

## MARYLAND

Park Operational Base Summary: The table below shows the annual park operating base for all parks within this state. Park operational base funds are supplemented by as yet undetermined amounts of project funding from regional or servicewide-managed programs, such as cyclic maintenance, the Natural Resources Preservation Program, and the Drug Enforcement Program.

If a park is in more than one state, the park is included in each of the appropriate state tables. The full operating base is shown; no attempt has been made to split the park operating base amount between two or more states.

Congress'l District Park Units	(dollars in thousands)				
	FY 2001 Enacted	FY 2002 Enacted	FY 2003 Uncontrol Changes	FY 2003 Program Changes	FY 2003 Estimate
04 Accokeek Foundation	599	599	0	0	599
04 Alice Ferguson Foundation	200	200	0	0	200
06 Antietam NB	2,156	2,457	27	-11	2,473
01 Assateague Island NS	3,142	3,220	52	-22	3,250
05 Baltimore-Washington Parkway	1,270	1,276	13	-6	1,283
06 Catoctin Mountain Park	2,121	2,331	28	-12	2,347
06,08 Chesapeake & Ohio Canal NHP	7,207	7,611	89	636	8,336
08 Clara Barton NHS	200	496	1	-1	496
03 Fort McHenry NM & Historic Shrine	1,609	1,640	21	-9	1,652
04 Fort Washington Park	699	877	12	-5	884
08 George Washington Mem Parkway	9,488	9,832	101	-43	9,890
05 Greenbelt Park	864	874	12	-5	881
02 Hampton NHS	651	664	8	297	969
06 Harpers Ferry NHP	5,626	5,749	79	-33	5,795
06 Monocacy NB	597	717	7	210	934
04,05 Piscataway Park	488	484	0	0	484
00 Potomac Heritage NST	200	198	0	0	198
05 Thomas Stone NHS	589	596	5	-2	599

For FY 2003, Program Changes include increases contained in park operations and for counter-terrorism activities. Program Changes are reduced for travel and associated costs by implementing management reforms to achieve savings.

This table does not include programs from other appropriations such as General Management Plans, Land Acquisition, Line Item Construction, Federal Lands Highway Program, and Historic Preservation Fund State Grants. Information on the distribution of funds in these programs is outlined on the next page. There are separate sections on General Management Plans and the Trails Management Program.

## MARYLAND

### **Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park; District of Columbia, Maryland and West Virginia**

#### **\$674,000 to Protect Park Resources and Visitors**

Funding is requested to expand the park's visitor and resource protection program. Urbanization of surrounding areas has created an urgent need for additional law enforcement capability to combat increasing threats to the park's 1,275 historic structures, 220 archeological sites, and unique natural and cultural resources. Incidents detected annually include encroachments, disturbances to archeological sites, vandalism, poaching, and dumping. Funding would be used to increase patrol frequency of park areas, including river patrols. Increased patrols would improve visitor safety and resource protection.

### **Hampton National Historic Site, Maryland**

#### **\$300,000 to Increase Resource Protection and Visitor Services Programs**

Funding is requested to protect and maintain 45 historic structures; historic gardens, 62 acres of designed cultural landscape, and museum objects valued at over \$15 million. A number of classified structures are unsafe due to rotting floors, inadequate support, and infestations caused by animals and mold. Funding would provide the ability to inventory and monitor the resources, and to repair and maintain roads and trails. In addition, funding would allow the park to increase its support of partnership activities, special park uses and events. These improvements would allow the park to reach a more diverse audience, and increase visitor satisfaction.

### **Monocacy National Battlefield, Maryland**

#### **\$121,000 to Provide Cultural Resource Management for New Area**

Funding is requested to establish a cultural resource management program. Since its opening in 1991, the park has doubled in size. The creation of a cultural resource management program would ensure the continued preservation of the battlefield. Preservation would be accomplished by completing and updating cultural resource inventories, monitoring resource conditions, stabilizing and repairing historic structures, and improving the management of a growing museum collection. The cultural management program would preserve and protect thirty historic structures and numerous archeological sites.

#### **\$92,000 to Enhance Natural Resources Management**

Funding is requested to enhance natural resource management. Funding would enable the park to manage an extensive number of exotic and invasive species, monitor known endangered plants, and complete its inventory of plants and animals. The battlefield would establish effective management strategies for invasive plants, white-tailed deer, the reduction of resource degradation, and monitoring of water quality. An enhanced program would also enable the park to increase watershed protection activities and riparian buffer zone management in support of Chesapeake Bay preservation initiatives. All identified natural resource data sets would be acquired and exotic vegetation controlled more effectively.

**MARYLAND**  
(dollars in thousands)

**PROGRAMS NOT INCLUDED IN PARK BASE:**

GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLANS (See GMP section for further information)

<u>Park Area</u>	<u>Type of Project</u>
Chesapeake Bay Sites	Ongoing Study
Harriet Tubman Sites	Ongoing Study
Monocacy NB	Ongoing Project

LAND ACQUISITION

<u>Park Area</u>	<u>Remarks</u>	<u>Funds</u>
Piscataway Park	21 acres	\$500

CONSTRUCTION: LINE ITEM CONSTRUCTION (see attached)

<u>Park Area</u>	<u>Type of Project</u>	<u>Funds</u>
Fort Washington Park	Repair/rehab structures & features	\$3,384

PROPOSED FEDERAL LANDS HIGHWAY PROGRAM

<u>Park Area</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>Funds</u>
Assateague Island NS	Overlay North Beach Road	\$2,460
Chesapeake & Ohio Canal NHP	Resurface Great Falls entrance road	\$1,500

HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND: STATE GRANTS

State apportionment: \$751

STATE CONSERVATION GRANTS

Proposed state apportionment: \$2,908

(Does not include \$48,600,000 for Cooperative Conservation Initiative, which will be distributed to the states through national competition.)

**Land Acquisition and State Assistance/Federal Land Acquisition**

**Fiscal Year 2003 National Park Service Federal Land Acquisition Program**

Program or Park Area: **Piscataway Park**

National Park Service Land Acquisition Priority (FY03): Priority No. 15

Location: Across Potomac River from Mount Vernon.

State/County/Congressional District: State of Maryland/Charles and Prince George's Counties/Congressional District No. 5

Land Acquisition Limitation Amount Remaining: None. The over-ceiling authority of Public Law 95-42 would permit the requested appropriation.

Cost Detail: The estimated annual operating costs associated with this acquisition are \$0.097 million

Date	Acres	Total Amount
FY 2003 Request	21	<b>\$500</b>
Future Funding Need	0	0

The total amount includes the cost of title, appraisal, environmental site assessment, acquisition, and relocation assistance.

Improvements: Residential

Description: Piscataway Park was established by Congress on October 4, 1961, and through subsequent amendments to the Act of that date. The purpose of the park is to preserve lands in the State of Maryland comprising the principal viewshed from the Mount Vernon Estate and Fort Washington across the Potomac River. Such preservation will ensure the natural beauty of such land as it existed at the time of the construction and active use of Mount Vernon Mansion and Fort Washington.

Natural/Cultural Resources Associated with Proposal: The park preserves the tranquil view from Mount Vernon of the Maryland shore of the Potomac.

Threat: An analysis completed in 1991 revealed that 98 percent of the viewshed outside the boundaries of Piscataway Park could be protected by local low density zoning which currently controls building heights. The analysis also revealed that several parcels of land, if developed in any way under existing zoning regulations, would intrude on this otherwise completely protected viewshed.

Need: The tract to be acquired is located directly across the Potomac River from Mount Vernon. Though the United States presently owns a scenic easement interest in the property, the easement does not preclude further subdivision. Acquisition of the remaining interest is necessary to prevent further development that would detract from the historic viewshed. *Acquisition of this land will contribute to the NPS GPRA Goal 1a Preserve Natural and Cultural Resources and to Goal IIa Provide for Visitor Safety and Satisfaction.*

Interaction with Landowners and Partners: Several non-profit groups, including the Mount Vernon Ladies Association, the Trust for Public Lands, The National Park Trust, and The Accokeek Foundation have expressed a willingness to assist with this acquisition. The owners have indicated willingness to consider sale of the property. The local community, non-profit groups, and members of the Maryland Congressional delegation have endorsed efforts by the National Park Service to acquire and protect this property.

**Construction and Major Maintenance/Line Item Construction and Maintenance**

**National Park Service  
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

<b>Project Score/Ranking:</b>	670
<b>Funding FY:</b>	2003
<b>Funding Source:</b>	Line Item Construction

**Project Identification**

<b>Project Title:</b> Repair/Rehab Structural Buildings and Features At Fort Washington Park		
<b>Project No:</b> 21937	<b>Unit/Facility Name:</b> Fort Washington Park	
<b>Region:</b> National Capital	<b>Congressional District:</b> 04	<b>State:</b> Maryland

**Project Justification**

<p><b>Project Description:</b> Fort Washington Park was established in 1930. There are no other coastal fortifications of this size and design within the metropolitan D.C. area. The present fort was designed by Pierre Charles L'Enfant and was completed in 1824. The lack of adequate preventive maintenance, weathering, storm damage, aging and other deteriorating factors have left the buildings and structures of Fort Washington in desolate condition. This project proposal is for the funding of repairs of the historic wood, brick, masonry and metal structures, features and buildings within Fort Washington. This will include the Main Gate, the Enlisted Men's Barracks, the Officer's Quarters, the Casemates, and the Powder Magazine.</p>								
<p><b>Project Need/Benefit:</b> With its commanding view of the Potomac River, this fort is the best example of 19th century American Coastal Fortification remaining in the United States. It is the only masonry fort built prior to the Civil War for the protection of the Nation's Capital. More than 268,000 visitors came to the park in 2000. Engineering reports, architectural evaluations and soil analysis reveal severe undermining of the walls and foundation due to the non-existent drainage system. The continual water penetration and pressure under the walls coupled with the extremely high volume and speed of water cascading along the walls and down the embankment further exacerbate the escalating erosion and structural failure. If these corrective measures are not undertaken, a large and very visible portion of this fort will be lost and an even greater portion of the adjoining structures will be de-stabilized, and visitors and employees will be endangered.</p>								
<p><b>Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need.</b></p> <table> <tr> <td>20% Critical Health or Safety Deferred</td> <td>30% Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0% Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td> <td>0% Compliance &amp; Other Deferred Maintenance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>50% Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td> <td>0% Other Capital Improvement</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0% Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	20% Critical Health or Safety Deferred	30% Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance	0% Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement	0% Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance	50% Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance	0% Other Capital Improvement	0% Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement	
20% Critical Health or Safety Deferred	30% Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance							
0% Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement	0% Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance							
50% Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance	0% Other Capital Improvement							
0% Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement								
<p><b>Capital Asset Planning 300B Required: YES: NO: x</b></p>	<p><b>Total Project Score: 670</b></p>							

*Project Costs and Status*

<p><b>Project Cost Estimate:</b></p> <table> <tr> <td></td> <td>\$'s</td> <td>%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Deferred Maintenance Work :</td> <td>\$ 4084000</td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Capital Improvement Work:</td> <td>\$ 0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total Project Estimate:</b></td> <td><b>\$ 4084000</b></td> <td><b>100</b></td> </tr> </table> <p>Class of Estimate: c Estimate Good Until: 09/30/02</p> <p><b>Dates:</b> Sch'd (qtr/yy) Construction Start/Award 1 / 2003 Project Complete: 4 / 2003</p>		\$'s	%	Deferred Maintenance Work :	\$ 4084000	100	Capital Improvement Work:	\$ 0		<b>Total Project Estimate:</b>	<b>\$ 4084000</b>	<b>100</b>	<p><b>Project Funding History:</b></p> <table> <tr> <td>Appropriated to Date:</td> <td>\$ 700,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Requested in FY 2003 Budget:</td> <td>\$ 3,384,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Required to Complete Project:</td> <td>\$ 0</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Project Total:</b></td> <td><b>\$ 4,084,000</b></td> </tr> </table> <p>Project Data Sheet Prepared/Last Updated: 2/10/02</p>	Appropriated to Date:	\$ 700,000	Requested in FY 2003 Budget:	\$ 3,384,000	Required to Complete Project:	\$ 0	<b>Project Total:</b>	<b>\$ 4,084,000</b>	<p>Unchanged Since Departmental Approval: YES: x NO:</p>
	\$'s	%																				
Deferred Maintenance Work :	\$ 4084000	100																				
Capital Improvement Work:	\$ 0																					
<b>Total Project Estimate:</b>	<b>\$ 4084000</b>	<b>100</b>																				
Appropriated to Date:	\$ 700,000																					
Requested in FY 2003 Budget:	\$ 3,384,000																					
Required to Complete Project:	\$ 0																					
<b>Project Total:</b>	<b>\$ 4,084,000</b>																					