

Request for Letters of Interest: Civil War Defenses of Washington Administrative History

Project Title: Administrative History of the Civil War Defenses of Washington (CWDW)

Project Budget: \$68,874.55 (This is the total compensation for the PI(s) and any additional Project Historians, including travel). There is an additional \$2,000 available for 508 compliance and \$800 for publication expenses available for project teams interested in taking on that work.

Deadline for Letter of Interest to NCPH: August 1, 2023

Expected Date to Award Project: September 1, 2023

Anticipated Start Date: October 15, 2023

Timeline for Completion: May 31, 2026

Questions? Email ncph@iupui.edu

Project Summary

The National Park Service (NPS) manages a network of seventeen Civil War forts, batteries, rifle trenches, and one national cemetery that encircles the city of Washington: one administered by the George Washington Memorial Parkway, nine by National Capital Parks-East, and seven by Rock Creek Park. This project will complete the first Administrative History of the Civil War Defenses of Washington (CWDW). This document will describe how the CWDW were individually and jointly conceived and established, their NPS development and operational history, and how they have been managed by NPS to the present day. It will particularly focus on the conception and administration of these sites as a cohesive group, and the major issues that have shaped their past and current management philosophies.

The administrative history will be developed in accordance with the guidelines outlined in "National Park Service Administrative History: A Guide (2004)," and the primary product will be a historical monograph. The project will be conducted by a historian meeting the Secretary of Interior's Professional Qualifications for History. The study will include an oral history component whereby 7 current and former NPS employees and partners will be interviewed, digitally recorded, and transcriptions prepared. (NPS has prepared a list of additional knowledgeable people to consult, but full interviews and transcriptions are not required.)_The study will also include a product oriented toward direct public outreach and education, to be determined by NPS and the researchers.

Resources & History

The NPS manages the remains of seventeen fortifications and batteries built to defend the nation's capital during the Civil War, as well as Battleground National Cemetery, the nation's smallest national cemetery, established in 1864. These fortifications and batteries, known as the Civil War Defenses of Washington, form a ring around the city across Washington, DC, Virginia, and Maryland.

The Army began the design and construction of these forts in late 1861, after the Confederate victory at the Battle of Manassas proved to Federal leadership that the nation's capital could come under real threat. At the Battle of Fort Stevens in 1864, the only Civil War battle that

occurred in Washington, DC, the fortifications met their purpose in securing a US Army victory and forcing Confederate retreat.

Major John G. Barnard of the Army Corps of Engineers described the accomplishment thusly:

" . . . from a few isolated works covering bridges or commanding a few especially important points, was developed a connected system of fortification by which every prominent point, at intervals of 800 to 1,000 yards, was occupied by an enclosed field-fort, every important approach or depression of ground, unseen from the forts, swept by a battery for field-guns, and the whole connected by rifle-trenches which were in fact lines of infantry parapet, furnishing emplacement for two ranks of men and affording covered communication along the line, while roads were opened wherever necessary, so that troops and artillery could be moved rapidly from one point of the immense periphery to another, or under cover, from point to point along the line." (Source: John G. Barnard, *A Report on the Defenses of Washington, to the Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army, Corps of Engineers, Corps of Engineers Professional Paper No. 20* (Washington, DC: The Government Printing Office, 1871), 33, cited in NPS Historic Resource Study.)

After the Civil War, the fortifications were dismantled. From 1865 to 1878, their lumber and materials were auctioned off, and much of the land was returned to private ownership.

Nevertheless, the sites continued to be places where history was made. As newly emancipated African Americans migrated to Washington, DC, in significant numbers during and after the Civil War, many established new communities in the vicinities of former forts, including Fort Reno in the District, Fort Ward in Alexandria, Virginia, and several others. Recent research is shifting the narrative from one of freedom seekers remaining in place around forts after finding the protection of the US Army during the war, to one of significant upheaval, mobility, and opportunity, in which many African Americans moved between multiple locations before putting down roots in new Reconstruction-era communities that became homes to both people from the Washington, DC, region and migrants from afar.

In the 1890s, organizations interested in memorializing and preserving Civil War sites began to advocate for the defenses; Elizabeth Proctor Thomas, a free Black woman who owned the land where Fort Stevens was built, supported the effort. The fort sites became a focus of major park planning as a result of the McMillan Plan of 1902, which sought to modernize and enhance both the park and road systems of Washington, DC. One of the most ambitious proposals of the McMillan Plan was to create a scenic parkway and greenbelt around the city, known as a Fort Drive, which would connect the Civil War Defenses as public parks and roadways. Land for the Fort Drive was purchased by the federal government between 1930 and 1965 following Congressional authorizations in 1924 and 1930.

In 1933, all federal park lands within the District of Columbia and the Battleground National Cemetery were transferred to management of the NPS. Today, the boundaries of the forts and the drive extend through three major NPS administrative units in the National Capital Region. George Washington Memorial Parkway (GWMP) administers Fort Marcy, which guards the

Potomac in Virginia. Rock Creek Park (ROCR) manages a semicircle of sites stretching from the Virginia border to northeast DC, including Battery Kemble, Fort Bayard, Fort Reno, Fort DeRussy, Fort Stevens, Fort Slocum, Fort Totten, and Fort Bunker Hill, as well as a portion of Fort Drive. National Capital Parks-East (NACE) manages a chain of forts southeast of the Anacostia River, encompassing Fort Mahan, Fort Chaplin, Fort Dupont, Fort Davis, Fort Ricketts, Fort Carroll, Fort Greble, and Fort Foote.

Today, the primary remains of this system are landscape and archeological features, such as earthworks, topography, viewsheds, and road traces; two sites, Fort Reno and Fort Bayard, show no remaining signs of their Civil War history, while others are better preserved (e.g., Fort DeRussy, Fort Marcy), and Fort Stevens was reconstructed by the Civil Conservation Corps (CCC) between 1938 and 1941. While some of these fortifications have been visibly preserved as natural and historic sites, other parcels operate as small green spaces within a heavily urbanized setting and serve as connecting corridors between sites, and still others have been sites of significant development of visitor amenities and recreational facilities (Cf. Zenzen 2020 for more). The reconstructed Fort Stevens provides a central location for in-person historical and educational programs, ceremonies, and annual battle commemorations.

Master plans to standardize and unify NPS management of these sites were developed in 1968 and 2004. The 1968 master plan formally retired the Fort Drive concept as impractical. Although the parkway was never completed, the portions of the plan that were realized played a significant role in the preservation of the remaining fort sites and their historic resources, as well as the development of road access and visitor amenities. The development of the Civil War Defenses as twentieth century park land constitutes another period of historical significance that the NPS is now working to preserve and document.

The 1968 master plan replaced the Fort Drive concept with a call for continuous trails through the greenway to connect the fort sites. In 1971, the Fort DeRussy and Fort Dupont sections of the planned Fort Circle Parks National Recreation Trail were dedicated. This master plan also focused on the preservation of historic resources, with site-specific recommendations for stabilization, preservation, rehabilitation, and reconstruction. However, the NPS was not able to complete the suite of recommended trail building and preservation projects.

A 1997 study called a Rapid Ethnographic Assessment Protocol surveyed park visitors about their impressions, understanding, and wishes for the CWDW, and found that most of those who used the parks understood and valued them as individual neighborhood or regional sites, rather than as a unified system of historical parks. The study showed that the parks meet multiple purposes for residents, providing forested areas to enjoy in an urban environment, spaces for traditional and family activities like picnicking and fishing, community gardens, ballfields, and playgrounds; accordingly, visitor uses varied among different parks and demographics. Visitors expressed desires for infrastructure ranging from additional picnic tables to sports facilities, to more historical signage. The geography, complexity, and multiple audiences and uses of the CWDW are among their greatest strengths within an urban park system, and their great administrative challenges.

The 2004 master plan, which is still in use, aimed to review and update the network's management directions. Its contributions included management zones, natural and cultural resource conservation goals, and desired improvements for infrastructure, staffing, and visitor use and interpretation. A significant number of cultural resource management documents and a Long Range Interpretive Plan (2012) have been completed in the years following the 2004 plan, or are in progress now. Today, the CWDW program, headquartered out of the Superintendent's Lodge at Battleground National Cemetery and administered through Rock Creek Park, facilitates management, partnerships, and community engagement across the three parks. Particular emphases include cultural and natural resource preservation, recreation, visitor services, and interpretation and education, as well as coordination with the major external partners to include the Alliance to Preserve the Civil War Defenses of Washington and the Military Road School Preservation Trust. The 150th anniversary commemoration of the Battle of Fort Stevens in 2014 was among the program's major recent successes.

The CWDW program's mission is to raise awareness and advocacy through community, educational and interpretive programming. With community partners to include neighboring municipal and community organizations such as the Ward 7 councilmember and staff, ANC commissioners and civic associations, annual/commemorative and other special programs such as Lincoln-Thomas Day, Emancipation Day, Public Lands Day and other activities have been become quite sought out by neighboring and regional communities. In addition to managing staff (both paid and volunteers) to execute programs and events, the CWDW Program Manager is also responsible for managing collaborations with the three parks and regional support staff to assess, monitor and prepare Project Management Information System (PMIS) requests to ensure both programming and infrastructural needs are addressed and funded if applicable.

Research Products

The primary goal of this project is to research and prepare an administrative history study of the CWDW sites, documenting their conception, authorization, operations, significant planning, preservation, and construction efforts, community relations, and the major issues that have shaped the past and current management philosophies. The central final product will be a written report, prepared according to [NPS guidance for administrative histories](#) and the [Harpers Ferry Center editorial style guide](#).

At the conclusion of the study, the PI(s) will transfer recordings and transcriptions of oral history interviews, and any digital research notes, images, or scanned primary sources not provided by NPS, with a spreadsheet or other clear key to contents. To share the information more broadly, the PI(s) will also deliver a presentation of research findings and prepare a brief (500-1000 word) summary or narrative for a general public readership, with a selection of appropriate captioned, credited, and permitted or public domain images, to be posted on NPS.gov and/or printed in handouts.

Statement of Work

The emphasis of the report and focus of substantive new research will be on the management of the CWDW from 1953 to 2022. Major events that impacted administration and use of CWDW

sites during this period included the integration of Washington, DC's schools and public facilities in and beyond 1954; the creation of the 1968 Master Plan that defined unified management goals for the CWDW sites as a group for the first time; and the development of the 2004 Management Plan, which revisited the Master Plan and led to dedicated staffing for the CWDW Program.

The initial chapter(s) must use information from NPS's existing body of research to describe the sites that constitute today's CWDW, and when and how they were acquired by the NPS. The historical context must also situate the CWDW parks within early twentieth century park and urban planning efforts in Washington, DC, and the administrative structures of public lands in and around Washington, DC.

The NPS has identified two major research questions to address through new research for this administrative history:

1. How has the NPS approached management of the CWDW sites across three parks over time: before the 1968 master plan (1953-1968), between 1968 and 2004, and after the creation of the CWDW Program (2004-present)? (For instance, have the parks managed their sites differently? What can we learn from attempts to achieve more consistent and connected management?)
2. How have changing demographics and uses of the city impacted how NPS has managed the CWDW over time? (For instance, in response to development pressure, community requests for infrastructure, and public perceptions of "connecting corridor" sites)

The most significant management efforts that continue to bring these questions to the fore, and should be explored and discussed in the administrative history, include:

- Development and impacts of the 1968 Master Plan and 2004 Management Plan
- Division of responsibilities between park, regional, and CWDW staff
- Historic preservation priorities, successes, and challenges
- Natural resource monitoring, management, and invasive vegetation
- Dynamics and challenges of infrastructure and community planning
- Interpretation and public programs
- Community relations, stakeholders, and partnerships

The following are the typical components of an administrative history:

- Table of contents: The table of contents must list the titles of all major divisions and the first-level subdivisions in the study and provide page numbers for all major divisions.
- List of illustrations: A list of illustrations must include captions and give page numbers for photographs, figures/illustrations, maps, and other forms of graphics subject matter. If warranted, separate lists for specific types of illustrations may be used. It is the responsibility of the project historian to gain permission to publish non-NPS images. All illustrations used in the final document will be credited. If any of the illustrations carry restrictions (such as one-time use limitations), the project historian will provide this information to the NPS.

- Acknowledgements: The acknowledgements must include any obligatory or appropriate personal or organizational acknowledgements.
- List of abbreviations and/or acronyms: The list must include nonstandard abbreviations and acronyms used in the report. The spelled-out version of a term should be given the first time the term appears within the study.
- Executive Summary: The executive summary must contain background information about the scope of the research preparation of the study. It will discuss methods and summarize major findings.
- Introduction: The introduction must include general background information on the geographic location, history, and significance of the CWDW sites administered by the NPS and their resources and how areas within the park were administered prior to NPS management.
- Narrative history (organized chronologically and/or topically, as appropriate): This section represents the main body of the product and must address the topics described above. The narrative must synthesize existing research and provide new research as needed. Use of primary sources, including oral histories, in writing this section is critical. Photographs, maps, charts, and other figures will be used as necessary to enhance the text. The overview history must contain footnotes.
- Epilogue or conclusion: The epilogue (or conclusion) must consist of a closing statement that provides further comment, if appropriate, on the interpretation of the information found in the study, and recommendations for further research.
- Bibliography: All references should be made using the latest edition of the Chicago Manual of Style.
- Appendices:
 - Chronology of notable events in CWDW history
 - List of acquisitions of CWDW lands
 - A list of oral history interviews completed for this study with brief summaries
 - Any other useful documents or summaries

Existing Cultural Resource Documentation

N.B. NPS will supplement the list below with additional park planning documents from the Planning, Environment, & Public Comment (PEPC) system and digitized park records, to be uploaded by file transfer. NPS will assist the PI(s) in identifying and accessing relevant documentation in the Electronic Technical Information System (ETIC), park headquarters at ROCR, GWMP, and NACE, and the Federal Records Center in Suitland, MD, during the project.

While the focus of this project is on the NPS's administration of the CWDW sites, managing these sites has often involved coordination with other federal, state, and local entities and stakeholders; thus, relevant documents may also exist beyond NPS collections. The PI(s) will be responsible for drawing on relevant sources in repositories such as National Archives; records of other public agencies in Washington, DC, Maryland, and Virginia; local history collections such as the DC Public Library; and newspapers and other publications.

The Civil War Defenses of Washington, Parts I and II: A Historic Resources Study	2004	DataStore - Published Report - (Code: 2203199) (nps.gov)
An Urban Oasis: Rock Creek Park's History and Management (to 2015)	2020	DataStore - Published Report - (Code: 2286520) (nps.gov)
Rock Creek Park: An Administrative History (to 1985)	1985	DataStore - Published Report - (Code: 2194952) (nps.gov)
George Washington Memorial Parkway Administrative History (1985-2010)	2011	DataStore - Published Report - (Code: 2264711) (nps.gov)
George Washington Memorial Parkway Administrative History	1994	DataStore - Published Report - (Code: 2264712) (nps.gov)
National Capital Region Administrative History, 1952-2005	2008	DataStore - Published Report - (Code: 2264710) (nps.gov)
Civil War Defenses of Washington National Register Nomination Draft (internal)	In progress	To be provided via file transfer for kickoff with PI(s)
Fort Circle Parks Management Plan	2004	File transfer
Fort Circle Park Master plan North and East National Capital Parks, Washington DC	1968	File transfer
Rapid ethnographic assessment of Civil War defenses of Washington and Anacostia Park management plans	1997	DataStore - Published Report - (Code: 165764) (nps.gov)
Ethnohistorical study of African American communities associated with Civil War Defenses	In progress	File transfer
Historic Resource Study: Reconstruction and the Early Civil Rights Movement in the National Capital Area	2021	DataStore - Published Report - (Code: 2287623) (nps.gov)
"On the Fort": The Fort Reno Community of Washington, DC, 1861–1951	2021	DataStore - Published Report - (Code: 2291435) (nps.gov)
Summer in the Parks (1968-1976); A Special Ethnohistory Study	2020	DataStore - Published Report - (Code: 2283622) (nps.gov)
Fort Bunker Hill: Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Capital Parks- East, National Park Service	2017	DataStore - Published Report - (Code: 2238663) (nps.gov)
Fort Chaplin: Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Capital Parks- East, National Park Service	2017	DataStore - Published Report - (Code: 2242628) (nps.gov)

Fort DeRussy: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Rock Creek Park, National Park Service	2014	DataStore - Published Report - (Code: 2236796) (nps.gov)
Fort Marcy: Cultural Landscape Inventory, George Washington Memorial Parkway (GWMP), National Park Service	2015	DataStore - Published Report - (Code: 2236793) (nps.gov)
Fort Stevens: Cultural Landscape Inventory, Rock Creek Park - Fort Circle Park - North, National Park Service	2010	DataStore - Published Report - (Code: 2184742) (nps.gov)
Fort Foote: Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Capital Parks East- Fort Circle Park- East	2014	DataStore - Published Report - (Code: 2236798) (nps.gov)
Fort Dupont: Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Capital Parks East- Fort Circle Park- East, National Park Service	2013	DataStore - Published Report - (Code: 2236799) (nps.gov)
Fort Drive: Cultural Landscapes Inventory, Rock Creek Park	2021	DataStore - Published Report - (Code: 2288127) (nps.gov)
Battleground National Cemetery: Cultural Landscape Report, Rock Creek Park, National Park Service	2014	DataStore - Published Report - (Code: 2240653) (nps.gov)
Fort Mahan: Cultural Landscape Inventory, National Capital Parks - East - Fort Circle Park-East, National Park Service	2013	DataStore - Published Report - (Code: 2221791) (nps.gov)
Superintendent's Lodge, Physical History and Condition Assessment, Battleground National Cemetery, Rock Creek Park	2004	DataStore - Published Report - (Code: 2284152) (nps.gov)
Historic Structures Report, Part I: Fort Dupont, Fort Circle Park	1967	DataStore - Published Report - (Code: 2276763) (nps.gov)

Schedule for Product Delivery

Below is a suggested timeline for delivery of the required products. This timeline is negotiable depending on the needs of the selected PI. Payment will be rendered to the PI according to the following schedule:

PRODUCT	DETAILED DESCRIPTION	DUE	PAYMENT
Kick-off meeting with PI(s)	Schedule an orientation meeting with park and NPS regional staff, NCPH representatives, and PI(s) to discuss the research plan, project goals and schedule, products, locations and access to source materials. If possible,	By October 15, 2023	15% of total (\$10,331.18 by October 30, 2023)

	the NPS will provide a tour to acquaint the PI(s) with the parks.		
Year 1 Mid-year Progress Report & Meeting	<p>The PI(s) will submit a spreadsheet and/or briefing describing sources, repositories, and individuals/interviews consulted to date, and be ready to discuss current questions, challenges, or needs for sources.</p> <p>NPS and NCPH will organize a partial-day meeting to discuss how NPS can assist with research needs, and substantively discuss PIs' thoughts and questions so far on the central research questions.</p>	May 15, 2024	5% of total (\$3,443.73) by May 31, 2024
Year 1 Archival and Oral History Research and Detailed Outline	<p>The first several months of PI(s)' work on this project will be focused on conducting archival research and oral history interviews and preparing a detailed outline (see below).</p> <p>Conduct sufficient preliminary research to complete a detailed outline (e.g. with text describing the contents of each chapter, descriptions of source material, and identification of gaps or issues identified in addressing the Statement of Work). The outline should contain all pertinent information necessary for sound decisions to be reached regarding further topical research and content of the final report.</p> <p><i>NPS review period: 30 days</i></p>	August 15, 2024	15% of total (\$10,331.18) by August 31, 2024
Workshop	The PI(s) will meet with NPS staff from the CWDW program, responsible parks, and regional office in a partial-day workshop where PIs will present the outline, and engage in discussion with NPS about research directions, challenges, and needed sources.	Before November 1, 2025	

Draft of Sample Chapter	<p>The initial sample chapter draft submitted should be a substantive chapter from the main body of the report. For best feedback, this chapter should include new research rather than historical context drawn from secondary literature.</p> <p><i>NPS review period: 30 days</i></p>	January 15, 2025	20% of total (\$13,774.80) by May 15, 2025
First Draft of Study	<p>The first draft will consist of a 66% completed report, including draft footnotes, bibliography, and draft illustrations and maps where available. NPS and NCPH will review and meet with PIs to discuss feedback. The PIs will inform NPS of major questions so that NPS can assist with bringing the project to substantial completion.</p> <p>NPS and NCPH will organize a conference call with PIs within 2 weeks after review if needed.</p> <p><i>NPS and NCPH review period: 45 days</i></p>	July 15, 2025	15% of total (\$10,331.18) by September 1, 2025
Second Draft of Study	<p>The second draft will be submitted for peer review in addition to NPS review. NCPH will propose appropriate peer reviewers and coordinate peer review. NPS and NCPH will organize a conference call with PIs within 2 weeks after review if needed. PIs will also be responsible for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • obtaining copyright permission and providing appropriate credit line for government printing of all images • providing images as digital images in high resolution jpg or tif format suitable for 	November 15, 2025	15% of total (\$10,331.18) by January 15, 2026)

	<p>printing – see NCR Formatting Guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> identifying images by subject, publication information, and location of original <p><i>NPS and peer review period: 60 days</i></p>		
Final draft	<p>The PIs will submit a final revised draft to NCPH and NPS for manuscript preparation and printing.</p> <p>In addition to meeting the requirements for the second draft, Recipient will select an appropriate illustration for the cover and a descriptive title. NPS can provide cover and title page templates.</p> <p>PI Submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Original formatted MS word document, images used in the report, and any scanned resource material submitted via NPS’s external file transfer site. Copies of clearly labeled permission agreements for any non-public domain images; the PI is responsible for securing image permissions. 	March 15, 2026	10% of total (\$6,887.46) by April 1, 2026
Knowledge sharing product and event	<p>Recipient and NPS will work together to develop a short form, widely accessible research product (e.g. material for web articles, printable handouts, etc.) and a concluding event to share research findings.</p>	By April 30, 2026	5% of total (\$3,443.73) within two weeks of completion
Final product submissions	<p>NCPH will work with the PI to deliver final documents to NPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 12 copies printed and bound (3 copies each for ROCR, GWMP, NACE, and CWDW program office) 	May 31, 2026	n/a <i>UNLESS</i> PI chooses to undertake 508 compliance and final preparations

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One 508-compliant PDF copy • Copies of PI’s relevant primary sources and research notes shall be submitted to the NPS, with a spreadsheet or similar key to the primary source image/transcription files and source information. 		for additional funding
--	---	--	------------------------

Personnel qualifications

1. The Principal Investigator

The Principal Investigator (PI) is responsible for all aspects of managing the proposed study. The PI must have a PhD, MA, or equivalent in United States History (no exceptions). A level of experience equivalent to a PhD is acceptable and may be evidenced by a publication record demonstrating a professional level of research, analysis, and report preparation. It is expected that the publication record will reflect an understanding and ability to apply research methodology, and education and experience beyond that of a project historian. For this project we are looking for a PI with a PhD, *or* a MA with relevant experience doing long-term research and preparing monograph-length works using primary and secondary sources.

2. Project Historian(s)

Although the overall research design, guidance, and responsibility for the completed study lies with the Principal Investigator, the PI may utilize the assistance of project historians (PH) and other project staff at their discretion to accomplish the research. The minimum requirements for a PH are a Bachelor's and Master's degrees in United States History from an accredited college or university. A Master's thesis in history or its equivalent in research and publication are highly recommended.

3. Standards for consultants

Personnel hired or subcontracted for their special knowledge and expertise must carry academic and/or experiential qualifications in their particular area of expertise. Such qualifications are to be documented by means of vitae attachments when the proposal is prepared and submitted.

Stipulations

- The principal investigator must be fully qualified personnel according to the Secretary of the Interior's standards for professional historians, outlined in [NPS-28: Cultural Resource Management Guidelines, Appendix E](#).
- All material collected and created as part of the project will remain the property of the Federal Government. Such material includes oral history recordings and transcripts, documents, photographs, maps, microfilm, drawing, notecards, computer files, etc.

- All reports and material collected resulting from the study will become the property of the United States Government. The project historian may publish reports or other products based on the research conducted under this agreement, provided the NPS role is acknowledged and no sensitive information is shared.

Submitting Your Letter of Interest

Your letter of interest must be emailed to ncph@iupui.edu by August 1, 2023. It should come in the form of a single PDF attached to the email, and should include:

1. a full C/V for the PI (or for each member of the proposed project team, if multiple researchers will be involved);
2. a one-page proposal letting us know why you'd be the right fit for this project. Please include an explanation of your approach to the project as well as any past research experience in park/program administrative/institutional history;
3. a professional writing sample of at least 4,000-5,000 words, demonstrating original research and use of secondary source citations (if possible, a writing sample demonstrating past research experience in park/program administrative/institutional history is preferred);
4. a proposed line-item budget for the project budget that includes:
 - a. Personnel services including PI and other personnel
 - b. Miscellaneous personal expenses
 - c. Supplies and equipment
 - d. Travel (travel costs must be factored into the budget; there is not a separate fund source for site visits and research trips)
 - e. Cost of analysis and report preparation
 - f. Overhead, Indirect (which cannot exceed 10%), and In-kind costs if applicable
 - g. Other expenses (for example if you plan to handle 508 compliance and preparation of final document for print)
 - h. Total project cost
5. any suggested changes to the schedule of work found above along with a work schedule diagramming the duration of field and archival work outlined in the research strategy section of the proposal; and
6. an explanation of your previous experience with long-term research projects.