Research Center for Archaeology moved from its quarters at the Yorktown Victory Center to the DHL's Morson's Row headquarters in Richmond. The move consolidated into one repository all of Virginia's historic resource materials. In merging the two libraries, DHL staff incorporated published and unpublished materials and survey forms, and topographic and historic maps. The unified collections enhanced the archives' research utility and improved agency efficiency in providing the public and other agencies and entities information about historic sites.

In 1986 the agency hired its part-time first archivist, a position that eventually evolved into full time as it became critical to DHL's purpose in caring for, and making accessible cultural resource information for many clients. With a rapidly growing archive in the late 1980s, the eve of the Information Technology era found agency.
Virginia's historic preservation office, during its various configurations, has often proved a leader in the national arena of preservation. When then-deputy director H. Bryan Mitchell was president of the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers (NCSHPO), and now-retired staff historian Robert Carter served on NCSHPO's Survey Committee, the Department of Historic Preservation Officers partnered with the National Park Service to pilot development of computer software for cultural resource surveys, known as Integrated Preservation Software (IPS). Virginia staff worked closely with NPS to tailor the software first for architectural, then archaeological survey. One of the first states to automate inventory data, Virginia began using IPS for architectural survey by 1992 and for archaeological survey by 1993.

With IPS came the ability to share new survey information with other state and federal agencies as well as local governments. While the IPS was helpful going forward, pre-IPS survey records—approximately 30,000 archaeological sites and 100,000 architectural properties—remained inaccessible until 1994-95, when the Virginia Department of Transportation, a heavy user of survey information for transportation planning, generously provided a sizeable grant to enter the data for the older survey records into IPS. But alas, while IPS, with a few bumps along the way, carried DHR into the information technology age, its limitations soon became apparent. For instance, it lacked internet compatibility and a Geographic Information Systems component. The 1990s closed with several attempts to make IPS work in an internet environment with a GIS component without success.

With a GIS component without success, Virginia's historic preservation office, during its various configurations, has often proved a leader in the national arena of preservation. When then-deputy director H. Bryan Mitchell was president of the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers (NCSHPO), and now-retired staff historian Robert Carter served on NCSHPO's Survey Committee, the Department of Historic Resources partnered with the National Park Service to pilot development of computer software for cultural resource surveys, known as Integrated Preservation Software (IPS). Virginia staff worked closely with NPS to tailor the software first for architectural, then archaeological survey. One of the first states to automate inventory data, Virginia began using IPS for architectural survey by 1992 and for archaeological survey by 1993.

With IPS came the ability to share new survey information with other state and federal agencies as well as local governments. While the IPS was helpful going forward, pre-IPS survey records—approximately 30,000 archaeological sites and 100,000 architectural properties—remained inaccessible until 1994-95, when the Virginia Department of Transportation, a heavy user of survey information for transportation planning, generously provided a sizeable grant to enter the data for the older survey records into IPS. But alas, while IPS, with a few bumps along the way, carried DHR into the information technology age, its limitations soon became apparent. For instance, it lacked internet compatibility and a Geographic Information Systems component. The 1990s closed with several attempts to make IPS work in an internet environment with a GIS component without success.

While DHR moved into information technology during the late 1990s, it made a significant physical leap when it relocated out of the historic Morson's Row to a new wing of the Virginia Historical Society on The Boulevard in Richmond, under then-director Alex Wise. The new building accommo-


dated a library reading room and map room, open to the public. A space for open-stack shelves also allowed the agency to house an ever-growing collection of architectural resource envelope files, some many inches thick, and expandable archaeological site files. The agency's collection of black- and white negatives and color slides, returned from the Library of Virginia, were also incorporated into the library. Public computer stations also allowed—and still do—Archives visitors to review inventory and unpublished report databases, and other finding aids that facilitate research.

In June of 2001, IPS made way for a new database, the Historic Resources Data Sharing System, later shortened to DSS. The Data Sharing System resulted from another partnership between VDOT and DHR. With the introduction of DSS, DHR entered the Internet era. Consultants conducting architectural and archaeological survey in Virginia could now log into a common database. DSS allowed field surveyors to create electronic records on newly identified historic resources and update records of previously documented sites and properties.

DSS made it possible for cultural resource professionals and local planners to recreate the DHR archival experience without having to travel to Richmond. With the GIS platform available, licensed users could search specific geographic areas for previously documented historic resources. The database querying and reporting capabilities also allowed researchers to retrieve property and site records.

DHR's public website, initially developed primarily by now-retired conservator Melba Myers, ushered in the next major change for the archives. National Register nomination forms, now submitted to DHR in both hard copy and digital form, were posted as PDFs on the website, building an electronic archive on those listed properties. A scanning project led to the posting of older nomination forms as well. Currently an effort is underway to complement the full listing of PDF nominations with an online version of the Virginia Landmarks Register, similar to its previous iteration as a book, last updated and published in 1999 as a fourth edition. Today it would require a large, multi-volume book to encompass the VLR, an impractical and prohibitively costly project. As with the book format, the Online VLR will summarize each property's significance, display a representative photograph and (unlike in print) provide links to its nomination form and other documents.

The DHR website's e-digital archives continue to expand beyond register nominations with downloadable copies of material such as reports, historic scrapbooks, brochures, and other documents, from our library's special collections. Of particular value are reports and educational by-products (e.g. PowerPoint, brochures) generated from the agency's cost share survey program. These reports typically cover hundreds of historic properties and include research that puts town, city, or county resources into a regional context.

In September 2013, DHR retired the DSS, after its long and fruitful tenure as DHR's historic resources database. It has been replaced by the more streamlined and robust Virginia Cultural Resource Information System, or VCRIS. VCRIS is more user-friendly for the field surveyors entering data, including allowing the consultants to upload the boundaries of properties directly into each record. The database also has more flexible querying and reporting capabilities than its predecessor. An exciting additional aspect to the creation of VCRIS was the development of a simplified public version of the database, allowing the general public to find basic information on historic districts and properties through the VCRIS—GIS platform.

Whether online or in-person, the DHR Archives welcomes anyone interested in learning more about Virginia's architectural and archaeological historic resources.

Elizabeth Lipford is a preservation specialist with DHR and was DHR's first-hired archivist. Quatro Hubbard, DHR's current archivist, contributed to this article.
As the National Historic Preservation Act turns 50, Virginia’s historical highway marker program is on the cusp of its 90th anniversary. Having placed more than 2,500 silver-and-black signs throughout the state, the marker program offers a visible account of Virginia’s past. Although the program has evolved in crucial ways over the decades and will continue to do so, it is rooted in the allure of special places and evermindful of the benefits to be reaped by combining preservation, tourism, and education.

In 1926, at the beginning of Harry Byrd’s term as governor of Virginia, the General Assembly established the Commission of Conservation and Development; that agency consolidated the state’s departments of geology, forestry, parks, and water power, and it soon added a new division of history and archaeology. Charged with stimulating economic development in the new age of the automobile, the commission sought to fill Virginia’s expanding highway system with residents and tourists eager to explore the state’s unique natural and historic resources. To that end, the commission quickly established a formal program for marking Virginia’s historic sites. These markers would link important events from the past to the landscape where they had taken place, turning the Commonwealth into an open-air museum.

The Conservation Commission hired Hamilton James Eckenrode, who held a doctorate in history from the Johns Hopkins University, to develop and manage the marker program. A native of Fredericksburg, Eckenrode had previously taught history at the college level, managed the department of archives and history at the Virginia State Library, and edited schoolbooks for a publishing company in Richmond. Convinced that “Virginia is the most historical region of the continents of North and South America,” he began his new job early in 1927 by planning a system of informational signs intended to catch the eye and capture the imagination of motorists.

His idea was to tell a continuous, unfolding story along the highways, revealing “the development of historic movements such as the spread of settlements or the march of armies.” The traveler’s car was to be like an “easy chair” and the “roads before him” would be “open pages in the most thrilling history of the Nation.”

The Conservation Commission members debated the type of marker to use for their new program. Some favored granite blocks with bronze plaques. Finally they adopted an innovative concept: a large iron or aluminum sign on a post, easily readable from inside a car. The design, drafted by Landon L. Perdue, was patented in 1928.

Eckenrode and two assistants quickly began traveling throughout Virginia to gather historical information from residents. When possible, they confirmed the accuracy of the information using primary documents, and then they wrote brief inscriptions for potential markers. A twelve-member advisory committee composed of prominent historians reviewed and approved the texts, many of which were only one or two sentences long, and the first markers were installed late in 1927 along Route 1 between Richmond and Alexandria. As the system expanded, each marker was assigned an alpha-numeric code based on the highway on which it was erected. Route 1’s markers were labeled “E,” for example, while Route 11 had “A” markers and Route 50 had “B” markers. (The program no longer follows the roads when assigning codes to new markers. Each marker is simply given the letter that is most prominent in its locality and then receives the next available number.)

The Conservation Commission’s marker program obtained funding from the state’s advertising budget, and the purpose of the markers as a promotional tool for Virginia was never far from Eckenrode’s mind. “It is in our power to make Virginia the greatest tourist state in the union,” he wrote, “thereby increasing the value of property to an incredible degree.” Erecting historical signs on underdeveloped highways would stimulate enterprise, “resulting perhaps in the establishment of better restaurants along the way and more numerous filling stations.” Eckenrode envisioned carloads of travelers stopping for lunch, fueling their automobiles, purchasing items in local shops, and perhaps spending the night. The perceived desires and interests of tourists shaped many of the decisions about which subjects would be featured on markers, resulting in a program heavily weighted toward the colonial period, the Revolutionary War, the Civil War, and places associated with great men. These were the same categories that the historical profession then considered significant and worthy of study.

Only seven of the 700 markers erected before 1930 focused on women. Most of these were relatives of famous men, such as the sister of George Washington and the mother of the Wright Brothers. Virginia Indians were often referred to as “heathens” or “savages,” and were discussed largely in the context of “massacres” or “outrages.” African Americans were almost entirely absent except for Nat Turner and one reference to the “faithful slaves” who hid their masters during Turner’s revolt.

Civil War topics alone accounted for
fully one third of the first 700 markers. The primary objective of these markers was to guide motorists along the paths of particular military campaigns. Accordingly, they addressed subjects such as “Where Sheridan Turned,” or “Where Burnside Crossed.” Inscriptions were not designed to glorify the Confederacy. In fact, Eckenrode saw the marker program as an agent of reconciliation between North and South. He hoped that “the thousands of tourists that come to Virginia from the north and west will have a new feeling of friendship for the state when they gain an adequate idea of its mighty past.” Regarding his plans for Civil War markers, he stated that “Confederate positions would not be neglected, but the elaborate marking of Union positions along the road would show the northern visitor the impartial nature of the work.” Early on, Virginia erected markers commemorating Winfield Scott (of Dinwiddie County) and George Thomas (of Southampton County), both of whom served as Union generals during the war.

As with any major public undertaking, the marker program faced a number of challenges. Chief among these was the impossibility of always satisfying tourists, local residents, and factual accuracy all at the same time. Complaining about the tone of the Civil War markers, one Virginia woman contended that the signs “toady to northern tourists and humiliate southern people.” Some owners of historic homes tried to prevent the installation of markers so as to keep nosy tourists away. Occasionally, local groups petitioned for markers to be removed when the inscriptions did not comport with their version of the facts, leading Eckenrode firmly to rule that “we cannot take down markers at the dictation of private parties, since then we should be at the mercy of every crank and sorehead.” Vandalism and theft of signs prompted an extended discussion in 1929 about the possibility of hiring detectives solely for the purpose of “watching Highways and protecting Markers.”

General maintenance also quickly became a problem. By 1931, when the oldest markers had been on the roadsides for only three or four years, many already were in need of repainting. The marker program forged on despite the obstacles. Almost 1,500 markers had been erected by 1941, when the program was suspended during World War II. By then the system of historical signs had generated positive attention around the country. Officials from other states wrote to ask for advice about starting their own programs, and travelers sent notes of appreciation. “These markers add immeasurably to the pleasure of motoring in Virginia,” wrote a woman from Alabama, while a man from Ohio reported that he enjoyed the markers so much on his first trip to Virginia that he had since spent two additional vacations in the state.

The program’s very success almost triggered its downfall after World War II. In 1948, during a reorganization of state government aimed at reducing its size and increasing its efficiency, Governor William Tuck discontinued the Division of History and Archaeology and its highway marker program. His staff praised the program for accomplishing its goals and asserted that the addition of new signs could only detract from the “prestige of the significant markers already in the system.” In the opinion of a committee of professional historians, “the saturation point in the historical marker system has about been reached.” The program, in much pared-down form, was folded into the State Library in 1950. In 1966 the program was transferred to the newly established Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission (forerunner of the present-day Department of Historic Resources, or DHR). For thirty years, from 1950 until about 1980, the program was technically alive but practically dormant. Only about 100 new signs were erected during those three decades, and state funding for markers was discontinued in 1976. The system remained heavily focused on military and political subjects, while markers pertaining to women and African Americans were still almost nonexistent.

After the withdrawal of state funding, the program began accepting applications for highway markers from private groups and local governments; those groups were required to pay for the manufacture of the signs if the topics and texts won the approval of the Landmarks Commission (later the Board of Historic Resources). This approach led to the revival of the program beginning early in the 1980s. During that decade, about 20-25 new markers were approved each year. Texts were expanded to about 100 words, and the markers were designed to be self-contained, not part of a serialized story that unfolded as a driver progressed down the road. Allowing the public to apply for and sponsor markers—a project often taken on by historical societies, heritage associations, alumni groups, churches, and student organizations—helped generate a much greater variety of topics. The definition of what qualified as historic expanded greatly during this period, as a new generation of scholars raised awareness of social and cultural history, prominently including the lives of people other than elite, white men. The marker system, for example, now features signs about the First Southern African American Girl Scouts, the 1936 Virginia Prison Recordings of traditional African
American music, the origin of Brunswick Stew, George Washington Carver Regional High School, actor Joseph Cotten, author Pearl S. Buck, and many other subjects.

Today the marker program is thriving, with 40–50 new texts approved annually. To be eligible for a marker, an event, person, or place must be of regional, statewide, or national significance; subjects of strictly local importance do not qualify. The subject must have attained its significance at least fifty years ago, and a marker may not commemorate a living person. Each applicant is asked to propose a 100-word text for the potential marker, suggest a location, and provide documentation confirming the accuracy of the information that would appear on the sign. DHR’s marker historian evaluates the applications, checks the facts, conducts additional research, and edits the proposed texts for clarity, brevity, thoroughness, and educational value. After working closely with the sponsor to produce an agreed-upon text, the historian sends the text to DHR’s marker editorial committee, a group of outside scholars who evaluate the potential marker’s historical accuracy, prose style, and level of significance. If the committee accepts the text, the historian presents it to the Board of Historic Resources for official approval. The board, a seven-member panel appointed by the governor, meets four times each year.

While DHR and its board are responsible for the texts of markers, the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) handles the site approval, installation, and maintenance of markers in the VDOT right-of-way. If a marker is to be placed in an independent town or city, the locality’s public works department performs these functions. After a marker is installed, the sponsor may host a dedication and unveiling ceremony to celebrate the culmination of the project.

While the application system has sustained the marker program since the 1980s, a series of federal grants received through the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) and the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st century (TEA-21) between 1996 and 2009 also provided crucial support. These funds enabled DHR to begin replacing some of the oldest, most outdated markers with updated versions. In 2001 DHR launched a diversity initiative that relied on TEA funds to create markers about women, African Americans, and Native Americans, further broadening the way history is told on Virginia’s roadides. Markers erected under this program include those for Anthony Burns, Elizabeth Keckley, Grandma Moses, Janis Martin, Mary Greenhow Lee, Powhatan, and Werowocomoco. TEA funds also made possible a series of markers about the War of 1812 to highlight its bicentennial as well as a number of new Civil War markers at the sesquicentennial.

The modern-day marker program does not avoid difficult subjects. The Bloody Monday marker in Danville addresses an attack by police on a nonviolent civil rights demonstration, for example, while the Buck v. Bell marker in Charlottesville describes eugenics legislation under which more than 8,000 Virginians were sterilized. Governor Mark Warner used the occasion of this marker’s unveiling to issue a formal apology for the state’s role in the sterilization program. He noted that the marker “would remind us of past events and assist us to strive to do better.”

While a system of roadside markers is one of the most static forms of public history—the signs are meant to stand for decades—the Virginia marker program strives to be as dynamic as possible within the constraints of the medium. In 2016 the Virginia General Assembly allocated $2 million in recreational access funds to VDOT for the purpose of, among other projects, refurbishing and replacing damaged and deteriorated historical markers in the VDOT right-of-way. A recent VDOT assessment revealed that more than 200 markers—many from the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s—have reached the end of their lifespans owing to cracks, rust, peeling paint, and other problems.

The opportunity to replace these old markers with new ones manufactured...
using modern technology and materials will result in a substantial aesthetic improvement. The process will also allow DHR to expand the texts of old markers beyond the original one or two sentences and to correct factual errors. The replacement markers will benefit from modern scholarship and research methods, resulting in a richer and more educationally valuable overview of each topic.

Because many older markers are now regarded as important artifacts and, in some cases, as community landmarks, DHR has established a program by which local museums, historical societies, or other organizations with an educational mission can apply to receive a retired marker for display to the public. To qualify, organizations must meet certain criteria and must agree to a set of conditions, including that the marker not be permanently installed outdoors and that the display be accompanied by an interpretive text.

Finally, DHR has brought the marker program into the digital age by offering a searchable marker database on its website. This format is more flexible, and more easily updatable, than the traditional printed guidebooks to the system, the last of which was published in 2007. Because students, educators, and researchers looking for information about Virginia history are likely to find markers online, it is particularly important that the brief, almost telegraphic spoken texts of markers to interested passersby. A GPS signal will trigger a high-quality audio recording of a marker’s text whenever a listener is within proximity, in effect “narrowcasting” the text to a mobile device. By making a marker text audible rather than displaying it on a mobile device screen, drivers of vehicles will be visually undistracted, a crucial safety consideration. A prototype of the mobile app will be launched on the Virginia Capital Trail (above), which runs between Richmond and Williamsburg.

Jennifer R. Lux, Ph.D., is the historian and coordinator of the DHR marker program. She joined the agency in 2014.

by Mike Barber, DHR State Archaeologist

First visited the Hatch Site in Prince George County one fall day in 1972. It would be thirty-four years until I returned. The archaeological site at Hatch represents the remnants of a long-term Indian village on a tributary of the James River. My first visit was with the man who eventually spent more than a decade in excavations there, Mr. Leverette ‘Lefty’ Booth Gregory. He was a legend in Virginia archaeology; ending his formal schooling after third grade, he spent his youth traveling as a carny with his family, who managed a Donkey Basketball Team—a unique background for an archaeologist.

After running through a number of craft careers in wood, bronze, and clay, Gregory joined the anthropology department staff at The College of William and Mary, working on such projects as a Chickahominy Survey of Indian sites, excavations at Poor Potter of Yorktown, Maycocks Point shell midden, and finally at the 17th-century fort at Flowerdew Hundred, where he became vice president of Southside Historic Sites Foundation, an archaeological contracting firm.

That day in 1972, Lefty and I were working a shell-filled trash feature when a couple of fox hunters stopped by and mentioned that they saw similar shell along a nearby creek. A few days later, we visited the site and knew it was something very important in the understanding of prehistory.

We eventually lost touch. A job offer moved me to a different part of the state. Lefty moved on from William and Mary and founded the Virginia Foundation for Archaeological Research and began excavation at Hatch. Meanwhile, I spent three decades as an archaeologist for USDA-Forest Service and Lefty continued investigating the Hatch site into the 1980s. Hatch proved an iconic site in Virginia prehistory. It contained hundreds of refuse-filled pit features producing a cornucopia of new data, numerous hearths, and oval house patterns of post stais dating to the Middle and Late Woodland periods (AD 300–1650), as well as a 17th-century Colonial earthfast structure built on posts set in square pits, numerous trade goods, and two intriguing ditch features. It also yielded the largest prehistoric dog cemetery in North America with 120 canine burials.

Time moved on. Lefty ended excavations at Hatch, funding ebbed, and 500 boxes of Hatch artifacts got stored in sheds at Lefty’s house for thirty years. Lefty passed on in 2015. His wife, Eve Gregory, now president of the Virginia Foundation for Archaeological Research, knew the research value of the collection and wanted Lefty’s legacy to live on. As the Gregorys were dedicated to bettering the understanding of the past, Eve sought a solution for long-term curation of the collection and records. In April, 2016 she donated both the artifacts and the records to DHR.

Now housed in Richmond, the collection will be available for study. During a recent informal review of the collection, it was apparent that the data base could provide the grist for a multitude of theses and dissertations for generations to come. DHR is already collaborating with local universities, meaning the collection will see a bright future in interpretation, exhibits, and print.

Howard Carter, when asked what he saw as he opened King Tut’s tomb, said, “Wonderful Things.” When one of the boxes from Hatch is opened, we say, “Wonderful data.”

Stay tuned.
In the fall of 2015 and the spring of 2016, DHR and the Archeological Society of Virginia (ASV) teamed up to excavate the Great Neck site in Virginia Beach. The spring investigations occurred during an annual field school DHR hosts with key partners such as the ASV. These excavations through the common interests of historians and professional and avocational archaeologists benefit public history and archaeology in Virginia. The Great Neck work showcased the breadth and depth of Virginia’s archaeological community, which has grown over the past decades through closer collaboration between DHR, ASV, the Council of Virginia Archaeologists, and local organizations—and, importantly, the cooperation of many private property owners in Virginia.

The archaeological site at Great Neck (44VB0007, its official designation; herein, simply “VB7”) is one of the most significant pre-European contact sites on Virginia’s coastal plain and covers nearly 20 acres on the south bank of Broad Bay. Its significance derives mostly from its association with Middle and Late Woodland period occupations (around 500 B.C. to 1600 A.D.), although it has yielded some evidence of earlier Paleo and Archaic Period usage.

A local amateur initially collected Native American artifacts there as early as the late 1930s and into the 1940s. One collector recalls going there after school as a teen in the 1950s to scavenge artifacts in plowed fields. He again returned in the 1970s and excavated a number of features that were exposed during the development of newly divided housing lots. By the 1970s this collector and other well-known amateurs began earnest excavations at the site which they continued into the early 1980s. Eventually, several primary collectors of the site shared with DHR the field notes, drawings, and maps they made during their excavations along with published papers in ASV’s Quarterly Bulletin that detailed their findings. Two of the amateur excavators also donated to DHR the artifacts they recovered from VB7.

DHR’s involvement at Great Neck started in 1981 when an anthropology student, whose family purchased one of the new house lots, contacted DHR after conducting some of his own excavations there. In response, the agency quickly began systematic excavations of several house lots and continued investigations intermittently through 1987 under the supervision of now-retired DHR archaeologists Keith Egloff and Dr. Randolph Turner.

Through the years the people involved in the excavations with DHR at Great Neck reads like a who’s-who of Virginia archaeology and includes many individuals who have gone on to long careers in the field. The primary source detailing early excavations is Mary Ellen Hodges’ Native American Settlement at Great Neck: Report on DHR Archaeological Investigations of Woodland Components at Site 44VB7, Virginia Beach, Virginia, 1981-1987 (1998). The report consolidates all the excavations conducted by DHR and offers a comprehensive summary of the work undertaken by the pre-DHR collectors. Several other smaller volumes covering specific aspects of the investigations were also produced by various professionals who assisted with the excavations. Those works are on file at DHR and can be accessed in the agency’s Richmond archives. Also of note is site 44VB9, which lies to the west of VB7. Archaeologists from James Madison University excavated 44VB9 in 1984 in preparation for the widening of Great Neck Road. That site likely represents an extension of the VB7 Woodland period occupations and is probably, in reality, all part of the same complex.

While VB7 (and VB9) appears to have been occupied continuously throughout the Woodland periods, the most intensive occupation seems to have been around 200 to 400 A.D. and again circa 1400 to 1500 A.D. There is a mix of evidence of both Middle and Late Woodland settlement interspersed across this south side of Broad Bay, with the later period concentrated to the east, the earlier one to the landform’s west. The site as a whole included numerous human burials from both periods; at least one example of post molds indicating a Late Wood-
land palisade; several post mold patterns likely showing house sites; and an abundance of trash- and shell-filled pits.

In the spring of 2015 DHR discovered that a Virginia Beach construction permit application pertained to three new lots that had been subdivided at the edge of the Meadowridge neighborhood, the western end of Great Neck. DHR also learned no federal, state, or city requirements would necessitate the lots undergo archaeological testing beyond a limited area along the waterway for a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (a requisite of the National Historic Preservation Act). Because of the well-known importance of Great Neck, DHR contacted the landowner to inform him of the site’s significance and to request permission to conduct excavations. Pleased to hear of our interest, the owner proved to be an exemplary partner. In addition to granting permission to investigate the soon-to-be developed housing lots, the owner at great expense provided a backhoe to strip the surface, allowing archaeologists to view potential features for recording and excavation. (He also extended free accommodations to staff and volunteer archaeologists at his nearby hotel for the duration of the excavations and allotted space for storage and onsite lab work.)

For the initial investigations in 2015, DHR decided to focus primarily on the easternmost part of the three subdivided lots since construction of a house would get underway soon. With limited time and funds to conduct the work, DHR enlisted the vital assistance of the ASV, which helped get the word out about the urgent need to conduct the excavations. ASV’s summons brought to Great Neck experienced professional and amateur archaeologists to begin opening up and documenting the site. The work began the first week of October and continued through the first week of December. Multiple DHR staff members were deployed to oversee the day-to-day operation of the work and as many as ten ASV volunteers showed up on a regular basis to assist, with a core group of four-to-five volunteers in attendance nearly every day. Volunteers also arrived from VDOT, the Virginia Museum of Natural History, and the Jamestown Rediscovery Project, which sent its entire crew of archaeologists for a day.

Archaeologists and volunteers worked quickly. Each day involved shovel and trowel scraping of the stripped surface to reveal soil differences that could indicate a subsurface feature. Once identified, a feature was mapped in relation to other ones and then bisected to test it for width, depth, and contents, all aimed at determining its original purpose. If a feature proved distinctive or yielded potentially significant or unique artifacts, it was excavated in its entirety. Dozens of features emerged during the excavations including several large bell-shaped storage pits, multiple small, shell-filled roasting pits, structural post molds, and two human burials.

DHR recovered thousands of artifacts: pottery, bone tools, lithics (stone tools and related waste) and multiple bags of soil for later processing in a flotation tank—a device that uses screens of various weaves related waste) and multiple bags of soil for later processing in a flotation tank—a device that uses screens of various weaves to gradually separate larger and heavier material from lighter and smaller matter. The flotation process has produced an unusually large amount of faunal—e.g. bones, scales, and teeth—and flora—seeds, stems, and other plant matter. These remains can provide environmental and dietary information about the people living at VB7. To date, faunal samples reveal small shark and dolphin teeth, stingray and other fish bones and a variety of scales. Radio carbon tests of two samples taken from deer bones date to around 200 to 400 A.D. Mockley pottery, the dominant ware recovered—and distinguished by its shell temper and net-impressed design—has long been associated with sites in the same date range as the bone samples. Such pottery, typically conical in shape and thick walled, is often associated with cooking and storage uses.

Very few lithic artifacts were recovered.
processing artifacts. As in the 2015 excavations, Native American pottery sherds were the predominant artifacts uncovered, again, much of it Mockley ware. A few additional lithic items were found, too.

At the time of this writing, DHR is processing the artifacts from VB7 at our Richmond conservation lab and an extensive report will be published of our findings. The soil flotation process is ongoing at the Virginia Museum of Natural History in Martinsville under the direction of Dr. Elizabeth Moore. The resulting samples will be processed and catalogued by a combination of ASV volunteers and VMNH and DHR staff. DHR hopes that once complete this research will allow archaeologists and historians a better understanding of the lifeways of people who lived on Virginia's Coastal Plain long before European settlement.

We are closely examining the bones recovered, dividing them into two groups: those worked into tools, versus those likely to be food waste. Collectively the bones can offer insight into the diet of the people and the tools will improve our knowledge of what activities engaged them. By inventorying the bones, we can also quantify the numbers of large mammals in relation to small ones, the number of mammals compared to birds, the numbers of those compared to fish, and so on. In this way we may also figure out the seasonality of the occupations at Great Neck. Were people there year round or only in the summer? Perhaps they were there only when certain fish species were available. Perhaps we’ll find that most of their diet was made up of deer meat and that for some reason no large water fowl were present. Why would that be true? In the end the bones will tell us a lot—but as is usually the case inevitably raise more questions.

One of the few lithics found at Great Neck, this is a quartzite broadspear. Found with Middle Woodland pottery, this point type is generally considered older than Middle Woodland time period.

The spring 2016 DHR-ASV field school at VB7, a great success during its two week run, drew as many as 25 volunteers per day. The work unfolded similarly to the plan employed in the 2015 excavations. During the field school, volunteers excavated features previously identified but which had yet to be tested. They also identified and excavated new features on two additional house lots. Several new pit features were discovered as well as what appears to be a series of posts representing a possible house structure. Volunteers were responsible for note keeping, photographic documentation, mapping, and proper collection of their finds. The crew also spent time washing and processing artifacts. As in the 2015 excavations, Native American pottery sherds were the predominant artifacts uncovered, again, much of it Mockley ware. A few additional lithic items were found, too.

At the time of this writing, DHR is processing the artifacts from VB7 at our Richmond conservation lab and an extensive report will be published of our findings. The soil flotation process is ongoing at the Virginia Museum of Natural History in Martinsville under the direction of Dr. Elizabeth Moore. The resulting samples will be processed and catalogued by a combination of ASV volunteers and VMNH and DHR staff. DHR hopes that once complete this research will allow archaeologists and historians a better understanding of the lifeways of people who lived on Virginia's Coastal Plain long before European settlement.

We are closely examining the bones recovered, dividing them into two groups: those worked into tools, versus those likely to be food waste. Collectively the bones can offer insight into the diet of the people and the tools will improve our knowledge of what activities engaged them. By inventorying the bones, we can also quantify the numbers of large mammals in relation to small ones, the number of mammals compared to birds, the numbers of those compared to fish, and so on. In this way we may also figure out the seasonality of the occupations at Great Neck. Were people there year round or only in the summer? Perhaps they were there only when certain fish species were available. Perhaps we’ll find that most of their diet was made up of deer meat and that for some reason no large water fowl were present. Why would that be true? In the end the bones will tell us a lot—but as is usually the case inevitably raise more questions.

Our ongoing research into the botanical remains from Great Neck will delve into the field of ethnobotany, the scientific discipline that studies human relationships with plants; that is, what plants people use and consume as a culture. DHR saved a lot of soil from specific deep pit features and carefully "floated" the plant remains out of the soil. An ethnobotanist will analyze the bones, we can also quantify the numbers of large mammals in relation to small ones, the number of mammals compared to birds, the numbers of those compared to fish, and so on. In this way we may also figure out the seasonality of the occupations at Great Neck. Were people there year round or only in the summer? Perhaps they were there only when certain fish species were available. Perhaps we’ll find that most of their diet was made up of deer meat and that for some reason no large water fowl were present. Why would that be true? In the end the bones will tell us a lot—but as is usually the case inevitably raise more questions.

Our ongoing research into the botanical remains from Great Neck will delve into the field of ethnobotany, the scientific discipline that studies human relationships with plants; that is, what plants people use and consume as a culture. DHR saved a lot of soil from specific deep pit features and carefully "floated" the plant remains out of the soil. An ethnobotanist will analyze the bones, we can also quantify the numbers of large mammals in relation to small ones, the number of mammals compared to birds, the numbers of those compared to fish, and so on. In this way we may also figure out the seasonality of the occupations at Great Neck. Were people there year round or only in the summer? Perhaps they were there only when certain fish species were available. Perhaps we’ll find that most of their diet was made up of deer meat and that for some reason no large water fowl were present. Why would that be true? In the end the bones will tell us a lot—but as is usually the case inevitably raise more questions.

One of the few lithics found at Great Neck, this is a quartzite broadspear. Found with Middle Woodland pottery, this point type is generally considered older than Middle Woodland time period.

The profile of a large bell-shaped pit feature is seen here. The east half of the feature has been excavated. The diameter is just over one meter and is approximately that deep as well. The bottom right shows a level where a collection of periwinkle (small edible sea snails) shells were concentrated..
this material to identify what plants were present at the site at the time of occupation. Such analysis may determine what plants were used as food, what ones were native to the location, or found their way into the pit by happenstance. Such information is valuable for understanding what portion of the VB7 people's diet consisted of plants; it can also tell us something about the natural environment of present-day Virginia Beach some 2,000 years ago. Additionally, this information may indicate if the people domesticated any plants such as corn and squash as well as whether any plants such as wild species were eaten. We will also submit samples of soil for phytolith research. Phytoliths are generally microscopic silica absorbed by thriving plants. Once a plant perishes its silica returns back to the soil with a signature of sorts that helps scientists figure out what type of plant it derives from. We hope this, too, will yield some information about diet and environment of the area at the time.

Ongoing analysis of the pottery recovered at Great Neck may also tell us something about the people of VB7. We hope to learn about production methods and clay sources. The types and sizes of the vessels can inform us about cooking habits and food storage. Varying types of pottery may reveal that different groups occupied the site at different periods, or possibly at the same time. Or maybe one group settled there in the cooler months and another moved in during warmer weather. The association of specific vessel types and forms may indicate a relationship via cooking or storage uses. We may also learn how pottery production and style evolved over time. In the end, a lot can be learned from closely considering recovered fragments of pottery.

Plans are now in place to interpret for display in both Richmond and in Virginia Beach some of the artifacts from VB7. Our goal is to allow more people to see the items from nearly 2,000 years ago. The opportunity to excavate a site like Great Neck is rare but it could never happen without a vibrant and robust network of archaeologists and volunteers—and the partners that make events like DHR field schools and excavations at threatened sites a possibility. Meanwhile, DHR is committed to processing and documenting the finds so that we can advance our knowledge of North America's cultural past.

Michael Clem is DHR's eastern region archaeologist. He joined the agency in 2014. For their support and participation at Great Neck, he thanks Dr. Elizabeth Moore and Lucy Treado from the Virginia Museum of Natural History, ASV President Dr. Carole Nash, and Wayne Edwards of the Nansemond Chapter of the ASV. This work also would never have been completed without the dedicated labor of Bev Barker, Cynthia Hansen, and Sonja Ostrander. Mike Makin at the College of William & Mary was a huge help in the field. Thanks, too, to Dr. Shiflet for providing so much to make the excavations possible.

**Partnerships in Preservation Summerseat Revival**

by John S. Salmon and Marc C. Wagner

Through a consortium of local, state, and national preservation partners, a long-neglected architectural gem in central Virginia is coming back to life. Summerseat, in the old mill town of Ettrick in Chesterfield County, is a superb Italianate cottage dating from around 1860. Set off by itself on a large parcel, Summerseat now stands as a remaining landmark denoting the historic Ettrick community. To local residents, it’s an icon on Chesterfield Avenue, Ettrick’s main street. Owned by Virginia State University, the house sits in an area VSU targeted for redevelopment under a multi-year plan.

The vacant Summerseat seemed forgotten until a partnership of local citizens, county officials, the Cameron Foundation,
Preservation Virginia, VSU and DHR formed to encourage its preservation. The partnership benefited with new momentum when HistoriCorps, a non-profit restoration group, joined it in the summer of 2016. HistoriCorps, which depends on volunteer laborers and craftsmen, agreed to take on the project, a process entailed peeling back layers of modern exterior cladding to reveal the cottage’s 19th-century character and beauty.

Summerseat’s story intertwines with Ettrick’s. By the 1830s, Ettrick Manufacturing Company and Fleet’s Manufacturing Company were established on the north bank of the Appomattox River. The mill factories produced “cotton, wool, hemp, flax, metals, [and] wood” and “iron, steel, brass and other metals” products. The village of Ettrick was laid out near the river bluff and drew employees and tradesmen of the mills who moved into southern Chesterfield County to live closer to their places of work.

On the eve of the Civil War, August, 1859, the area was described as the “pret-tily situated mechanical village of Ettricks, which peeps over the city [of Petersburg] from the north bank of the Appomattox.”

Linneaus H. James, a carpenter, born in Virginia between 1831 and 1833, likely built Summerseat. A dwelling long rumored to have been used for some court functions, modern tradition held that the lower floor served as a jail or holding cell. But recent research reveals its association with the county courts appears to date from the 1920s through the 1950s. That’s when Judge John W. Snead periodically held magistrate’s court in Ettrick and Colonial Heights. He may have used the house during those decades for court proceedings when no other convenient public space was available.

For most of its life, Summerseat served as a residence. During the 1980s, it was repurposed as a commercial building and modified with aluminum siding and the addition of a one-story rear, a kitchen, and bathroom.

The preservation of historic buildings benefits communities, connecting us to our heritage and enriching our lives in many tangible and intangible ways. In addition to cultural and environmental benefits, preservation of historic buildings also provides demonstrable economic benefits. The federal rehabilitation tax credit (RTC) program, established in 1976, and the Virginia RTC program, established in 1997, provide property owners with compelling financial incentives to invest in their historic buildings. By leveraging private investment in historic buildings, the state rehabilitation tax credit program has made a positive visible and economic impact throughout Virginia, boosting revitalization, enhancing livability, and encouraging tourism in places urban and rural. The recycling and re-purposing of historic buildings is indeed good for Virginia’s economy.

Beginning in 2007, Virginia Commonwealth University’s L. Douglas Wilder School for Government and Public Affairs has studied the economic benefits of the rehabilitation work accomplished through Virginia’s RTC program. In their most recent report, VCU found that during the 17-year period between 1997 and 2013, $3.9 billion in economic impact was realized through the rehabilitation of 2,375 historic properties—ranging from warehouses, hotels, theaters, garages, general stores, and other commercial buildings as well as private residences found throughout Virginia. The rehabilitation tax credit and the private investment that it stimulates supported approximately 31,000 full- and part-time jobs.

The following page offers a sampling of projects from around the state since 1997.
Union Station, Bristol

Occupying a commanding position on the edge of Bristol’s commercial district, this elegant railroad station was constructed in 1902 of stone and brick in a Romanesque style. It is one of the last surviving examples of a series of outstanding structures which were designed and built by the Norfolk and Western Railway for its extensive rail system before World War I. In 2008, a restoration and repurposing using tax credits created a dynamic commercial space for banquets, weddings and other events in downtown Bristol.

The Captain Timothy Hill House, Chincoteague Island, Accomack Co.

This modest rehab project using tax credits reclaimed a community’s history, adding to its heritage tourism. Built circa 1800, the 16’x17’ one-room residence is likely the oldest surviving structure on Chincoteague. Numerous images of 19th-century cutter ships are etched, inside and out, into its hand-hewn logs. In 2010, two New Jersey-based actors who appreciated the building’s heritage and craft, preserved it as a museum, now open to the public, seasonally.

Hanover Tavern, Hanover Co.

Although the oldest part of this legendary tavern dates to 1791, a tavern on the site traces back to circa 1733. The tavern’s guests have included Patrick Henry, George Washington, and Marquis de Lafayette. Since 1990, the Hanover Tavern Foundation has committed itself to restoring the building and ensuring its continued vitality as a valuable community resource and national historic treasure. Historic rehabilitation tax credits have been key to sustaining that effort.

Mimslyn Inn, Luray, Page Co.

This Colonial Revival-style inn opened in 1931 and established itself as a popular destination for visitors from Washington D.C. and the region. However, by the late 20th-century the Mimslyn Inn had fallen on hard times and into disrepair. After new owners purchased it, they used tax credits to rehabilitate the building and re-opened it as an elegant inn, returning it to its former glory. It is once again a center of social life in Luray and the northern Shenandoah Valley.

Part III: Looking to the Future

Architectural and Archaeological Surveys on Virginia’s Coasts
Residents of Virginia’s Eastern Shore know well the price of living against ever-changing coastlines. Since the mid-19th century, half a dozen Eastern Shore communities have relocated or been abandoned as a result of hurricanes, erosion, and shifting barrier islands.1

On Mockhorn and Cedar Islands, visitors can still view deserted vacation homes slipping into the sea. Yet in the 21st century those living on the Eastern Shore, and elsewhere along the state’s coast, face an amplified threat in climate change-induced sea level rise. The stronger storms and accelerated rates of coastal inundation promised by climate change will entail a host of problems for those living in low-lying parts of Virginia, from job loss to property damage. Climate change also poses an incalculable threat to thousands of cultural resources. Many of the state’s earliest known settlements, historic summer communities, and foundational urban centers lie within high-risk flood zones and stand to suffer significant damage within the next century. As stewards of the state’s constructed past, the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (DHR) is actively working to document places imperiled by sea level rise while also spearheading efforts to prepare for the impact of climate change on the state’s diverse historical assets. The following pages details these initiatives, specifically the ongoing architectural surveys in several of the Commonwealth’s most vulnerable coastal localities.

The main risks posed to Virginia’s coast by climate change are three fold. Most commonly addressed is the incremental increase in sea level rise caused primarily by melting ice sheets in the Arctic Circle. Tidal gauges indicate that water levels in the Chesapeake Bay have risen approximately one foot since the 1930s, and conservative estimates by the Virginia Institute of Marine Sciences (VIMS) indicate a localized sea level rise of slightly more than three feet by the year 2100.2 Worst case scenarios, which incorporate accelerated ice sheet loss, estimate a rise of nearly eight feet over the same time span.3 According to a 2014 study by the nonprofit Climate Central, a moderate estimate of five-foot sea level rise by 2100 would entail inundation of over 250,000 acres in Virginia.4 Rising waters intensify and accelerate the second threat to Virginia’s coast, tidal erosion. While the wearing away of coastal land produces an immediate risk to oceanfront communities, the gradual disappearance of barrier islands—such as Assateague, Chincoteague and numerous smaller landmasses—leaves many previously sheltered areas further exposed to erosion. With higher sea levels and stronger tides, Virginia stands increasingly vulnerable to a third hazard, inclement weather. Amplified hurricane storm surges and recurrent flooding associated with regular coastal storms are already observed in the Hampton Roads area. With climate change assuring unpredictable and extreme weather patterns, the likelihood of major storm events in Virginia increases substantially.5

In considering the effect of climate change on Virginia’s built environment, even the most cautious sea level rise projections will result in considerable loss. Studies show that a five-foot sea level rise in Virginia would inundate approximately 54,000 residential properties, 67 religious buildings, and seven schools.6 Though staggering, this figure gives only a glimpse of the actual threat, as it does not include damage to other building types, structures, or sites. A five-foot sea level rise will also result in new tidal zones, and anything within this area will experience daily recurrent flooding. Even more difficult to quantify is the loss of local culture and shared identity represented by the homes, civic facilities, and other buildings within the flood zones.

Though climate change is often discussed in projections or timelines, the effects of sea level rise are already being felt along Virginia’s coast, particularly on the low-lying peninsula of the Eastern Shore. Perhaps the most widely publicized example is Tangier Island, located off the west coast of the Eastern Shore’s Accomack County and settled in the 1700s. Isolated from the mainland, those living on Tangier maintain the historic lifeways of the Virginia watermen. The island’s 727 permanent residents face threats of erosion in tandem with frequent flooding as seawater permeates through the marshy soil. A study by the Army Corps of Engineers suggests that Tangier Island may become
uninhabitable in as few as thirty-five years.7

On the Atlantic side of the Eastern Shore, NASA scientists at the Wallop’s Flight Facility—a crucial launch site and research facility active since 1945—have recorded a seven-inch sea level rise over the past sixty years. In response to accelerating coastal erosion, NASA has constructed a new beach to temporarily guard their most crucial assets.8 Directly to the north in the historic resort town of Chincoteague, the beach is eroding at an unprecedented rate of 10-to-22 feet per year.9 In an article published by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Chincoteague Mayor Jack Tarr reported that “70-to-80 percent of the town’s businesses depend on the beach,” raising questions of the town’s economic viability over the coming decades. Equally concerning is a study published in 2015 by the Accomack Northampton Planning District Commission, which suggests that the access roads to Chincoteague and more than fifty other Eastern Shore communities could be permanently submerged by 2050.10

Predictions for other parts of the Eastern Shore are just as dire. A growing number of the historic farms that once powered the area’s economy and provided fruits and vegetables for much of the Mid-Atlantic are losing acres as seawater permeates once arable fields.11 Sea level rise maps published online by VIMS show that the one-meter rise predicted by year 2100 will flood the bayside communities of Cape Charles, Saxis, and Onancock. Additionally, the climbing waters will overtake the large swaths of marshland that currently protect the peninsula from the rougher waters of the open Atlantic.12

These case studies make clear the range of cultural resources at risk from climate change on the Eastern Shore. DHR understands the necessity for immediate action to identify and protect historic places at risk from rising seas. The agency’s commitment to the matter began in the fall of 2012 with the announcement that DHR would pursue National Register of Historic Places listing for the entirety of Tangier Island. In 2013, DHR architectural historians recorded over 300 individual properties to produce a detailed documentation of the Tangier Island’s built environment and cultural history. The National Park Service approved the nomination in June of 2014. The inevitability of climate change-related impacts to historic resources was brought into sharp relief by Hurricane Sandy, which made landfall in October 2012. As Hurricane Sandy moved up the Eastern Seaboard, the storm damaged iconic sites such as Ellis Island in New York, while flooding dozens of historic beach communities along the Eastern Seaboard. Though the brunt of Hurricane Sandy’s destructive power centered on New Jersey and New York, Virginians experienced high winds, coastal flooding, and widespread power outages, leading President Obama to include Virginia as one of twelve states issued a disaster declaration in the wake of the hurricane.13 As a result, Virginia received nearly $1.5 million from the Department of the Interior’s Historic Preservation Fund to distribute as grants in the twenty-six counties and three independent cities most affected by Hurricane Sandy. DHR was charged with administering this funding, which became known as the Hurricane Sandy Disaster Relief Assistance for Historic Properties Grants Program.

Hurricane Sandy Grants enabled the DHR to launch numerous multi-year projects focused on repairing damages from Hurricane Sandy and preparing the state’s coastline for future threats. These projects include repairing historic sites that sustained damage during Hurricane Sandy, as well as field review of archaeological sites exposed by coastal erosion. Of the seventeen current initiatives that utilize Hurricane Sandy grant funding, seven consist of broad-based, reconnaissance-level architectural survey. These surveys address several needs; first, by recording the location and condition of potentially threatened properties, DHR stands better equipped to assist homeowners in the event of a natural disaster. The surveys also give an opportunity for DHR staff to publicize the necessity of incorporating historic preservation planning into disaster preparedness efforts. For town and county officials, the publicly available records produced by the surveys can serve as a valuable tool for local planning efforts.

Beginning in early 2015, DHR’s architectural survey coordinator reached out to the localities most impacted by Hurricane Sandy, compiling a list of seven high-priority surveys. These projects concentrate on areas with the increased potential for inundation or damage related to hurricanes and sea level rise. The selected localities also represented regions in which DHR architectural survey records are either sparse or outdated. The full list of survey localities

Some property owners are already taking measures to protect their historic homes from rising sea level. In the town of Saxis, several buildings have been lifted on concrete block or wooden piers.

Though often located further inland, historic buildings associated with coastal agriculture—like this potato house on the Eastern Shore—are too at risk as sea level rise inundates once-arable farm land.
listing. While all of the survey projects entail the identification of low-lying and potentially at risk properties, several also incorporate components specifically designed to better prepare a locality for future disasters. In the Town of Surry, consultants are preparing a management plan focused on stewarding the town’s historic resources before and after events including hurricanes, flooding, fire, or earthquakes. The plan will be the first of its kind in Virginia and will function as a template to assist other communities prepare for the intensifying storms and unpredictable weather patterns projected to occur with climate change.

While the survey projects encompass many of the areas affected by Hurricane Sandy, the Eastern Shore is receiving particular focus due to its vulnerability. Other projects build upon previously completed studies. In the Town of Colonial Beach, the survey will record properties in a neighborhood found eligible as a National Register historic district in 2001 but never formally nominated. The current project lays the groundwork for the Colonial Beach officials to complete a historic district listing.

During an architectural survey, consultants collect property-level data including the approximate age, style, and significant characteristics of each building, structure, or site visible from the public right of way. This property in the Northern Neck community of Lewisetta, for example, consists of an early 20th century residence, several domestic outbuildings, and a dock.

Included the counties of Accomack, Lancaster, Mathews, Middlesex, Northampton, Northumberland, and the towns of Colonial Beach, Saxis, and Surry.

In order to best meet the needs of the diverse areas where the Hurricane Sandy grant-funded projects are taking place, DHR staff collaborated with local representatives to tailor each initiative. For each of the projects that include an architectural survey element, the finished products will vary depending on the locality. In Mathews County, for example, the survey scope includes the preparation of several Preliminary Information Forms, which are used to determine National Register eligibility. Other projects build upon previously completed studies. In the Town of Colonial Beach, the survey will record properties in a neighborhood found eligible as a National Register historic district in 2001 but never formally nominated. The current project lays the groundwork for the Colonial Beach officials to complete a historic district listing.

During an architectural survey, consultants collect property-level data including the approximate age, style, and significant characteristics of each building, structure, or site visible from the public right of way. This property in the Northern Neck community of Lewisetta, for example, consists of an early 20th century residence, several domestic outbuildings, and a dock.

A second project on the Eastern Shore focuses on the Town of Saxis, a low-elevation community isolated from the mainland by large swaths of marsh. In an effort akin to the documentation of Tangier Island, DHR-hired consultants are surveying the entirety of the town and preparing a National Register of Historic Places historic district nomination form. The finished product will provide a detailed history of Saxis in addition to a catalog of the town’s constructed fabric, including such regionally distinctive elements as front yard family burial plots.
Virginia's shores are home to a variety of historic buildings related to the seafood processing industry. Reedville Oyster (R), built in 1913, in Northumberland County anchors the town's waterfront. Crabhouses, such as the one (L) on Quinby Bridge in Accomack County, date to the first half of the 20th century. While collecting information about newly identified historic resources, surveyors also update records on some previously documented properties. Reedville Oyster, was last surveyed with DHR in 1984.

and seafood processing facilities.

An essential component of the Hurricane Sandy Grant-funded surveys is public engagement. DHR views these projects as a way to communicate the agency's mission to foster interest in and stewardship of the state's built history. Each survey project includes opportunities for residents of the project area to share their ideas, concerns, or questions. In the communities with greater percentages of full-year residents, including Middlesex County and Colonial Beach, public meetings at the start of the project provided a forum for people to learn about the initiative and provide feedback. In localities with many seasonal residents, like Saxis, letters to homeowners’ primary addresses provided project information and points of contact at DHR. Perhaps the greatest allies in this effort were the many local news sources that ran articles announcing the projects. As a result of this publicity, several homeowners reached out to share local histories or to give permission for surveyors to access their property.

As of June 2016, the Hurricane Sandy Grant-funded surveys have resulted in the documentation of 1,015 historic properties. By the time the projects conclude in 2017, DHR staff anticipates that a total of 1,200 survey forms will be added to the department's publicly available archives. Through the continued recordation of coastal properties, DHR will gain a clearer image of the resources most at risk from sea level rise and stand better prepared to assist owners of historic buildings.

Fortunately, the Department of Historic Resources is not the only such agency taking action to address sea level rise and other impacts of climate change. Across the globe, historians, archaeologists, planners, and many others are developing innovative strategies for documenting and mitigating the effects of climate change on a diverse array of historic resources. In the spring of 2016, DHR sent representatives to several conferences on sea level rise and cultural heritage in order to begin developing a toolkit for Virginia's coastal resources. These summits are part of a growing dialogue on how the preservation community will respond to climate change; such discourse will continue to inform how DHR approaches the stewardship of historic resources endangered by rising seas.

Alongside the ongoing documentation through the Hurricane Sandy Grant-funded surveys, this foundational first step moves Virginia closer to a comprehensive strategy for managing our historic resources in the face of climate change.

Endnotes:
1. http://www.barrierislandscenter.org/about/barrierislands/

Blake McDonald received his Master’s in Architectural History from the University of Virginia and currently serves as a Hurricane Sandy survey assistant at DHR.
Between 1999 and 2001, I had the privilege of circumnavigating the coastlines of both Accomack and Northampton counties on Virginia’s Eastern Shore to locate, document, and record eroding archaeological sites. These two surveys (see Lowery 2001 and 2003), funded by DHR’s Threatened Sites program, documented 152 sites, increasing to 198 the known number of coastal archaeological sites in both Accomack and Northampton counties. During the years since, the shorelines of Virginia have changed—especially after Hurricane Sandy struck the eastern seaboard and the Delmarva Peninsula on October 29 and 30 in 2012. The unfortunate circumstances associated with Hurricane Sandy provided an opportunity—supported by an NPS Hurricane Sandy grant awarded to DHR—to revisit the coastal sites of Accomack and Northampton counties to assess their condition after a 15-year hiatus. In a broad sense, Hurricane Sandy alerted officials and the public to issues associated with coastal erosion and flooding, and sea level change, natural processes independent of the other.

Erosion, an ongoing process, occurs where land and water intersect. It varies from place to place depending on the exposure, the fetch (the distance that wind travels across water), and the geology at any given shoreline. Erosion is not unique to the 21st century. There are countless islands in the Chesapeake Bay that are no longer with us. Many of which once contained a significant archaeological record. The history of one such now-vanished island, originally documented by Capt. John Smith, provides a superb example.

In 1612, the island was situated at the mouth of the Choptank River in Maryland, a southern extension of the “Winston’s Isles,” as depicted on John Smith’s Map of Virginia. The island consisted of at least 1,500 acres of land in 1631, when William Claiborne claimed and named it after himself. By 1634, the island lost its original Virginia pedigree when Lord Baltimore established the Maryland colony, which encompassed the upper portion of the Chesapeake Bay. In 1664, Peter Sharp, a Quaker surgeon, acquired the island. Upon his death in 1672, Sharp deeded “Claborn’s Island,” which encompassed roughly 1,400 acres of land to his eldest son, William. Sharp’s Island, as it was thereafter known, by 1809 totaled only 700 acres. At that time, the Valliant family possessed the island and it was reported that “great fields of wheat” and “flocks of grazing sheep” could easily be seen from the mainland. An 1846 U.S. Coastal Survey provides the first glimpse into the historic structures once located on this landmass, which at the survey’s date had dwindled, again, to about 438 acres. (See maps, opposite page.) All the same, the island boasted tilled fields, a forest, orchard, hunting blinds, three structures, a sand beach, and a fringe of tidal marsh located along its southern and eastern margins.

By 1900, another U.S. Coastal Survey indicates that Sharp’s Island encompassed only 91 acres, representing a loss of over four-and-a-half acres per year since Claiborne’s claim. In 1910, J. Fred Hunter of the U.S. Geologic Survey mapped Sharp’s and noted that it had some 53 acres of abandoned upland and tidal marsh. Hunter surveyed Sharp’s Island to better understand the rapid erosion and coastal land loss seen at the mouth of the Choptank River. He wanted to investigate public concerns that the “Chesapeake Bay bottom was sinking” and the waters were rising, a familiar concern today. Hunter observed an historic well, which had been transgressed by waves, in the midst of the bay waters. He also noted the island’s trees had disappeared save for a meager half dozen and the houses had washed away, and all that remained was a large abandoned hotel, alone in the center of the island. Finally, he commented that the northern part of the island consisted of silt-loam and rose out of the marsh remnant as it appeared in 1946; the pilings of a steamboat wharf are visible in the lower left corner. Above: By 1961, the island had completely disappeared. A navigation chart of the area delineates the submerged pilings and defines the former island location as the “Sharps Island Obstruction.” (Author images)
the water as much as seven feet.

As a geologist, Hunter understood coastal processes. He wrote.

the marshland is withstand the force of the waves much more effectively than the rest of the island and will doubtless be the last to disappear.

By September 1946, the U.S. Navy was using Sharp’s Island as a bombing site (top photo, p. 65). At this time, all that remained was the southeastern portion of the once-majestic island, including a meager 5-acre lump of tidal marsh. Importantly, without evoking any concept of sea level rise, Hunter in 1914 had predicted that Sharp’s Island would disappear as a result of erosion sometime between 1950 and 1955. By 1956, the vestiges of Sharp’s Island (map, p. 65), once part of John Smith’s “Winston’s Isles” and William Claiborne’s upper bay Virginia fur trading adventure, ultimately succumbed to the impacts of wave energy and tide-related erosion.

Aside from the historical structures and features that occupied the upland portion of Sharp’s Island, the area also had a prehistoric presence when global sea levels were much lower. A local newspaper reported on December 26, 1947 that “numerous arrowheads found on Sharp’s Island” indicate the presence of a large Choptank Indian village. Tangible clues about the prehistoric use of the island exist in a few surviving arrowhead collections amassed between 1938 and 1946 (above). However, no prehistoric or historic archaeological features associated with Sharp’s Island survived the perils of wave energy. Notably, Sharp’s Island did not sink. The late Pleistocene through late Holocene geology and archaeology of Sharp’s Island were bulldozed away by the hourly onslaught of waves and the diurnal movement of tides. The historic and prehistoric archeological sites that once dotted this island landscape are not submerged; these sites have been destroyed by erosion.

The situation noted at Sharp’s Island is repeating itself at many locations around the Chesapeake Bay. Nowhere is this more evident than at Watt’s Island in Accomack County. On John Smith’s 1612 map, Watt’s is part of the amalgamation of islands he named “The Russell Isles” situated at the confluence of both the Tangier and Pocomoke sounds. Like the setting of Sharp’s, Watt’s Island now stands as a lone sentinel amidst a vast body of open Chesapeake Bay water. Though topographically lower, the geology and natural processes impacting Watt’s Island mimic those reported by Hunter at Sharp’s Island in 1914.

I initially examined Watt’s Island in 1999 as part of the archaeological survey funded by DHR’s Threatened Sites program. Six archaeological sites were recorded based on features and artifacts exposed along the shoreline (right, middle image). These sites revealed numerous diagnostic circa 13,000- to 500-year old Paleoindian through Woodland period prehistoric artifacts (right, top). Colonial artifacts and features spanning the 17th through 19th centuries were also observed. The island then measured 2,367 meters (7,763 feet) in length and encompassed two linear upland forested ridges surrounded by a tidal marsh and open water. Over the years, I have periodically inspected and photographed these archaeological sites as wave energy dismantled them. By 2013, only three of the original six sites remained (above). Wave and tidal erosion completely destroyed the others.

Watt’s Island now consists of only one linear upland forested ridge, it’s length diminished to 1,623 meters (5,323 feet); a net loss of 744 meters (2440 feet) over a 14-year period. As Hunter would have understood, the marshland of Watt’s Island has withstood the force of wave energy much more effectively than the upland ridges. However, only a thin veneer of tidal marsh partially encompasses the last upland ridge on Watt’s. The remaining...
three archaeological sites (above) represent a crumbling remnant documenting the human activities once associated with this imposing island. When the protective veneer of tidal marsh disappears, the exposed upland will rapidly melt into the bay. Given the rates of observed erosion, I predict that Watt’s Island will disappear within the next decade or by 2025.

The NPS funding allocated as a byproduct of Hurricane Sandy has provided a welcome opportunity (despite various field hazards such as biting insects, sharks, and sting rays!) to reexamine the Atlantic and Chesapeake coastlines of Accomack and Northampton counties. The primary goal of the recently completed survey was to assess the condition of all archaeological sites adjacent to the shorelines in the two counties. After examining over 1,100 linear miles of shoreline, my research fieldwork has been completed and I am now preparing a final report. But my field research is a somber reminder about the inherent vulnerability of archaeological sites located along active coastlines. Of the known 243 archaeological sites previously identified and documented during the 2015 survey, 35 have been completely lost to erosion over the past 15 years, including the three associated with Watt’s Island. Unfortunately, erosion continues long after a shoreline survey is completed. Some protected landforms (e.g., forested hummocks) once situated inland of the coastline in 1999 and 2001 are now actively eroding. Consequently, 45 previously unknown archaeological sites were exposed and documented during the 2015 survey. Subtracting the 35 losses from the previous total, there is a net gain of ten newly identified archaeological sites for these two counties.

By using geo-referenced satellite images for the period spanning 1999 and 2015, I was able to calculate the annual amount of erosion or land loss for each of the 243 sites. Ten percent of the sites (24) are associated with stable and largely non-erosive shorelines. Even with these stable sites included in the measured sample, the average annual erosion for all the coastal sites in Accomack and Northampton counties is 1.92 meters or 6.3 feet per year.

The rapidity of archaeological site loss within these coastal settings is, indeed, staggering. On October 31, 2014, for example, the remnants of a prehistoric burial feature were observed along the eroding shoreline at one Accomack site. (Like Watt’s Island, the site is within a large tract of public-ally-owned and managed land.) But only 42 days later, when DHR’s state archaeologist Dr. Mike Barber visited the site, the burial feature had completely washed away. Significantly, coastal erosion, not sea level rise, was the culprit that dismantled this prehistoric burial—showing the greatest threat to archaeological resources along the margins of the Chesapeake Bay is the Chesapeake Bay. With respect to shoreline archaeological sites, as the saying goes, “time and tide wait for no man.” As a young child growing up on Tilghman Island, my father used that phrase on numerous occasions. The small collection of artifacts he amassed from Sharp’s Island as a child (top, p. 66) now represents the only extant tangible clue as to the human use of this now-vanished island landscape. Nonetheless, I remain ever hopeful that cultural resource managers and concerned government agencies will begin to address the magnitude of archaeological site loss along the region’s coastlines.
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- 19 historic districts are NHLs

Historic rehabilitation tax credit projects since 1977**: 3,203
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More than 600 easements are held or co-held by the Virginia Board of Historic Resources and administered by DHR staff, covering roughly 40,000 acres and 210 town/city "lots."*** These easements include more than 12,000 acres of battlefield lands since the program began.

Resources inventoried (as of June, 2016):
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Unpublished cultural resource management reports:
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**Year the federal RTC program began; state RTC began in 1997.

***The total number of easements and acreage is approximate because throughout the 50-year history of the program, the number of easements recorded has been tallied differently. Also, prior to 2008, the program tracked easements on city lots by using the term "lots" rather than applying an actual acreage to the property. These lots are usually small—less than 1 acre. Since 2008, DHR has tracked newly recorded easements by the actual acreage (e.g. 0.25 acres or 0.69 acre) rather than using the term "lots."
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