



# *Update to the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission Report on the Nation's Civil War Battlefields*

## *State of South Carolina*

Washington, DC  
December 2010



# *Update to the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission Report on the Nation's Civil War Battlefields*

## *State of South Carolina*

U.S. Department of the Interior  
National Park Service  
American Battlefield Protection Program

Washington, DC  
December 2010

### **Authority**

The American Battlefield Protection Program Act of 1996, as amended by the Civil War Battlefield Preservation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-359, 111 Stat. 3016, 17 December 2002), directs the Secretary of the Interior to update the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission (CWSAC) *Report on the Nation's Civil War Battlefields*.

### **Acknowledgments**

**NPS Project Team** Paul Hawke, Project Leader; Kathleen Madigan, Survey Coordinator; Tanya Gossett and January Ruck, Reporting; Matthew Borders, Historian; Kristie Kendall, Program Assistant

**Battlefield Surveyor(s)** Matthew Borders, Shannon Davis, and Kathleen Madigan, American Battlefield Protection Program

**Respondents** Daniel Bell, South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism; Robert Dodson and Rick Dorrance, Fort Sumter National Monument; Rick Hatcher, Charles Pinckney National Historic Site; Brian Long, South Carolina Department of Natural Resources; Bill Stephen and Robert Williams, Friends of Rivers Bridge; Stephen Wise, University of South Carolina

Cover: View from Morris Island (with jettie in the foreground) of the Atlantic Ocean shipping channel approach to Charleston Harbor. This approach is part of the Study Area for **Charleston Harbor I, Charleston Harbor II, Fort Sumter I, Fort Sumter II, Fort Wagner I, and Fort Wagner II**. Photograph by Kathleen Madigan, 2009.

# Table of Contents

<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>SYNOPSIS.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>METHOD STATEMENT.....</b>	<b>8</b>
RESEARCH AND FIELD SURVEYS .....	8
QUESTIONNAIRES .....	11
<b>SUMMARY OF CONDITIONS OF SOUTH CAROLINA’S CIVIL WAR BATTLEFIELDS.....</b>	<b>13</b>
QUANTIFIED LAND AREAS .....	13
CONDITION ASSESSMENTS .....	14
REGISTRATION .....	18
STEWARDSHIP .....	20
PUBLIC ACCESS AND INTERPRETATION.....	23
LOCAL ADVOCACY .....	24
<b>INDIVIDUAL BATTLEFIELD PROFILES .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>65</b>
APPENDIX A. CIVIL WAR BATTLEFIELD LAND ACQUISITION GRANTS.....	65
APPENDIX B. AMERICAN BATTLEFIELD PROTECTION PROGRAM PLANNING GRANTS .....	66
APPENDIX C. CIVIL WAR BATTLEFIELD PRESERVATION ACT OF 2002 .....	67
APPENDIX D. BATTLEFIELD QUESTIONNAIRE .....	70

## Introduction

The information in this report fulfills, in part, the purposes of the Civil War Battlefield Preservation Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-359, 111 Stat. 3016). Those purposes are:

- 1) to act quickly and proactively to preserve and protect nationally significant Civil War battlefields through conservation easements and fee-simple purchases of those battlefields from willing sellers; and
- 2) to create partnerships among state and local governments, regional entities, and the private sector to preserve, conserve, and enhance nationally significant Civil War battlefields.

The Civil War Battlefield Preservation Act of 2002 directs the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the American Battlefield Protection Program (ABPP) of the National Park Service, to update the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission (CWSAC) *Report on the Nation's Civil War Battlefields*. The CWSAC was established by Congress in 1991 and published its report in 1993. Congress provided funding for this update in FY2005 and FY2007. Congress asked that the updated report reflect the following:

- Preservation activities carried out at the 384 battlefields identified by the CWSAC during the period between 1993 and the update;
- Changes in the condition of the battlefields during that period; and
- Any other relevant developments relating to the battlefields during that period.

In accordance with the legislation, this report presents information about Civil War battlefields in South Carolina for use by Congress, federal, state, and local government agencies, landowners, and other interest groups. Other state reports will be issued as surveys and analyses are completed.

Figure 1. CWSAC battlefields in South Carolina.



## Synopsis

There are 11 CWSAC battlefields in the State of South Carolina – **Charleston Harbor I, Charleston Harbor II, Fort Sumter I, Fort Sumter II, Fort Wagner I, Fort Wagner II, Grimball’s Landing, Honey Hill, Rivers’ Bridge, Secessionville,** and **Simmon’s Bluff**. Historically, these battlefields encompassed more than 34,600 acres of land and water.<sup>1</sup> Today, more than 19,500 acres (57 percent of the battlefield Study Areas) survive, retaining sufficient significance and integrity to make the battlefields worthy of preservation.<sup>2</sup>

At present, more than 4,800 acres of land have been permanently protected at these battlefields. While this figure seems to represent a condition where only 25 percent of the state’s battlefield land retains integrity, it is important to keep in mind that the Study Area and PotNR boundaries for the six battles that took place in Charleston Harbor are mostly comprised of water. Moreover, much of the land and water associated with the Civil War battles of South Carolina overlap geographically. Under such circumstances, these 4,800 acres represent a healthy effort to preserve the state’s battlefield landscapes.

The battlefield land that is currently preserved in South Carolina has been protected through the efforts of local, state, and federal government stewards. The South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism is responsible for preserving more than 320 acres at **Rivers’ Bridge** within the boundaries of Rivers Bridge State Historic Site.<sup>3</sup> The South Carolina Department of Natural Resources (SCDNR) administers the Fort Johnson site, portions of which fall within the boundaries of **Charleston Harbor I, Charleston Harbor II, Fort Sumter I, Fort Sumter II,** and **Secessionville**. The SCDNR also administers the Fort Lamar Heritage Preserve, which protects segments of **Grimball’s Landing** and **Secessionville**. A third state agency – the South Carolina Ports Authority – preserves a small portion of **Fort Sumter I** at the harbor shoal where the 1808 fortification, Castle Pinckney, is located.

The National Park Service manages more than 220 acres of battlefield land at Fort Sumter and Fort Moultrie. These holdings lie within the boundaries of each one of the six Civil War battles fought in Charleston Harbor. Locally, the City of Charleston protects almost 130 acres within the boundaries of the six Charleston Harbor battlefields, and the Charleston County Parks and Recreation Commission protects an additional 82 acres at **Fort Wagner I**.

Private non-profit organizations also protect battlefield land in the state through fee simple ownership. The South Carolina Battleground Preservation Trust protects portions of **Charleston Harbor II, Fort Sumter II,** and **Fort Wagner II** at its Battery Cheves property, as well as two smaller parcels – one within the boundaries of **Secessionville**, and the third falling within the boundaries of **Fort Sumter II, Fort Wagner II,** and **Grimball’s Landing**.

The Charleston Museum protects portions of the **Grimball’s Landing** and **Secessionville** battlefields within the boundaries of Dill Sanctuary, and the John Preston Frost Nature Preserve protects a portion of the **Fort Wagner II** battlefield at its Fiddler’s Green parcel.

---

<sup>1</sup>Using GIS, and accounting for overlapping areas, ABPP calculated that the Study Areas for the 11 battlefields in South Carolina represent 34,620.83 acres.

<sup>2</sup>Using GIS, and accounting for overlapping areas, ABPP calculated that the Potential National Register Boundaries for the battlefields of South Carolina represent 19,592.89 acres.

<sup>3</sup>The total acreage of the Rivers Bridge State Historic Site is 390 acres, however, only 320 acres of that park is included within the boundaries of the ABPP’s **Rivers’ Bridge** Study Area. Although the additional property is not an area where combatant fought, it is the site where Confederate soldiers who died during the battle were reinterred in 1876.

Although these sites are not preserved specifically for their association with the Civil War, their mission and use are compatible with the goals of historic landscape preservation.

While fee purchase has proven to be a successful method for protecting battlefield land in South Carolina, preservation easements have become a powerful and increasingly popular alternative in recent years. The Lowcountry Open Land Trust has preserved almost 2,400 acres of battlefield land through the purchase of preservation easements. The Trust for Public Land also holds easements on battlefield land in South Carolina (at **Charleston Harbor I, Charleston Harbor II, Fort Sumter I, Fort Sumter II, Fort Wagner I, and Fort Wagner II**), as does the South Carolina Heritage Trust (at **Fort Wagner I**).

In 1993, the CWSAC used a four-tiered system that combined historic significance, current condition, and level of threat to determine priorities for preservation among the battlefields. Table 1 indicates how the CWSAC prioritized South Carolina’s Civil War battlefields in its study.

One of South Carolina’s battlefields ranked among the nation’s top priorities for preservation, two ranked as battlefields where comprehensive preservation could be achieved, and six ranked as battlefields needing additional protection. The CWSAC considered two battlefields – **Fort Wagner I** and **Fort Wagner II** – to be fragmented/destroyed.

<b>Table 1. CWSAC Preservation Priorities from 1993</b>		
<b>CWSAC Priority</b>	<b>Battlefield</b>	<b>County/City</b>
<b>I Critical Need</b>	Secessionville (SC002)	City of Charleston/Charleston County
<b>II Comprehensive Preservation Possible</b>	Grimball’s Landing (SC006) Honey Hill (SC010)	City of Charleston Jasper County
<b>III Additional Protection Needed</b>	Charleston Harbor I (SC004) Charleston Harbor II (SC009) Fort Sumter I (SC001) Fort Sumter II (SC008) Rivers’ Bridge (SC011) Simmon’s Bluff	Charleston County Charleston County Charleston County City of Charleston Bamberg County City of Charleston
<b>IV Fragmented/Destroyed</b>	Fort Wagner I (SC005) Fort Wagner II (SC007)	City of Charleston City of Charleston

Today, **Secessionville**, which was identified as a Priority I landscape in 1993, is no longer an intact battlefield and does not retain historic integrity as a landscape.

With 63 percent of the **Grimball’s Landing** Study Area and 79 percent of the **Honey Hill** Study Area intact, the two battlefields ranked as Priority II landscapes in 1993 retain significant historic integrity today.

Of the CWSAC’s six Priority III battlefields, 100 percent of the **Rivers’ Bridge** Study Area remains intact. Although **Fort Sumter I**, with 90 percent of its Study Area intact, and **Charleston Harbor I**, with 88 percent of its Study Area intact, seem to follow closely

behind **Rivers' Bridge**, it is important to note that most of the battlefield area associated with these two harbor battlefields is water. The same is true of **Fort Sumter II** (with 63 percent of the Study Area remaining intact) and **Charleston Harbor II** (with 54 percent of the Study Area remaining intact). The **Simmon's Bluff** battlefield is no longer intact and does not retain any integrity.

While the CWSAC originally determined that **Fort Sumter II**, **Fort Wagner I**, and **Fort Wagner II** did not retain sufficient integrity to merit preservation, reevaluation of these battlefields by the ABPP resulted in different conclusions. Upon reassessment of primary source documentation, the ABPP determined the 1993 study did not include the full extent of the historical boundaries for **Fort Wagner I** and **Fort Wagner II**. Field surveys of these additional areas by the ABPP revealed the existence of historic features and a small amount of intact land. More than 82 percent of **Fort Wagner I** and more than 51 percent of **Fort Wagner II** retain integrity. Again, most of the Study Area associated with these two battlefields is water.

Based on its findings, the ABPP considers nine of the South Carolina's battlefields to be candidates for protection. See the Individual Battlefield Profiles for detailed condition assessments and preservation recommendations. The National Park Service will issue updated priorities after all CWSAC battlefields nationwide have been surveyed and all state reports have been completed.



Figure 2. The wetlands to the west of Morris Island are typical of the landscape found within the Study Areas of **Charleston Harbor II**, **Fort Sumter II**, **Fort Wagner I**, **Fort Wagner II**, and **Grimball's Landing**. Photograph by Matthew Borders, 2009.

## Method Statement

Congress instructed the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the American Battlefield Protection Program (ABPP), to report on changes in the condition of the battlefields since 1993 and on “preservation activities” and “other relevant developments” carried out at each battlefield since 1993. To fulfill those assignments, the ABPP 1) conducted a site survey of each battlefield, and 2) prepared and sent out questionnaires to battlefield managers and advocacy organizations (see Appendix D).

The 1993 significance rankings for each battlefield stand. Significance was assigned by the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission and the ABPP sustains the CWSAC’s opinions as to the relevant importance of each battle within the larger context of the war.

## Research and Field Surveys

The ABPP conducted the field assessments of South Carolina battlefields in 2008. The surveys entailed additional historical research, on-the-ground documentation and assessment of site conditions, identification of impending threats to each site, and site mapping. Surveyors used a Global Positioning System (GPS) receiver to map historic features of each battlefield and used a Geographic Information System (GIS) program to draw site boundaries. The ABPP retains all final survey materials. Each battlefield survey file includes a survey form (field notes, list of defining features, list of documentary sources, and a photo log), photographs, spatial coordinates of significant features, and boundaries described on USGS topographic maps. The surveys did not include archeological investigations for reasons of time and expense.

## Study Areas and Core Areas

The CWSAC established a Study Area and a Core Area for each of South Carolina’s principal battlefields in 1993 (see Figure 3 for definitions). The CWSAC boundaries have proven invaluable as guides to local land and resource preservation efforts at Civil War battlefields. Since 1993, however, the National Park Service has refined its battlefield survey methodology, which include research, working with site stewards, identifying and documenting lines of approach and withdrawal used by opposing forces, and applying the concepts of military terrain analysis to all battlefield landscapes. The ABPP’s *Battlefield Survey Manual* explains the field methods employed during this study.<sup>4</sup> The surveys also incorporate the concepts recommended in the National Register of Historic Places’ *Guidelines for Identifying, Evaluating, and Registering America’s Historic Battlefields*, which was published in 1992 after the CWSAC completed its original assessments of the battlefields.<sup>5</sup>

Using its refined methodology, the ABPP was able to validate or adjust the CWSAC’s Study Area and Core Area boundaries to reflect more accurately the full nature and original resources of these battlefields (see Table 2). At many of South Carolina’s surveyed battlefields, the refined methodology resulted in significant increases in the size of Study Areas, Core Areas, or both. It is important to note, however, that the Study Area and Core Area boundaries are simply historical boundaries that describe where the battle took place; neither indicates the current integrity of the battlefield landscape, so neither can be used on its own to identify surviving portions of battlefield land that may merit protection and preservation.

---

<sup>4</sup> American Battlefield Protection Program, “Battlefield Survey Manual,” (Washington, DC: National Park Service, revised 2007).

<sup>5</sup> National Register Bulletin 40, *Guidelines for Identifying, Evaluating, and Registering America’s Historic Battlefields*, 1992, Revised 1999 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Interagency Resources Division).

### **Potential National Register Boundaries**

To address the question of what part of the battlefield remains reasonably intact and warrants preservation, this study introduced a third boundary line that was not attempted by the CWSAC: the Potential National Register boundary (see Figure 3).

Looking at each Study Area, the surveyors assigned PotNR boundaries where they judged that the landscape retained enough integrity to convey the significance of the historic battle. In a few cases, the PotNR boundary encompasses the entire Study Area. In most cases, however, the PotNR boundary includes less land than identified in the full Study Area.

In assigning PotNR boundaries, the ABPP followed National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) guidelines when identifying and mapping areas that retain integrity and cohesion within the Study Areas.<sup>6</sup> Because the ABPP focuses only on areas of battle, however, the Program did not evaluate lands adjacent to the Study Area that may contribute to a broader historical and chronological definition of “cultural landscape.” Lands outside of the Study Area associated with other historic events and cultural practices may need to be evaluated in preparation for a formal nomination of the cultural landscape.

Most importantly, the PotNR boundary **does not constitute a formal determination of eligibility by the Keeper of the National Register of Historic Places.**<sup>7</sup> The PotNR boundary is designed to be used as a planning tool for government agencies and the public. Like the Study and Core Area boundaries, the PotNR boundary places no restriction on private property use.

The term integrity, as defined by the NRHP, is “the ability of a property to convey its significance.”<sup>8</sup> While assessments of integrity are traditionally based on seven specific

### **Figure 3: Boundary Definitions**

The **Study Area** represents the historic extent of the battle as it unfolded across the landscape. The Study Area contains resources known to relate to or contribute to the battle event: where troops maneuvered and deployed, immediately before, during, and after combat, and where they fought during combat. Historic accounts, terrain analysis, and feature identification inform the delineation of the Study Area boundary. The Study Area indicates the extent to which historic and archeological resources associated with the battle (areas of combat, command, communications, logistics, medical services, etc.) may be found. Surveyors delineated Study Area boundaries for every battle site that was positively identified through research and field survey, regardless of its present integrity.

The **Core Area** represents the areas of fighting on the battlefield. Positions that delivered or received fire, and the intervening space and terrain between them, fall within the Core Area. Frequently described as “hallowed ground,” land within the Core Area is often the first to be targeted for protection. There may be more than one Core Area on a battlefield, but all lie within the Study Area.

Unlike the Study and Core Areas, which are based only upon the interpretation of historic events, the **Potential National Register (PotNR) boundary** represents ABPP’s assessment of a Study Area’s current integrity (the surviving landscape and features that convey the site’s historic sense of place). The PotNR boundary may include all or some of the Study Area, and all or some of the Core Area. Lands within PotNR boundaries should be considered worthy of further attention, although future evaluations may reveal more or less integrity than indicated by the ABPP surveys.

<sup>6</sup> For general guidance about integrity issues and National Register of Historic Places properties, see National Park Service, *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, revised 1997). The survey evaluations described above do not meet the more stringent integrity standards for National Historic Landmark designation. See National Park Service, *How to Prepare National Historic Landmark Nominations* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, 1999), 36-37.

<sup>7</sup> See 36 CFR 60.1-14 for regulations about nominating a property to the National Register of Historic Places and 36 CFR 63 for regulations concerning Determinations of Eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

<sup>8</sup> National Park Service, National Register Bulletin 40, *Guidelines for Identifying, Evaluating, and Registering America’s Historic Battlefields*, 1992, Revised 1999 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Interagency Resources Update to the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission Report on the Nation’s Civil War Battlefields

attributes – location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association – battlefields are unique cultural resources and require special evaluation.” Generally, the most important aspects of integrity for battlefields are location, setting, feeling and association,” and the most basic test for determining the integrity of any battlefield is to assess “whether a participant in the battle would recognize the property as it exists today.”<sup>9</sup>

Other conditions contribute to the *degree* of integrity a battlefield retains:

- the quantity and quality of surviving battle-period resources (e.g., buildings, roads, fence lines, military structures, and archeological features);
- the quantity and quality of the spatial relationships between and among those historic resources and the landscape that connects them;
- the extent to which current battlefield land use is similar to battle-period land use; and
- the extent to which a battlefield’s physical features and overall character visually communicate an authentic sense of the sweep and setting of the battle.

The degree to which post-war development has altered and fragmented the historic landscape or destroyed historic features and viewsheds is critical when assessing integrity.

Changes in traditional land use over time do not generally diminish a battlefield’s integrity. For example, landscapes that were farmland during the Civil War do not need to be in agricultural use today to be considered eligible for listing in the NRHP so long as the land retains its historic rural character. Similarly, natural changes in vegetation – woods growing out of historic farm fields, for example – do not necessarily lessen the landscape’s integrity.

Some post-battle development is expected; slight or moderate change within the battlefield may not substantially diminish a battlefield’s integrity. A limited degree of residential, commercial, or industrial development is acceptable. These post-battle “non-contributing” elements are often included in the PotNR boundary in accordance with NRHP guidelines.<sup>10</sup>

Significant changes in land use since the Civil War do diminish the integrity of the battlefield landscape. Heavy residential, commercial, and industrial development; cellular tower and wind turbine installation; and large highway construction are common examples of such changes. Battlefield landscapes with these types of changes are generally considered as having little or no integrity.

The PotNR boundaries therefore indicate which battlefields are *likely* eligible for future listing in the NRHP and *likely* deserving of future preservation efforts. If a surveyor

---

Division), <http://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/pdfs/NRB40.pdf>. Archeological integrity was not examined during this study, but should be considered in future battlefield studies and formal nominations to the National Register of Historic Places.

<sup>9</sup> National Park Service, National Register Bulletin 40, *Guidelines for Identifying, Evaluating, and Registering America’s Historic Battlefields*, 1992, Revised 1999 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Interagency Resources Division).

<sup>10</sup> The ABPP looks only at the battle-related elements of a cultural landscape. Post-battle elements, while not contributing to the significance of the battlefield, may be eligible for separate listing in the National Register of Historic Places on their own merits.

determined that a battlefield was entirely compromised by land use incompatible with the preservation of historic features (i.e., it has little or no integrity), the ABPP did not assign a PotNR boundary.<sup>11</sup>

In cases where a battlefield is already listed in the NRHP, surveyors reassessed the existing documentation based on current scholarship and resource integrity, and, when appropriate, provided new information and proposed new boundaries as part of the surveys. As a result, some PotNR boundaries will contain or share a boundary with lands already listed in the NRHP. In other cases, PotNR boundaries will exclude listed lands that have lost integrity (see Table 4 for boundary comparisons.)<sup>12</sup>

The data from which all three boundaries are drawn do not necessarily reflect the full research needed for a formal NRHP nomination. PotNR boundaries are based on an assessment of aboveground historic features associated with the cultural and natural landscape. The surveys did not include a professional archeological inventory or assessment of subsurface features or indications. In some cases, future archeological testing will help determine whether subsurface features remain, whether subsurface battle features convey important information about a battle or historic property, and whether that information may help to confirm, refine, or refute the boundaries previously determined by historic studies and terrain analysis.

The ABPP survey information should be reassessed during future compliance processes such as the Section 106 process required by the National Historic Preservation Act<sup>13</sup> and Environmental Impact Statements/Environmental Assessments required by the National Environmental Policy Act.<sup>14</sup> Likewise, more detailed research and assessments should take place when any battlefield is formally nominated to the NRHP or proposed for designation as a National Historic Landmark (NHL). New research and intensive-level surveys of these sites will enlighten future preservation and compliance work. Agencies should continue to consult local and state experts for up-to-date information about these battlefields.

While none of South Carolina's battlefields have been designated as National Historic Landmarks, portions of nine of the state's 11 battlefields have already been listed in the NRHP. Unfortunately, of these nine, only the listing for **Honey Hill** represents the historic battlefield landscape in a comprehensive manner. For each of the other listed battlefields, the NRHP boundaries include less than 10 percent of their total Study Area (see Table 4).

## Questionnaires

While the ABPP maintains data about its own program activities at Civil War battlefields, most preservation work occurs at the local level. Therefore, to answer Congress's directive for information about battlefield preservation activities, the ABPP sought input from local battlefield managers and advocacy organizations. The ABPP distributed questionnaires

---

<sup>11</sup> National Park Service, National Register Bulletin 40, *Guidelines for Identifying, Evaluating, and Registering America's Historic Battlefields*, 1992, Revised 1999 (<http://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/pdfs/NRB40.pdf>), offers recommendations regarding "Selecting Defensible Boundaries." While this document indicates that "generally, boundaries should not be drawn to include the portion of the route taken to the battlefield where there were no encounters," the *Guidelines* also state that "a basic principle is to include within the boundary all of the locations where opposing forces, either before, during or after the battle, took actions based on their assumption of being in the presence of the enemy." The ABPP interprets this latter guidance to mean all military activities that influenced the battle. See the individual battlefield profiles for information about military actions taken along the routes included. In accordance with the methodology of this study, if routes included in the Study Area retain integrity, they are included within the Potential National Register boundary for the battlefield landscape.

<sup>12</sup> The ABPP's surveys and PotNR assessments do not constitute formal action on behalf of the office of the National Register of Historic Places. PotNR assessments are intended for planning purposes only; they do not carry the authority to add, change, or remove an official listing.

<sup>13</sup> 16 USC 470f.

<sup>14</sup> 42 USC 4331-4332.

designed to gather information about the types of preservation activities that have taken place at the battlefields since 1993. The Questionnaire is reproduced in Appendix D.

In South Carolina, representatives from five organizations responded to the ABPP's inquiries. Their responses, combined with the survey findings, allowed the ABPP to create a profile of conditions and activities at South Carolina's Civil War battlefields.



Figure 4. Boyd's Landing, part of the **Honey Hill** battlefield, is still used today as a boat landing. The original roadbed leading to the landing still exists and today the site looks much as it did during the battle. Photograph by Kathleen Madigan, 2009.

# Summary of Conditions of South Carolina’s Civil War Battlefields

## Quantified Land Areas

Using a Geographic Information Systems program, the ABPP calculated the amount of land historically associated with the battle (Study Area), the amount of land where forces were engaged (Core Area), and the amount of land that may retain enough integrity to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and that remains to be protected (Potential National Register boundary).

As noted above and as Table 2 illustrates, the Study Areas and Core Areas of South Carolina’s Civil War battlefields have been established in accordance with ABPP research and field survey methodology. Particular attention was paid to identifying the routes of approach and withdrawal associated with each battle, and to identifying areas of secondary action that influenced the course or outcome of the battles.<sup>15</sup> The Study Area and Core Area boundaries established for each battlefield take these movements and actions into account, recognizing the extent to which these ancillary areas serve as battlefield features.

**Table 2. Battlefield Area Statistics**

<b>Battlefield</b>	<b>Study Area</b>	<b>Core Area</b>	<b>PotNR Boundary</b>
Charleston Harbor I (SC004)	5,164.74	1,881.38	4,568.74
Charleston Harbor II (SC009)	9,407.24	5,763.86	5,093.82
Fort Sumter I (SC001)	4,389.13	702.43	3,948.47
Fort Sumter II (SC008)	9,367.57	4,763.32	5,967.43
Fort Wagner I (SC005)	6,308.58	2,188.12	5,234.69
Fort Wagner II (SC007)	11,840.68	5,695.22	6,043.51
Grimball’s Landing (SC007)	3,624.28	2,028.88	2,298.98
Honey Hill (SC010)	3,926.96	2,117.46	3,102.71
Rivers’ Bridge (SC011)	4,828.66	512.34	4,828.66
Secessionville (SC002)	3,547.53	1,108.59	0.00
Simmon’s Bluff (SC003)	3,178.93	320.14	0.00

In South Carolina, Civil War armies waged numerous battles over the same ground, while naval forces maneuvered in the same waters of the Charleston Harbor during different engagements. Thus, the total number of battlefield acres in the state is lower than a straight tally of the figures in Table 2 would indicate. Calculating for the overlapping areas in the battlefields, there are more than 34,600 total Study Area acres, nearly 15,700 total Core Area acres, and more than 19,500 total acres (land and water) likely eligible for

<sup>15</sup> National Register Bulletin 40, *Guidelines for Identifying, Evaluating, and Registering America’s Historic Battlefields* (<http://www.nps.gov/nr/publications/bulletins/pdfs/NRB40.pdf>), offers recommendations regarding "Selecting Defensible Boundaries." While this document indicates that "generally, boundaries should not be drawn to include the portion of the route taken to the battlefield where there were no encounters," the *Guidelines* also state that "a basic principle is to include within the boundary all of the locations where opposing forces, either before, during or after the battle, took actions based on their assumption of being in the presence of the enemy." The ABPP interprets this latter guidance to mean all military activities that influenced the battle. See the individual battlefield profiles for information about military actions taken along the routes included. In accordance with the methodology of this study, if routes included in the Study Area retain integrity, they are included within the Potential National Register boundary for the battlefield landscape.

listing in the NRHP.<sup>16</sup> Please see the Individual Battlefield Profiles for more information about the extent of and reasons for the established boundaries.

### Condition Assessments

Using field survey data, the ABPP assessed the overall condition of each battlefield’s *Study Area*. While no battlefield remains completely unaltered since the Civil War, seven of South Carolina’s eleven battlefields have experienced relatively little or only moderate change to their terrain, aboveground battle features, and water features during the past 150 years.<sup>17</sup>

**Table 3. Condition Summary**

<b>Condition</b>	<b>Battlefield</b>
<b>Land use is little changed (1)</b>	Rivers’ Bridge
<b>Portions of landscape have been altered, but most essential features remain (6)</b>	Charleston Harbor I, Charleston Harbor II, Fort Sumter I, Fort Sumter II, Grimball’s Landing, Honey Hill
<b>Much of the landscape has been altered and fragmented, leaving some essential features (4)</b>	Fort Wagner I, Fort Wagner II
<b>Landscape and terrain have been altered beyond recognition (0)</b>	Secessionville, Simmon’s Bluff

At **Rivers’ Bridge**, land use is little changed since the battle. The Salkehatchie River, with its accompanying wetlands, flows along a course similar to its 1865 path. Earthworks used by the Confederate defenders are preserved at Rivers Bridge State Historic Site. The landscape clearly conveys an understanding of why and how Confederate forces attempted to slow Sherman’s drive through South Carolina at this location. River crossings to the northwest and southeast of the state park, while modern, are very near or on top of the original crossings and provide a good sense of the battlefield’s breadth. Finally, several of the modern roads in the region are positioned in historic beds. Unfortunately, a portion of the bluff overlooking the river (upon which several Confederate earthworks were sited) was significantly altered by the operations of a railroad that paralleled the Salkehatchie River during the late 19th Century. Beyond the state park boundaries, the battlefield is framed by large modern highways. The only battlefield lands protected are within the Rivers Bridge State Historic Site, however, funding for the historic site is limited. Without sufficient resources for administration and management, the site’s historic resources (including Confederate earthworks) may be in jeopardy. With the majority of its landscape retaining integrity, **River’s Bridge** should be considered one of South Carolina’s greatest opportunities for comprehensive battlefield preservation.

Portions of the landscape have been altered, but most essential features retain integrity at **Honey Hill**, despite some alteration to the landscape. The Old House Plantation site,

<sup>16</sup> Using GIS software, and accounting for overlapping areas, the ABPP calculated, for the 11 battlefields in South Carolina, that the Study Areas represent 34,620.83 acres, the Core Areas represent 15,689.02 acres, and the PotNR boundaries represent 19,592.89 acres.

<sup>17</sup> The condition of archeological resources within the battlefields was not assessed. Future studies are needed to determine the degree of archeological integrity associated with subsurface battle deposits.

where the Coastal Division encampment prior to the battle, has suffered some residential development along its western edge. The site, however, retains its historic view of Honey Hill Pond. Some of the open fields present during the 1864 fighting retain their agricultural character, although most of the land is tree-covered today. Boyd's Landing, the location where Union troops disembarked from their transports on the Broad River (with the intention of moving inland to sever the railroad at Grahamville), retains much of its historic integrity. Although part of the Old Grahamville Road has been modernized, the Boyd's Landing Road bed remains intact. Unfortunately, the area around **Honey Hill** is under intense development pressure. Modern residential and low-impact commercial development has destroyed the integrity of the battlefield landscape associated with the historic towns of Ridgeland and Grahamville. With additional development planned, preservation efforts should concentrate on protecting the Confederate position at **Honey Hill**.

Portions of the landscape have been altered at **Grimball's Landing**, but most essential features remain. Routes used by US forces during their advance inland from Grimball's Landing and routes further south at Sol Leagre Island remain intact, and the surrounding land continues to be inaccessible marsh as it was at the time of battle. The waterways – DeSoto River and Folly Island Creek – which were crucial to the Federal operation, still flow along courses very similar to their 1863 paths. Significant residential development from the east and north represents an advancing threat to **Grimball's Landing**. This development has already destroyed most of the Confederate approach routes to the battlefield, along with the Confederate batteries located near the marshes of James Island. On Sol Leagre Island, much of the battlefield near the eastern causeway has been destroyed as well. Preservation efforts at **Grimball's Landing** should focus on listing in the NRHP, remaining lands that retain integrity.



Figure 5. The remaining portions of **Grimball's Landing** are primarily marsh or agricultural lands. Sixty-three percent of the battlefield retains integrity and looks much as it did during the time of battle. Photograph by Shannon Davis 2009.

Much of the land and water associated with the battlefields of **Charleston Harbor I, Charleston Harbor II, Fort Sumter I, Fort Sumter II, Fort Wagner I, and Fort Wagner II** overlap along the shores and waterways of Charleston Harbor. At **Charleston Harbor I, Charleston Harbor II, Fort Sumter I, and Fort Sumter II**, keeping in mind that the Study Area and PotNR boundaries are mostly comprised of water, it can be stated that portions of the battle area have been altered, but most essential features remain. The open waterways of Charleston Harbor remain much as they were at the time of battle. With the shorelines of Charleston to the west and islands to the south and north, any on-looker approaching Charleston from the water (as US naval forces did) can appreciate the harbor as a strong position of defense.

Dredging operations in the harbor and the shipping channels as well as the construction of jetties have proven to be extremely destructive to the land portions of **Charleston Harbor I, Charleston Harbor II, Fort Sumter I, and Fort Sumter II**. In several locations, dredge fill has been dumped into the wetland west of the barrier islands creating entirely new islands or peninsulas, or destroying many of the sand bars that were present at the time of battle. Construction of jetties in the harbor has contributed to the loss of batteries on Cummings Point and hastened the erosion of Morris Island as well as the islands to the south.

Despite these threats, several land-based features associated with the four battlefields retain their integrity. Fort Sumter and Fort Moultrie still stand guard in Charleston Harbor just as they did during the battles. Fort Johnson, an inner harbor fortification, is gone, but the magazine and portions of the mortar battery remain. Construction of a large research facility around the site, however, has compromised most of the landscape. While the batteries on Cummings Point have been lost, the northern edge of the point retains integrity.

Erosion and dredging are the primary reasons that much of the landscapes of **Fort Wagner I** and **Fort Wagner II** have been altered and fragmented. Today, most of the land associated with these two battles, including Fort Wagner and Battery Gregg, has been washed into the Atlantic Ocean. Although the historic landscape of Morris Island is almost completely eroded away, what remains is the same type of sand barrier island that existed in 1863. Visitors can still experience a sense of what it would have felt like to fight on Morris Island, even if the island itself does not retain integrity. In contrast, the Light House Inlet and Folly Island landscapes have changed little, and many of the wetlands between Morris Island and James Island retain integrity. In addition, while the waterways in the swamps to the west of Morris Island have shifted and changed over the years, the Marsh Batter, site of the “Swamp Angel,” remains intact.<sup>18</sup>



Figure 6. Erosion has destroyed much of the historic battlefield landscape on Morris Island, an important defining feature of the **Fort Wagner I** and **Fort Wagner II** battlefields. Although erosion is a natural process, the effects have been exacerbated by the construction of jetties on the island and in Charleston Harbor  
Photograph by Kathleen Madigan, 2009.

<sup>18</sup> Union forces positioned a 200-pound Parrott siege gun known as “The Swamp Angel” at the Marsh Battery west of Morris Island, and used the gun to fire upon the City of Charleston. Major General Quincy A. Gillmore is credited with the feat of military engineering that facilitated placement of this massive gun in the wetlands.

Aggressive development in Charleston, Mount Pleasant, James Island, Folly Island, and Sullivan’s Island has damaged the historic integrity of shoreline resources associated with each of the six Charleston Harbor battles, including the Confederate fortifications of Fort Beauregard and the Marshall Battery on Sullivan’s Island. Though development pressure has recently slowed, Charleston and its surrounding communities continue to grow. As more housing and associated infrastructure development takes place at the water’s edge, threats to the historic integrity of these battlefield landscapes and harbor viewsheds will increase and be compounded.

While large portions of the Study Areas for **Charleston Harbor I, Charleston Harbor II, Fort Sumter I, Fort Sumter II, Fort Wagner I, and Fort Wagner II** retain integrity, much of that area is water. Any future preservation will need to recognize the harbor’s role as a contributing feature of these battles. Battlefield advocates should consider focusing efforts on a larger thematic approach to preservation for Charleston Harbor’s six battlefield landscapes.

**Secessionville** has been altered beyond recognition. The only remaining intact battlefield feature is Fort Lamar, which is preserved by the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources. Fort Lamar Road bisects the Fort Lamar site dividing it in half. Unfortunately ready access to the site has led to residential development which now surrounds the fort. Continued development will isolate the fort from its wider historic viewshed. Foot and bike trails cross over the fort’s earthworks, and erosion resulting from this traffic poses a very specific and serious threat. Finally, to the south, wetlands that have grown larger since the time of battle could threaten to erode battlefield land surrounding the fort. Despite this damage to its context, the Fort Lamar structure is well preserved. If left unchecked, however, these threats could destroy the only remaining intact portion of the battlefield. Preservation efforts should focus on protecting the integrity of the Fort Lamar site, **Secessionville’s** most significant cultural feature.

Few other opportunities for cultural resource preservation exist beyond what has been saved and maintained at the Fort Lamar site. Archeological investigations may uncover important subsurface battle features within the Study Area, but the opportunity to save the landscape of battle is gone. Commemoration and public interpretation of the larger **Secessionville** battlefield, however, are possible and appropriate.



Figure 6. Fort Lamar, the only remaining cultural feature on the **Secessionville** battlefield, is threatened by erosion. Foot and bike trails cross over the fort’s earthworks posing a serious threat to the integrity of the fort. Photograph by Kathleen Madigan, 2009.

At **Simmon's Bluff**, the landscape has been altered beyond recognition. The land approach routes have been damaged by residential development and associated infrastructure. In addition, a scrap yard has been built on top of the location where the 16th South Carolina camped, and a boat hauling business has been built at the site where US forces landed. While the Federal approach up the Wadmalaw River has changed somewhat since the time of battle, the land portion of the battlefield – the primary focus of the raid – has lost all integrity. Although there is no opportunity for meaningful landscape preservation, commemorative and interpretive opportunities at this battlefield are possible and appropriate.

## Registration

The nation's official method for recognizing historic properties worthy of preservation is listing in the NRHP. Sites and structures listed in the NRHP meet national standards for documentation, physical integrity, and demonstrable significance to the history of our nation. Federal, state, and local agencies use information from the NRHP as a planning tool to identify and make decisions about cultural resources. Federal and state laws, most notably Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, require agencies to account for the effects their projects (roads, wetland permits, quarrying, cell towers, etc.) may have on listed and eligible historic properties, such as battlefields. Listing allows project designers to quickly identify the battlefield and avoid or minimize impacts to the landscape.

Properties listed in the NRHP may also be eligible for federal and state historic preservation grant programs. Recognition as an NRHP listed battlefield can advance public understanding of and appreciation for the battlefield, and may encourage advocacy for its preservation.<sup>19</sup>

As Table 4 indicates, nine of South Carolina's Civil War battlefields include areas or features already listed in the NRHP. As noted earlier, several of South Carolina's battlefields overlap in land and water areas. Therefore, the total amount of acreage potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP, over 19,500 acres, is lower than a simple tally of the numbers in the table.<sup>20</sup>

*Honey Hill/Boyd's Neck Battlefield* (NR#04000655) is the only Civil War site listed in the NRHP as a battlefield landscape. The listing includes not only the **Honey Hill** battlefield, but also actions at Boyd's Neck and associated fortifications.

Even though **River's Bridge** is not listed in the NRHP as a battlefield, a small portion of it is represented by the *Rivers' Bridge State Park* (NR#72001187). The listing incorporates the state historic site's boundaries – which encompasses a portion of the Core Area, an adjacent parcel of land used by the local community for annual battle commemoration ceremonies, and a Confederate cemetery. **River's Bridge** currently has the highest percentage of unlisted battlefield land retaining integrity in South Carolina.

While none of the six battles of Charleston Harbor - **Charleston Harbor I, Charleston Harbor II, Fort Sumter I, Fort Sumter II, Fort Wagner I, and Fort Wagner II** - are listed

<sup>19</sup> There are three levels of federal recognition for historic properties: Congressional designations such as national park units, National Historic Landmarks, and listings in the National Register of Historic Places. Congress creates national park units. The Secretary of the Interior designates National Historic Landmarks (NHL) – nationally significant historic sites – for their exceptional value or quality in illustrating or interpreting the heritage of the United States. The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) is the nation's official list of cultural sites significant at the national, state, or local level and worthy of preservation. Historic units of the National Park System and NHLs are also listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

<sup>20</sup> Using Geographic Information Systems software, and accounting for overlapping areas, the ABPP calculated that the Potential National Register Boundaries (inclusive of existing listings) for the Civil War battlefields in South Carolina represent 19,592.89 acres.

in the NRHP as landscapes, large portions of the Study Areas have enough integrity to merit nomination as battlefields. Because much of the Study Areas are water, future nominations and expansions to existing listings will need to recognize the harbor's role as a contributing feature. A thematic nomination to include intact land and water associated with the battles of **Charleston Harbor I, Charleston Harbor II, Fort Sumter I, Fort Sumter II, Fort Wagner I, and Fort Wagner II** may be appropriate.

Although none of the six battles of Charleston Harbor are listed in the NRHP, individual defining features associated with the battles are listed separately. These include *Battery Cheves* (NR#82003841), *Fort Johnson/Powder Magazine* (NR#72001197), the *Folly North Site* (NR#03001001), *Fort Sumter National Monument* (NR#66000101), and the "Unnamed Battery at Fort Johnson" which is listed as part of the *Civil War Defenses of Charleston Thematic Resources* (TR#64000766).



Figure 7. Located within the Study Areas of **Charleston Harbor I, Charleston Harbor II, Fort Sumter I, Fort Sumter II, Fort Johnson** and its associated Powder Magazine are defining features of the battles. Photograph by Matthew Borders, 2009.

**Grimball's Landing** has no associated listings in the NRHP, however, 2,299 acres – 63 percent of the Study Area - retain integrity and should be considered for inclusion in the NRHP.

The *Secessionville Historic District* (NR#79002378) does not represent the battle of **Secessionville** exclusively, however, it does include Fort Lamar (based on the fortification's role in the 1862 battle) among its listed resources. Other than what has already been listed, **Secessionville** offers no additional potential for listing in the NRHP.

The battlefield landscape at **Simmon's Bluff** retains no integrity and therefore offers no potential for listing in the NRHP.

Overall the ABPP has identified over 19,500 additional acres in South Carolina eligible for listing in the NRHP. While important defining features for many of the battlefields are recognized, only one battlefield is listed for its landscape. Advocates should consider adopting a broader approach to preservation that recognizes South Carolina's Civil War battlefields more comprehensively as historic landscapes.

**Table 4: Acres Registered Compared with Acres Potentially Eligible to be Registered**

<b>Battlefield</b>	<b>Designation</b>	<b>ABPP PotNR Acres</b>	<b>**Existing Registered Acres</b>	<b>Acres Potentially Eligible to be Registered</b>
Charleston Harbor I (SC004)	NPS, NRHP*	4,568.74	260.15	4,345.14
Charleston Harbor II (SC009)	NPS, NRHP*	5,093.82	276.29	4,864.14
Fort Sumter I (SC001)	NPS, NRHP*	3,948.47	287.67	3,701.58
Fort Sumter II (SC008)	NPS, NRHP*	5,967.43	276.29	5,737.44
Fort Wagner I (SC005)	NPS, NRHP*	5,234.69	130.49	5,104.20
Fort Wagner II (SC007)	NPS, NRHP*	6,043.51	152.39	5,915.43
Grimball's Landing (SC007)		2,298.98	0.00	2,298.98
Honey Hill (SC010)	NRHP	3,102.71	2,512.13	590.58
Rivers' Bridge (SC011)	NRHP	4,828.66	424.13	4,404.53
Secessionville (SC002)	NRHP	0.00	48.38	0.00
Simmon's Bluff (SC003)		0.00	0.00	0.00

*\*These NRHP designations are for individual fortifications associated with the battles..*  
*\*\* Note that some NRHP lands may have lost integrity since they were listed.*

### Stewardship

For the purposes of this update, “protected land” means battlefield land that is in public or private non-profit ownership, or is under permanent protective easement, and is managed specifically for 1) the purposes of maintaining the historic character of the landscape and for preventing future impairment or destruction of the landscape and historic features, or for 2) a conservation purpose and use compatible with the goals of historic landscape preservation.

The ABPP established this definition because, while public ownership of land often provides some level of protection for historic resources, it does not necessarily foreclose the potential for damage. Federal, state, and municipal ownership may prevent private development, and public ownership may require compliance with state and federal environmental laws, but the primary uses (military readiness, timber production, recreation, mineral extraction, impoundment, etc.) of that public land may not be compatible with the perpetual protection and appropriate management of a battlefield landscape.

Through fee simple ownership and purchase of development rights, non-profit organizations, along with local, state, and federal government stewards have permanently preserved more than 4,800 acres of battlefield land in South Carolina. With more than 26 percent of its Study Area protected, **Honey Hill** is the best protected battlefield in the state. At eight of South Carolina’s 11 battlefields – **Charleston Harbor I, Charleston Harbor II, Fort Sumter I, Fort Sumter II, Fort Wagner I, Fort Wagner II, Rivers’ Bridge, and Secessionville** – less than ten percent of the battlefield Study Area is protected. It should be noted, however, that the Study Areas associated with South Carolina’s six Charleston Harbor battlefields are composed mostly of water. Less than one percent of the **Grimball’s Landing** Study Area is protected, and there is no protected land at **Simmon’s Bluff**.

Federal, state, and local government stewards protect much of the battlefield land currently preserved in South Carolina. The National Park Service manages more than 220 acres of battlefield land in South Carolina.<sup>21</sup> Land associated with the Fort Sumter National Monument or its associated unit - Fort Moultrie - is included within the boundaries of each one of the six Civil War battles fought in Charleston Harbor.

The State of South Carolina, through the Department of Natural Resources, the Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism, and the Ports Authority, protects more than 470 acres of battlefield land. The South Carolina Department of Natural Resources (SCDNR) administers the Fort Johnson site, portions of which fall within the boundaries of **Charleston Harbor I, Charleston Harbor II, Fort Sumter I, Fort Sumter II, and Secessionville**. In addition to this land, the SCDNR also administers the Fort Lamar Heritage Preserve, which protects segments of **Grimball's Landing** and **Secessionville**. At Rivers Bridge State Historic Site, the South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism is responsible for preserving more than 320 acres within the boundaries of the **Rivers' Bridge** battlefield Study Area. Finally, the South Carolina Ports Authority preserves a small portion of **Fort Sumter I** at the harbor shoal where the 1808 fortification, Castle Pinckney, is located.



Figure 8. The Salkehatchie swamp, one of the defining features of the **Rivers' Bridge** battlefield, bisects both the Rivers Bridge State Park and the battlefield Core Area. Photograph by South Carolina Department of Archives and History.

Locally, the City of Charleston protects almost 120 acres of land within the boundaries of the following battlefields: **Charleston Harbor I, Charleston Harbor II, Fort Sumter II, Fort Wagner I, and Fort Wagner II**. In addition to this land, the City protects nearly 10 acres at **Fort Sumter I**, while the Charleston County Parks and Recreation Commission protects more than 82 acres at **Fort Wagner I**.

In South Carolina, nonprofit organizations play a small but significant role as battlefield landowners and stewards. The Charleston Museum preserves 0.56 acres of the **Grimball's Landing** and **Secessionville** battlefields within the boundaries of its Dill Sanctuary.<sup>22</sup> At

<sup>21</sup> Included in this 220-acre total is a .23-acre plot, which was purchased with financial assistance from Civil War Preservation Trust in cooperation with The Trust for Public Land, and a consortium of local residents for the permanent protection of the Fort Moultrie viewshed.

<sup>22</sup> Although there are only .56 acres associated with the Civil War battles of **Grimball's Landing** and **Secessionville** at the Charleston Museum's Dill Sanctuary, the wildlife sanctuary's total land holdings include 580 acres. Included within the sanctuary are four Confederate earthworks, three of which (Battery Pringle, Battery Leroy, and Battery Tynes) are listed in the National Register of Historic Places. These batteries are not included within the Study Area boundary of any battlefield assessed for this report, however, the efforts undertaken by the Charleston Museum as steward of these resources are noteworthy. The museum has

Battery Cheves, the South Carolina Battleground Preservation Trust protects a 2.72-acre property, which falls within the boundaries of the **Charleston Harbor II, Fort Sumter II,** and **Fort Wagner II** battlefields. The group also protects a 1.42-acre parcel at **Secessionville**, and a 0.25-acre parcel located within the Study Area boundaries of **Fort Sumter II, Fort Wagner II,** and **Grimball’s Landing**.

Although land owned by the John Preston Frost Nature Preserve is not reserved for its association with historic events, the 24.57 acres of the **Fort Wagner II** battlefield found within the boundaries of the preserve’s Fiddler’s Green parcel are considered by the ABPP to be protected. The wildlife habitat conservation mission of this site is compatible with the interests of battlefield landscape preservation.

While fee purchase has been a successful method of protecting battlefield land in South Carolina, preservation easements have become a powerful and increasingly popular alternative in recent years. Preservation easements provide protection without burdening the holder with obligations associated with fee simple ownership, while compensating owners who relinquish the development rights of their property. Beginning in the early 1990s and as recently as 2008, the Lowcountry Open Land Trust (LOLT) has purchased easements on more than 2,400 acres of battlefield land in South Carolina. The organization holds easements on the property of private landowners, including more than 340 acres at **Charleston Harbor I**, more than 177 acres at **Fort Sumter II**, more than 887 acres at **Fort Wagner II**, and more than 1,000 acres at **Honey Hill**. In addition to these holdings, the LOLT works with the South Carolina Battleground Preservation Trust and John Preston Frost Nature Preserve to protect the properties of those non-profit groups. In a similar way, the Trust for Public Land holds easements to provide legally binding protection for land owned by the City of Charleston, and the South Carolina Heritage Trust has served the same role for the Charleston County Parks and Recreation Commission.

Finally, in partnership with the National Park Service, other nonprofit organizations, and local communities, the Civil War Preservation Trust has supported the preservation efforts at Morris Island, Battery Wagner, and Fort Moultrie by providing funding to purchase land and acquire easements.

<b>Battlefield</b>	<b>Permanently Protected Acres</b>	<b>ABPP PotNR Acres</b>	<b>Unprotected, Intact Acres Remaining</b>
Charleston Harbor I (SC004)	361.00	4,568.74	4,532.74
Charleston Harbor II (SC009)	713.06	5,093.82	4,380.76
Fort Sumter I (SC001)	299.97	3,948.47	3,648.50
Fort Sumter II (SC008)	546.14	5,967.43	5,421.29
Fort Wagner I (SC005)	330.55	5,234.69	5,904.14
Fort Wagner II (SC007)	1,175.72	6,043.51	4,867.79
Grimball’s Landing (SC007)	7.40	2,298.98	2,291.58
Honey Hill (SC010)	1,055.34	2,401.71	1,346.37
Rivers’ Bridge (SC011)	320.82	4,828.66	4,507.84
Secessionville (SC002)	48.18	0.00	0.00
Simmon’s Bluff (SC003)	0.00	0.00	0.00

worked with the Army Corps of Engineers since 1993 to prevent erosion from destroying Battery Pringle, has made Battery Tynes accessible for public interpretation, and continues to monitor the condition of Battery Leroy.

## Public Access and Interpretation

In its questionnaire, the ABPP asked battlefield stewards about the types of public access and interpretation available at the battlefield. The ABPP did not collect information about the purpose or intent of the interpretation and access, such as whether a wayside exhibit was developed for purely educational reasons, to promote heritage tourism, or to boost local economic development.

The ABPP asked respondents to indicate the type of interpretation available at or about the battlefield. The categories included brochures, driving tours, living history demonstrations, maintained historic features or areas, walking tours and trails, wayside exhibits, websites, and other specialized programs. The results indicate that 10 of South Carolina’s 11 Civil War battlefields offer some degree of public interpretation.

Visitors center facilities are available at Fort Sumter National Monument, which interprets the Confederate defense of Charleston Harbor from 1863-1865 (**Charleston Harbor I, Charleston Harbor II, Fort Sumter I, Fort Sumter II, Fort Wagner I, and Fort Wagner II**). The Fort Sumter National Monument and its associated unit Fort Moultrie, also provide viewshed access to the naval portions of the six battlefields of Charleston Harbor.

The site of Fort Johnson, which is owned and managed by the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources, provides public access to small portions of **Charleston Harbor I, Charleston Harbor II, Fort Sumter I, Fort Sumter II, and Secessionville**.

Battery Cheves, owned and managed by the South Carolina Battleground Preservation Trust, offers public access to nearly three acres within the boundaries of **Charleston Harbor I, Fort Sumter II, and Fort Wagner II** battlefields. The Lighthouse Inlet Heritage Preserve, which is owned and managed by the Charleston County Parks and Recreation Commission, offers public access to more than 82 acres of **Fort Wagner I**, while Fiddler’s Green at the John Preston Fort Nature Preserve provides public access to more than 24 acres of **Fort Wagner II**.

Fort Lamar Heritage Preserve, which is owned and managed by the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources, provides public access to more than six acres of **Grimball’s Landing** and more than 12 acres of **Secessionville**. An additional 0.56 acres of land associated with both of those battlefields can also be accessed at the Charleston Museum’s Dill Sanctuary.

More than 320 acres of **Rivers’ Bridge** battlefield are publicly accessible at the Rivers Bridge State Historic Site, managed by the South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism. Only the **Simmon’s Bluff** battlefield landscape is not publically accessible.

**Table 6: Interpretation Summary**

<b>On-site Interpretation</b>	<b>Battlefield</b>
<b>Battlefields with public interpretation, including visitors center (6)</b>	Charleston Harbor I, Charleston Harbor II, Fort Sumter I, Fort Sumter II, Fort Wagner I, Fort Wagner II
<b>Battlefields with public interpretation, but no visitors center (4)</b>	Grimball’s Landing, Honey Hill, Rivers’ Bridge, Sessionsville
<b>Battlefields with no public interpretation (1)</b>	Simmons Bluff (SC003)

## Local Advocacy

Nonprofit organizations play important roles in protecting historic battlefields. These organizations step in to preserve historic sites when public funding and management for historic preservation are absent. When public funding is available, nonprofits serve as vital partners in public-private preservation efforts, acting as conduits for public funds, raising critical private matching funds, keeping history and preservation in the public eye, and working with landowners to find ways to protect battlefield parcels.

Since 2001, the Fort Sumter-Fort Moultrie Historic Trust has supported the operations of the National Park Service's units at Fort Sumter and Fort Moultrie. The Trust sponsors educational and commemorative events, facilitates private philanthropy, coordinates volunteer stewardship, and engages in public outreach. Recent efforts have focused on preparing for commemoration and education opportunities associated with the Civil War Sesquicentennial.

The South Carolina Battleground Preservation Trust (SCBPT), which formed in 1993, works with private citizens, developers, institutions, and communities throughout the state to protect military sites associated with both the Civil War and Revolutionary War. The SCBPT owns or holds easements for many of these sites, including Battery Cheves, a resource associated with the battles of **Charleston Harbor II**, **Fort Sumter II**, and **Fort Wagner II**. In addition to these efforts, the SCBPT provides educational programming to local schools, and interpretation at the sites it protects.

In addition to these active groups, from 2005 to 2009, the Friends of Rivers' Bridge served as advocate for the preservation of **Rivers' Bridge** battlefield. Until lack of interest led to the dissolution of the group, the Friends of Rivers Bridge focused on public education and fundraising to assist with the purchase and installation of interpretive signs for the Rivers Bridge State Historic Site. In addition, the Rivers Bridge Memorial Association, which formed in 1876 to commemorate the battle and its Confederate dead, still meets annually at the site. Although the association does not function as a traditional friends group, creation of the existing Rivers Bridge State Historic Site is attributed to the organization's support for the battle's commemoration.

While other organizations with more general historical interests may also play important roles in preserving South Carolina's battlefields, these groups are the only known local organizations in South Carolina that have been dedicated *solely* to the goals of battlefield preservation, interpretation, and promotion of these resources.<sup>23</sup> The battlefields of **Grimball's Landing**, **Honey Hill**, **Secessionville**, and **Simmon's Bluff** do not have nonprofit groups to advocate for preservation interests or commemorate their status as Civil War battlefields.

---

<sup>23</sup> For example, the state's historic preservation office, the South Carolina Department of Archives and History, provides staff to the South Carolina Civil War Battlefield Commission.

**Table 7: Active Battlefield Friends Groups**

<b>Battlefield</b>	<b>Friends Group(s)</b>	<b>Year Founded</b>
Charleston Harbor I (SC004)	Fort Sumter-Fort Moultrie Historical Trust	2001
Charleston Harbor II (SC009)	Fort Sumter-Fort Moultrie Historical Trust South Carolina Battleground Preservation Trust	2001 1993
Fort Sumter I (SC001)	Fort Sumter-Fort Moultrie Historical Trust	2001
Fort Sumter II (SC008)	Fort Sumter-Fort Moultrie Historical Trust South Carolina Battleground Preservation Trust	2001 1993
Fort Wagner I (SC005)	Fort Sumter-Fort Moultrie Historical Trust	2001
Fort Wagner II (SC007)	Fort Sumter-Fort Moultrie Historical Trust South Carolina Battleground Preservation Trust	2001 1993
Grimball's Landing (SC007)	None	
Honey Hill (SC010)	None	
Rivers' Bridge (SC011)	Friends of Rivers Bridge	2005-2009
Secessionville (SC002)	None	
Simmon's Bluff (SC003)	None	




Figure 9. Fort Sumter, an important defining feature of **Charleston Harbor I, Charleston Harbor II, Fort Sumter I** and **Fort Sumter II**, is suffering from an increase in heavy shipping in the harbor. Larger, more violent wakes from ships are being thrown against Fort Sumter's brick walls causing rock jetties, built to protect the fort, to push against the walls grinding and damaging the brick. Photograph by Kathleen Madigan, 2009.

## Appendices

### Appendix A. Civil War Battlefield Land Acquisition Grants

---

The Civil War Battlefield Preservation Act of 2002 (PL 107-359) amended the American Battlefield Protection Act of 1996 (16 USC 469k) to authorize a matching grant program to assist States and local communities in acquiring significant Civil War battlefield lands for permanent protection. Most recently, Congress showed its continued support for these grants through its reauthorization of this program within the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (PL 111-11).

Eligible battlefields are those listed in the 1993 Report on the Nation's Civil War Battlefields prepared by the Congressionally-chartered Civil War Sites Advisory Commission (CWSAC). Eligible acquisition projects may be for fee interest in land or for a protective interest such as a perpetual easement.

Since 1998, Congress has appropriated a total of \$38.9 million for this Civil War Battlefield Land Acquisition Grants (CWBLAG) Program. These grants have assisted in the permanent protection of more than 16,600 acres at 67 Civil War battlefields in 14 states. Although the program's funding has not been used by South Carolina's battlefields yet, all of the battlefields listed in this update are eligible to apply for CWBLAG funding. Applications to protect land that retains integrity (within PotNR boundaries) will be the most competitive.

## Appendix B. American Battlefield Protection Program Planning Grants

Since 1992, ABPP has offered annual planning grants to nonprofit organizations, academic institutions, and local, regional, state, and tribal governments to help protect battlefields located on American soil. Applicants are encouraged to work with partner organizations and federal, state, and local government agencies as early as possible to integrate their efforts into a larger battle site protection strategy. In South Carolina, the ABPP has awarded \$272,507.00.

<b>Grantee</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Project Title</b>	<b>Award</b>
<i>City of Charleston</i>	1999	Dill Tract Earthworks Preservation	\$9,500.00
<i>Coastal Carolina University</i>	2010	Battlefields within Horry and Georgetown Counties	\$60,000.00
<i>South Carolina Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism</i>	2003	Rivers' Bridge Battlefield Mapping Project	\$7,377.00
<i>South Carolina Institute for Archeology and Anthropology</i>	1998	GIS and National Register Data Acquisition at South Carolina Battlefields Associated with the Defense of the Charleston to Savannah Rail Road	\$36,600.00
<i>University of South Carolina Research Foundation</i>	2010	Study of Sherman's Campaign	\$64,200.00
	2008	Archeology of Civil War Naval Operations at Charleston Harbor	\$28,348.00
	2008	Mapping the Charleston to Savannah Railroad Defenses: Phase II	\$48,448.00
	2005	Shoreline Preservation Plan for Folly Beach, Site 38CH1213	\$18,034.00
<b>Total ABPP Planning Grants to South Carolina Battlefields as of FY2010</b>			<b>\$272,507.00</b>

## Appendix C. Civil War Battlefield Preservation Act of 2002

Public Law 107-359, 111 Stat. 3016, 17 December 2002

Amends the American Battlefield Protection Program Act of 1996 (16 U.S.C. 469k)

---

An Act

To amend the American Battlefield Protection Act of 1996 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a battlefield acquisition grant program.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Civil War Battlefield Preservation Act of 2002".

### SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) Findings.--Congress finds the following

(1) Civil War battlefields provide a means for the people of the United States to understand a tragic period in the history of the United States.

(2) According to the Report on the Nation's Civil War Battlefields, prepared by the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission, and dated July 1993, of the 384 principal Civil War battlefields--

(A) almost 20 percent are lost or fragmented;

(B) 17 percent are in poor condition; and

(C) 60 percent have been lost or are in imminent danger of being fragmented by development and lost as coherent historic sites.

(b) Purposes.--The purposes of this Act are--

(1) to act quickly and proactively to preserve and protect nationally significant Civil War battlefields through conservation easements and fee-simple purchases of those battlefields from willing sellers; and

(2) to create partnerships among State and local governments, regional entities, and the private sector to preserve, conserve, and enhance nationally significant Civil War battlefields.

### SEC. 3. BATTLEFIELD ACQUISITION GRANT PROGRAM.

The American Battlefield Protection Act of 1996 (16 U.S.C. 469k) is amended--

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as paragraph (3) of subsection (c), and indenting appropriately;

(2) in paragraph (3) of subsection (c) (as redesignated by paragraph (1))--

(A) by striking "Appropriations" and inserting "appropriations"; and

(B) by striking "section" and inserting "subsection";

(3) by inserting after subsection (c) the following

*Update to the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission Report on the Nation's Civil War Battlefields  
Final DRAFT - State of South Carolina*

- “(d) Battlefield Acquisition Grant Program.--
  - “(1) Definitions.--In this subsection
    - “(A) Battlefield report.--The term ‘Battlefield Report’ means the document entitled ‘Report on the Nation’s Civil War Battlefields’, prepared by the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission, and dated July 1993.
    - “(B) Eligible entity.--The term ‘eligible entity’ means a State or local government.
    - “(C) Eligible site.--The term ‘eligible site’ means a site--
      - “(i) that is not within the exterior boundaries of a unit of the National Park System; and
      - “(ii) that is identified in the Battlefield Report.
    - “(D) Secretary.--The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the American Battlefield Protection Program.
  - “(2) Establishment.--The Secretary shall establish a battlefield acquisition grant program under which the Secretary may provide grants to eligible entities to pay the Federal share of the cost of acquiring interests in eligible sites for the preservation and protection of those eligible sites.
  - “(3) Nonprofit partners.--An eligible entity may acquire an interest in an eligible site using a grant under this subsection in partnership with a nonprofit organization.
  - “(4) Non-federal share.--The non-Federal share of the total cost of acquiring an interest in an eligible site under this subsection shall be not less than 50 percent.
  - “(5) Limitation on land use.--An interest in an eligible site acquired under this subsection shall be subject to section 6(f)(3) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-8(f)(3)).
  - “(6) Reports.--
    - “(A) In general.--Not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the activities carried out under this subsection.
    - “(B) Update of battlefield report.--Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that updates the Battlefield Report to reflect--
      - “(i) preservation activities carried out at the 384 battlefields during the period between publication of the Battlefield Report and the update;
      - “(ii) changes in the condition of the battlefields during that period; and
      - “(iii) any other relevant developments relating to the battlefields during that period.
  - “(7) Authorization of appropriations.--
    - “(A) In general.--There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary from the Land and Water Conservation Fund to provide grants under this subsection \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2008.
    - “(B) Update of battlefield report.--There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry

out paragraph (6)(B), \$500,000."; and

(4) in subsection (e)--

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "as of" and all that follows through the period and inserting "on September 30, 2008."; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting "and provide battlefield acquisition grants" after "studies".

-end-

## Appendix D. Battlefield Questionnaire

---

**State**  
**Battlefield**

**Person Completing Form**  
**Date of completion**

**I. Protected Lands of the Battlefield** (“Protected lands” are these “owned” for historic preservation or conservation purposes. Please provide information on land protected since 1993.)

1) Identify protected lands by parcel since 1993. Then answer these questions about each parcel, following example in the chart below. What is the acreage of each parcel? Is parcel owned fee simple, by whom? Is there is an easement, if so name easement holder? Was the land purchased or the easement conveyed after 1993? What was cost of purchase or easement? What was source of funding and the amount that source contributed? Choose from these possible sources: Coin money, LWCF, Farm Bill, State Government, Local Government, Private Owner, Private Non-Profit (provide name), or Other (describe).

<b>Parcel</b>	<b>Acres</b>	<b>Owner</b>	<b>Easement</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Source</b>
<i>Joe Smith Farm</i>	<i>194</i>	<i>Private</i>	<i>SHPO</i>	<i>1995</i>	<i>\$500,000</i>	<i>LWCF/\$250,000</i> <i>Private/\$250,000</i>
<i>Sue Jones Tract</i>	<i>16</i>	<i>Battlefield Friends, Inc.</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>2002</i>	<i>\$41,000</i>	<i>State/\$20,000</i> <i>BFI/\$21,000</i>

2) Other public or non-profit lands within the battlefield? (Y/N)

- If yes, describe
- Name of public or non-profit owner or easement holder
- Number of Acres owned/held

3) Is the information in a GIS? (Y/N)

If yes, may NPS obtain a copy of the data? (Y/N)

## **II. Preservation Groups**

1) Is there a formal interested entity (friends group, etc) associated with the battlefield? (Y/N)

If yes

Name

Address

Phone

Fax

E-mail

Web site? (Y/N)

If yes, what is the URL?

Does the web site have a preservation message? (Y/N)

What year did the group form?

## **III. Public Access and Interpretation**

1) Does the site have designated Public Access? (Y/N) (Count public roads if there are designated interpretive signs or pull-offs)

If yes, what entity provides the public access (Access may occur on lands owned *in fee* or *under easement* to the above entities)

Federal government

State government

Local government

Private Nonprofit organization

Private owner

Other

Name of entity (if applicable)

Number of Acres Accessible to the Public (size of the area in which the public may physically visit without trespassing. Do not include viewsheds.)

2) Does the site have interpretation? (Y/N)

If yes, what type of interpretation is available?

Visitor Center

Brochure(s)

Wayside exhibits

Driving Tour

Walking Tour

Audio tour tapes

Maintained historic features/areas

Living History

Website

Other

## **IV. Registration**

Applies only to the battlefield landscape, not to individual contributing features of a battlefield (i.e., the individually listed Dunker Church property of .2 acres does not represent the Antietam *battlefield* for the purposes of this exercise)

1) Is the site a designated National Historic Landmark? (Y/N)

If yes, NHL and ID Number

2) Is the site listed in the National Register? (Y/N)

If yes, NRHP Name and ID Number

3) Is the site listed in the State Register? (Y/N)

If yes, State Register Name and ID Number

- 4) Is the site in the State Inventory? (Y/N)  
If yes, State Inventory Name and ID Number
- 5) Is the site designated as a local landmark or historic site? (Y/N)  
Type of Designation/Listing

#### **V. Program Activities**

What types of preservation program activities have occurred at the battlefield? Provide final product name and date if applicable (e.g., *Phase I Archeological Survey Report on the Piper Farm, 1994* and *Antietam Preservation Plan, 2001*, etc.)

- 1) Research and Documentation
- 2) Cultural Resource surveys and inventories (building/structure and landscape inventories, archeological surveys, landscape surveys, etc.)
- 3) Planning Projects (preservation plans, site management plans, cultural landscape reports, etc.)
- 4) Interpretation Projects (also includes education)
- 5) Advocacy (any project meant to engage the public in a way that would benefit the preservation of the site, e.g. PR, lobbying, public outreach, petitioning for action, etc.)
- 6) Legislation (any local, state, or federal legislation designed to encourage preservation of the battlefield individually or together with other similar sites)
- 7) Fundraising
  - a. To support program activities?
  - b. To support land acquisition/easements?
- 8) Other