"...THE FARM REPRESENTS AN ARTISTIC AND SOCIAL PHENOMENON OF THE LATE 19TH CENTURY—THE ARTIST'S COUNTRY RETREAT. LIKE CHASE AT SHINNECOCK AND HASSAM AT COS COB--BOTH PLACES NOW SUBSTANTIALLY DESTROYED--WEIR PAINTED AT HIS FARM AT A TIME WHEN PAINTING OUTDOORS, IN THE SUNLIGHT, WAS A VITAL ARTISTIC ISSUE.

AT WEIR FARM, WEIR AND HIS FRIENDS CREATED THE INDIVIDUAL STYLES THAT MADE AN IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTION TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF AMERICAN IMPRESSIONISM. WEIR FARM WAS MORE THAN A PLACE TO LIVE AND WORK; IT INSPIRED CREATIVITY."

NICOLAI CIKOVSKY, JR.
CURATOR OF AMERICAN ART
NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART
WASHINGTON, D.C.
MAY 16, 1990
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The purpose of the Weir Farm General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement is to define the basic management philosophy that will guide park management decisions over the next 15 to 20 years and to direct the actions required to support that philosophy. This final General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement includes changes made to the draft plan/statement and responds to comments received on that document.

The National Park Service staff and private consultants prepared several studies and reports in support of the management planning process; these are listed and summarized in the “Planning Background” section of the document. These research projects provided critical baseline data and detailed information to the planning team.

This document is divided into six parts. Part One provides background information about the park and the planning process; Part Two describes the plan and other alternatives considered; Part Three contains descriptions of the resources; Part Four describes the potential environmental consequences of the plan and the other alternatives considered; Part Five lists those contacted during the planning process; and Part Six contains various appendices.

For further information, please contact the site at the address below or telephone (203) 834-1896.

Superintendent
Weir Farm National Historic Site
735 Nod Hill Road
Wilton, Connecticut 06897
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background
The final General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement presents the National Park Service's proposal for the management and use of Weir Farm National Historic Site and other alternatives considered during the planning process. In addition, it describes the potential impacts of the proposal and alternatives on park resources and operations, and on the surrounding neighborhood. This document will guide park management for the next 15 to 20 years.

Each alternative developed during the planning process responded to issues identified through public comment and research findings relating to resource management, visitor safety, facility development, collections, interpretation, and artistic activity.

The alternatives range from minimal to extensive site interpretation and provide for the protection and preservation of resources, while meeting identified planning objectives, as described in the "Weir Farm of the Future" section of this document. These planning objectives reflect the site's purpose established in its authorizing legislation (P.L. 101-485) (104 stat. 1171) to preserve the farm as "a significant site of the tradition of American Impressionism [while maintaining] the integrity of a setting that inspired artistic expression and encourages public enjoyment."

Projected operations costs and estimated development costs for implementation of the plan and alternatives are included in Appendix C. Impact topics analyzed in this document include visitor use/experience, cultural resources, natural environment, socioeconomic environment, and park operations.

The draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement was on formal public review for 60 days from June to August, 1994. The final General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (which responds to public comments received during that period) will be made available for a 30-day no-action period, after which a Record of Decision will be prepared and circulated to interested parties. The approval of the Record of Decision will complete the National Environmental Policy Act process.

The Plan
The plan (identified as Alternative 1, the National Park Service's preferred alternative in the draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement) focuses on reuniting the historic property, presented as it appeared historically, with the art it inspired. The farm's buildings and landscape will appear to visitors as nearly as possible as they appeared to their historic occupants.

To retain the farm's peaceful environment, and to keep the historic landscape free of modern intrusion, a visitor center and an administration and maintenance facility will be developed at off-site locations, preferably in rehabilitated structures near the park. Criteria for acquiring properties for these purposes will include, but not be limited to, adequate access, proximity to resources, appropriate topography, absence of wetlands, minimal impact on neighbors, adequate lot size and configuration, and the presence of appropriate existing structures for redevelopment.

The park will be home to a vital artists-in-residence program. Housing will be provided in the Burlington house and studio space located in the rehabilitated and expanded caretaker's garage/barn. Arts education is also central to the plan and will combine outreach to schools with on-site programs, including workshops in the rehabilitated Burlington barn.

The proposal has been slightly changed from the preferred alternative presented in the draft plan. The changes were made in response to comments received during the public involvement period and in response to additional research findings.

The most noteworthy change is the increased emphasis on interpreting the contributions of Doris and Sperry Andrews to the site. Also, since the draft plan was
published, a development feasibility study for location of visitor and park support facilities was completed. This study indicates that few properties directly adjacent to the site have potential for redevelopment for park purposes, mainly due to access limitations. Properties between Nod Hill Road, Old Branchville Road, and Route 7 (northeast of the park) have the greatest potential for redevelopment for park purposes. Therefore, the final proposal suggests acquisition and redevelopment of parcels to the northeast of and near (not directly adjacent to) the park, and indicates that the Goldsmith, DiNapoli, and Meines properties would be appropriate for these uses. Because these properties are not directly adjacent to the park, a shuttle will be required for visitors who choose not to walk to the farm.

Due to public concerns regarding implementation costs, the plan includes recommendations for site managers to pursue fee area designation to allow revenue to be generated from special programs, special tours, and for general admissions. And, the plan includes recommendations for the National Park Service to work closely with the Weir Farm Heritage Trust to pursue alternative funding sources such as corporate, foundation, and private support. Finally, staffing projections have been decreased to lower operational costs and to reflect the NPS’s ongoing streamlining effort.

After the draft plan was published, Congress enacted legislation authorizing the inclusion of Lot 18 in Wilton within the park’s boundaries. Therefore, all discussions regarding the proposed inclusion of Lot 18 within the park’s boundaries have been deleted from the final plan.

**Alternative 2**

Alternative 2 would have emphasized the site’s continuous use by preserving Weir Farm as a “work of art” where three generations of artists worked and lived. In this alternative, the current appearance of the landscape would not have been altered, and the structures would have remained as they are to enhance visitors’ appreciation of the site’s continuous use since 1882.

In this alternative, a visitor center would have been located at an off-site location (within a three-mile radius of the site) in a rehabilitated structure. Visitors would have been shuttled to the site. An administrative/maintenance facility would have been developed in the northeast end of the park, off Weir Farm Lane.

Studio space for the artists-in-residence program would have been located in the rehabilitated Burlington barn. Some arts education programs would have taken place at the farm, while others, including art workshops, would have been conducted at the off-site visitor center.

**Alternative 3**

Alternative 3, the minimum action alternative, would have preserved the farm with only those actions necessary to protect and minimally interpret its current resources. No additional facilities would have been developed in this alternative. Limited visitor services would have been located on-site in the main barn with the main house used for art exhibition. The Burlington barn would have been rehabilitated for administrative offices, and space would have been leased off-site for maintenance operations.

No artists’ studios or accommodations would have been provided in this alternative. Art workshops for schools would have taken place in the rehabilitated Burlington barn.

**Conclusion**

The proposals that comprise the final plan were selected because they best satisfy the intent and provisions of the site’s enabling legislation (P.L. 101-485) (104 stat. 1171), which authorized the establishment of Weir Farm National Historic Site.
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PART ONE: BACKGROUND
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PART ONE: BACKGROUND

Introduction

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SITE
Weir Farm National Historic Site, established by Congress on October 31, 1990 (P.L. 101-485) (104 stat. 1171), preserves and interprets historically significant properties and landscapes associated with the life and work of J. Alden Weir (1852-1919), one of the founders of the Impressionist tradition in American art. According to the site’s enabling legislation (Appendix A), the National Park Service (NPS) and its principal partner at Weir Farm, the Weir Farm Heritage Trust, are charged with preserving the site and maintaining “the integrity of a setting that inspired artistic expression.” Weir Farm is one of only two sites within the national park system that focus primarily on fine art.

ACQUISITION HISTORY
Weir Farm’s preservation was initiated by a group of neighbors and concerned individuals who would not accept the loss of Weir Pond and the farm to suburban development. In 1985, this group enlisted the help of the Trust for Public Land (TPL), a national land conservation organization dedicated to preserving important natural, cultural, and historical resources for public use. TPL took the initiative in protecting the land by purchasing key acreage temporarily until a permanent management agency could be identified. In 1989, members of the group that initially sought TPL’s intervention formed the Weir Farm Heritage Trust, the source of grass-roots support for preserving the property.

In 1988, the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection purchased the majority of the site from TPL and then donated it to the National Park Service in 1992. In 1993, TPL transferred an additional two-acre parcel including the main house, the Weir and Young studios, and associated barns and outbuildings to the NPS. In 1994, TPL and the Trust worked together to acquire Lot 18 in Wilton, the last remaining undeveloped land adjacent to the site that was part of the historic farm’s original 238 acres. Also, the State of Connecticut transferred the Caretakers house parcel to the NPS. In October 1994, Congress enacted legislation authorizing a boundary expansion to incorporate Lot 18 and its associated unbuilt road into the site’s boundary, expanding the park by 2.9 acres.

SITE DESCRIPTION
Weir Farm National Historic Site is located in the towns of Ridgefield and Wilton in Fairfield County, Connecticut. The site is within the Fifth Congressional District.

Weir Farm NHS includes 60 of the 238 acres J. Alden Weir purchased between 1882 and 1907 in a part of these towns known as Branchville. Only about 45 miles from New York City and 25 miles from Long Island Sound, the farm lies atop a north-south ridge in the southwestern Connecticut upland.

The topography of the farm undulates between gentle and rather steep slopes and includes glacial boulders and outcroppings, woodlands, and seven wetlands.

The site embraces properties and landscape features in three distinct complexes set off from each other by the intersection of Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane. The Weir complex includes approximately 10 acres north of Pelham Lane and west of Nod Hill Road. In addition to minor outbuildings, garden and orchard remnants, and various fields edged with stone walls and hedgerows, it contains four major structures:

- The main house, portions of which were built in the eighteenth century, enlarged in ca 1825, and both modified and enlarged at Weir’s instruction in 1888, 1900, and 1911;
- The Weir studio, built by 1885, three years after Weir purchased the farm;
- The studio of sculptor Mahonri Mackintosh Young, husband of Weir’s daughter Dorothy, built in 1933-34;
- The main barn, built between the late-eighteenth century and the early-nineteenth century.
The Burlingham complex, south of Pelham Lane and west of Nod Hill Road, is the former Webb farm that Weir purchased in 1907, which eventually became the home for his daughter, Cora Weir Burlingham, and her husband, Charles Burlingham. Approximately 12 acres in extent, it contains a woodshed, a tool house, sunken and terraced gardens, stone walls, former farm fields, minor outbuildings, and three major structures:

- The Burlingham house, built between 1748 and 1782, occupied by Weir’s daughter Cora and her husband, Charles Burlingham, and enlarged at her instruction in the 1930s and 1940s;

- The Burlingham barn, built sometime between the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth century;

- The woodshed on the Burlingham farm, dating to the mid-nineteenth century.

The third complex, the pond and woodland area on the east side of Nod Hill Road, represents the largest portion of the park and consists of approximately 38 acres. It contains the caretaker’s house, dating to the mid- to late-nineteenth century and the garage/barn, dating to the early- to mid-twentieth century; the pond Weir built in 1896 with prize money from the Boston Art Club; the majority of the site’s wetlands and woodlands; and vestiges of an old wagon road, trails, and stone walls.

There is also evidence of once-cultivated fields and meadows, terraces, a fishing bridge, a boat house, and a summer house, improvements Weir and successive occupants made that are no longer present on the landscape.

Weir Farm NHS (60 acres) is one component of a network of nearly 300 acres of contiguous open space. To the southwest, The Nature Conservancy operates the 113-acre Weir-Leary-White Preserve; to the northeast, the Town of Ridgefield owns approximately 33 acres of conservation land; and, also to the north- east, the Connecticut Department of Transportation owns approximately 86 acres. The site’s northwestern and southeastern boundaries are rimmed by residential development. The location of Weir Farm, and adjacent conservation land and open space, are shown on the Context Map.

**ROLE OF WEIR FARM HERITAGE TRUST**

The private nonprofit Weir Farm Heritage Trust is the National Park Service’s primary partner in planning for Weir Farm and in developing visitor programming. Founded in 1989 to support the site’s protection and eventual establishment as a national historic site, the Trust served as interim manager of the property from October 31, 1990, when it was designated a national historic site, until January 1992, when NPS staff arrived at Branchville. It continues to function at the site through a cooperative agreement with the National Park Service.

The Trust’s mission is to enhance public understanding of the farm’s cultural and natural heritage, to perpetuate its artistic tradition, and to ensure its long-term preservation. It is a membership organization governed by a board of directors and a separate council of overseers, the latter composed largely of regional and state leaders in the arts and historic preservation. An executive director and other staff at the site manage the Trust’s day-to-day affairs. Trust programs are funded largely through private donations, and membership stands at about 300 persons.
Planning Background

METHODOLOGY
The National Park Service (NPS) takes an interdisciplinary approach to planning. Staff skilled in the fields of art history, landscape architecture, architecture, community planning, natural resource management, cultural resource management, historic preservation, interpretation, and collections management composed the planning team for Weir Farm; members of the Weir Farm Heritage Trust were also included on the team.

To acquaint the community and interested groups and individuals with the NPS planning process, to solicit comments or concerns regarding the future of Weir Farm, and to report on the status of planning, the NPS and the Weir Farm Heritage Trust published an informational newsletter in July 1992 and distributed it to about 1000 residents of Wilton and Ridgefield, farm visitors, and others. The team then sponsored a public meeting on July 15 at the Wilton Library.

As a starting point for subsequent team planning sessions, Weir Farm’s purpose, as defined in its enabling legislation, was reviewed at this first public meeting. The team then developed a significance statement for the site as well as management objectives that describe the conditions the team considered necessary to realize the site’s purpose in a manner consistent with NPS policy. Members also developed interpretive themes—ideas that help communicate a site’s meaning to visitors—for the site. Finally, the planning team focused on identifying obstacles or issues that might inhibit the NPS from achieving these objectives. Describing and suggesting ways to resolve these issues became the subject of later workshop sessions as well as the focus of this document.

To learn how they perceive Weir Farm at present and how they envision its future, the team then invited 24 artists, art historians, and art educators to attend workshops at the site. At these workshops, participants isolated alternative forms of management and interpretation, and the team then refined these over the next few months. At the same time, the NPS directed staff and consultants to gather data on the historical, natural, and cultural resources of Weir Farm. These studies are described in this section under “Resource Analysis and Research.”

In March 1993, the team developed and distributed a second newsletter to about 2,500 persons and sponsored a second public meeting to explain and gather reaction to preliminary alternatives for Weir Farm’s future. The public response expressed at this meeting and on the mailback forms included in both newsletters allowed the team to continue to refine alternatives and to develop three different plans for managing, developing, and interpreting Weir Farm. The three alternatives, and the potential environmental impacts of implementing each of them, were presented in the draft document.

The draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement was available for formal public review for 60 days, from June 17 to August 17, 1994. During this review period, the team solicited written and verbal comments, and held a public meeting at the Aldrich Museum in Ridgefield on July 16, 1994, to describe the plan and address public concerns. Sixteen people attended the meeting. On July 27, 1994, the team made a presentation at Ridgefield’s selectmen meeting. The team also distributed approximately 2,500 summaries of the draft plan with a mail back card included for comments and made available about 30 copies of the unabridged version of the draft plan. A total of 63 responses were received.

The team carefully reviewed all responses and incorporated substantive comments in the final General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement. This plan, once approved by the director of the National Park Service’s North Atlantic Region, will be implemented over the next 15 to 20 years as funding and other contingencies allow.
PART ONE: BACKGROUND

PARK PURPOSE
The threefold purpose of Weir Farm National Historic Site, as described in its enabling legislation, is to 1) preserve a significant site associated with the tradition of American Impressionism; 2) maintain the integrity of a setting that inspired artistic expression; and 3) continue to offer opportunities for people to study and create art at the farm.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF WEIR FARM
Weir Farm celebrates the life and work of the painter J. Alden Weir (1852-1919), a major and pioneering figure in the American Impressionist movement. Weir was a founding member of what became known as the “Ten American Painters,” a group of artists based in New York and New England whose reaction to the exhibitions of the prestigious Society of American Artists late in 1897 caused a major controversy in the turn-of-the-century art world.

“The Ten” did not publicly identify themselves as Impressionists, but by the 1890s most of them—Weir, Edmund Tarbell, Childe Hassam, John Twachtman, and, later, William Merritt Chase—were painting in this manner. They shared an interest in what art historian William H. Gerds has termed “the radiance of the sunlit landscape.” In an 1891 issue of the American journal Art Amateur, one critic explained Impressionism as: “The theory is that colors must no longer be mixed on the palette, but are to be laid side by side, either in dots or dashes, in pure tints, and left to mix optically on the retina.” American Impressionism showed an intense interest in place and invigorated the tradition of landscape art in America.

American Impressionism marked the first decided effort of artists in this country to break away from aesthetic conventions taught in academies in the United States after the Civil War. Impressionism represented what Gerds has called “an acceptable modernism” for the time, a transition between the precepts of academic realism and abstraction in art. According to art historian Richard Boyle, American Impressionists “broke with the older conception of a picture as a classically ordered unit in time and space, and substituted the casual passage of time, the “fleeting moment.”

Weir Farm, which J. Alden Weir acquired in 1882, became a frequent destination for his circle of artist friends; the farm in turn became the subject of many of their paintings. Art historians have argued that Weir’s move to the Branchville farm inspired his own turn toward Impressionism, a movement he had once disparaged.

Weir Farm, J. Alden Weir’s summer home and workplace for 37 years, thus preserves a way of life once shared by many important figures in American arts and letters. What drew him to the farm initially was its landscape and the opportunity it offered to “experience nature” as well as to take artistic inspiration from it. Located within easy reach of his New York City home, for Weir the farm was a retreat from urban life which, by the late-nineteenth century, was increasingly viewed as harmful to the body and spirit.

By 1890, Weir and his colleagues were doing more and more of their painting outdoors, en plein air. They modified the French Impressionist technique of pure color, broken brushwork, and intense light into an American idiom. Weir and others focused increasingly on landscape as their subject matter, but unlike Albert Bierstadt and Frederick Edwin Church, American landscape painters of the previous generation who sought to depict the extraordinary, untamed, and dramatic on canvas, the American Impressionists painted familiar, cultivated landscapes located in their own backyards. By repeatedly depicting selected sites in Connecticut and elsewhere in New England in their art, they helped create a heightened sense of appreciation for these landscapes.

Weir’s house and studio are remarkably little changed since he used them a century ago. The sculptor Mahonri Young, married to Weir’s daughter Dorothy, built a much larger studio next to Weir’s that, too,
remains essentially unaltered since Young's death in 1957. The studios are simple wooden structures, each with a wall of windows on the north side. Inside are the creative tools and other paraphernalia that belonged to the site's artists—Weir, his daughter Dorothy, Young, and painter Sperry Andrews, who has used the studios since Young's death and is the farm's current resident artist.

Today, Weir Farm is a historic vernacular Connecticut landscape. Additionally, it has survived with a level of documentation and physical integrity surpassed by few artists’ homes and studios. Perched on the top of winding Nod Hill Road, the farm is dotted with clusters of red clapboard buildings and overlaid with an intricate pattern of fieldstone walls. Remnants of historic orchards and hay fields recall a long tradition of working the land and enhance the feeling among those who visit the farm today that it is, as it was historically, a strongly familiar, welcoming place.

PLANNING ISSUES
Based on its analysis of public comments and of the findings of the resource reports on the site, the planning team identified a set of interrelated issues involved in making Weir Farm an effective national historic site.

Resource Management
Museum-quality environmental controls necessary to preserve collections of furnishings and art in the main house, the Weir studio, and the Young studio cannot be installed without compromising the fabric, structure, or appearance of these historic buildings. Alternative methods for collections preservation—including rotating collections on a regular basis from exhibition to storage and controlling the microclimate around exhibited works of art by encasing them in glass box frames—are required to furnish and interpret these interiors.

The local deer population is browsing on the park's vegetation. Resource protection strategies, such as fencing or wrapping young growth or other methods should be considered to preserve existing vegetation and provide for additional plantings in the future. Such strategies may affect the landscape restoration specified in the plan.

Finally, land protection strategies must be devised to protect the site’s historic setting and the privacy of adjacent property owners. Currently, adjacent residential properties are visible from the pond and the former wagon road. In addition, in the past, vegetation was removed on farm property near the pond to maintain water views from the surrounding homes. Properties on two of the site’s boundaries are extensively developed. In order to maintain the integrity of the historic site, vegetation management practices along the park’s periphery are advised in the future.

Visitor Safety
The site is bisected by small, winding roadways on which commuters travel at high, and often unsafe, speeds. Pedestrian and motorist safety is thus a concern, as is the difficulty that buses and recreational vehicles may have in negotiating these narrow roads.

Facilities
When fully operational, Weir Farm will require facilities for visitors, staff, maintenance and other equipment, and museum collections. Only two historic structures on the site, the Burtlingham house and the Burtlingham barn, can potentially be adapted for such uses because, unlike the main house, barn, and the studios, Weir acquired them late in his tenure at the farm and their use was secondary to the park's historic significance.

The need to preserve the fragile ecology of Weir Farm and numerous features of its cultural landscape requires that the NPS carefully evaluate all options for securing needed facilities, through new construction or reuse of existing structures on- and off-site.
Collections
Unlike other former homes that are now national historic sites—for example, those of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and Augustus Saint-Gaudens in Cornish, New Hampshire—Weir Farm does not have ample collections of the work of Weir and others who drew, painted, made prints, and sculpted at the site. Without such works, it will be difficult to interpret effectively the life and art of Weir, Young, Andrews, and other Weir Farm artists, as well as the intimate relationship between this landscape and their creative work. The National Park Service can acquire art only through donation or purchase with private funds. The Weir Farm Heritage Trust will continue to assist the park in establishing an appropriate art collection.

Moreover, museum-quality exhibition and storage space is currently not available at Weir Farm. Facilities must be provided for the proper care and storage of the site's current and future collection.

Interpretation
To understand the rich artistic heritage of Weir Farm, artists, school groups, and national park visitors in general must be exposed to exhibits, programs, and other forms of interpretation that convey the historic and aesthetic significance of the site. Weir Farm's modest collection of art and its minimal facilities must be enhanced to support this interpretive programming.

Artistic Activity
Landscape artists from the region and the New York metropolitan area, as well as area schools, have consistently shown interest in using the site to create art and as a setting for art-related programs. Artists who wish to use the site need quiet and an uncrowded space in which to draw and paint, as well as such amenities as parking and rest rooms. Provisions must be made to accommodate these activities.

INTERPRETIVE THEMES
The planning team identified the following themes to guide visitor interpretation:

- Weir Farm, the summer home and workplace of American painter Julian Alden Weir, became an important place in the development of American Impressionism, an art movement characterized in part by the celebration of place. Weir Farm was also a destination and inspiration for numerous artistic figures of the late-nineteenth century.

- Weir Farm continues to serve as a setting and inspiration for visiting artists. In addition, it has been continuously occupied by working artists, including Mahonri Young and Doris and Sperry Andrews, who have preserved the character of the property even as they adapted it to their own needs.

To enhance visitors' understanding and appreciation of Weir Farm, the site's interpretive mission will also embrace these secondary themes:

- Weir Farm was protected from development and established as a national historic site due to the foresight, commitment, coordination, and effort of local citizens (including Doris and Sperry Andrews and Cora Weir Burlingham), private organizations, and public agencies.

- Artists have historically influenced environmental and conservation movements by producing images that served to galvanize political response.

- The relationship of landscape and art has evolved because of technological advances (for example, premixed paints in tubes) and changing attitudes towards nature.

- Weir Farm contains a variety of natural and cultural resources that illustrate several historical periods and a variety of land uses.

- Paintings, sculpture, and etchings and other prints have been produced at Weir Farm, and the process of working in each of these media requires distinctive skills and equipment.
MANAGEMENT ZONING
Management zoning, a concept that divides land into sectors depending on its primary uses, management objectives, and the nature of its resources, will guide the use and management of land and waters at Weir Farm.

Weir Farm has been divided into four zones—cultural, natural, development, and transportation. The cultural zone has been divided further into the protected and the protected/adaptive use subzones. The locations of these zones are shown on the Management Zoning Map.

Cultural Zone
The resources contributing to Weir Farm's historic significance and thus to its establishment as a national historic site are within the cultural zone, which will be managed to preserve, protect, and interpret these resources and their settings.

Protected Subzone. This subzone includes the majority of the site, including the Weir complex and the pond (created by Weir in 1896) and woodland area. It is largely composed of those sites, structures, objects, and landscapes on the property Weir acquired in 1882, all significant because of their association with the artist. Because they are critical to site interpretation, resources in this subzone will be preserved or restored and interpreted for the public.

Protected/Adaptive Use Subzone. This subzone consists largely of the caretaker’s house and the former Webb Farm, which Weir acquired in 1907 and Cora Weir Burlingham later modified. Historic structures and landscapes in this subzone may be modified for special uses or administrative functions provided that the historic character of the site is retained.

All uses of historic resources will be subject to preservation and public safety requirements. No administrative or public use will be permitted if it is determined to threaten the safety of users or the stability, character, or integrity of a cultural landscape, an historic structure, or the museum objects within a structure.

New structures, landscape features, and utilities could be constructed in this subzone if other on- or off-site solutions are infeasible and if such construction does not compromise the integrity of the historic landscape or structures. First consideration will be given to reusing existing historic features. New construction located within this subzone will be subject to the design considerations outlined in the “Cultural Environment” section in Part Three of this document.

Protected Natural Zone
The protected natural zone includes the site’s wetlands. Because of their fragility and ecological significance, human intrusion is minimized to protect the ecological values of the resources in this zone.

Development in this zone will be limited to features such as boardwalks, trailside displays of information, and directional signs that have no adverse effect on natural processes, are essential for management, and enhance visitors’ appreciation of the site’s resources. Only pedestrian traffic will be permitted in this zone.

Development Zone
The planning team identified a development zone in response to the proposal in Alternative 2 to develop an administration and maintenance facility on park property. Although no such development is proposed in the park’s plan, this zone reflects the area with greatest development potential for park-related facilities.

The development zone includes lands located along Weir Farm Lane and Nod Hill Road and encompasses resources that could be directly modified through park development or intensive use. If other options for development of park-related facilities are not possible, this zone would be managed to provide and maintain facilities serving park managers and visitors, including support facilities and utilities. To mitigate the effects of
such development on the historic character of the site and on park neighbors, the zone would be restricted to the smallest area necessary, and the impacts of development and use within it will be managed toward the same end.

Transportation Zone
The transportation zone includes Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane, non-federal lands used for transportation. The park is not the destination nor is it the source for these routes.

RESOURCE ANALYSIS AND RESEARCH
The planning team identified several distinct areas of research necessary to develop comprehensive alternatives for the future of Weir Farm and an assessment of the costs and impacts of each. A summary of the scope and findings of each research effort follows.

Cultural Landscape Report
The landscape of Weir Farm changed in numerous respects during the occupancies of the Weir, Young, and Andrews families. To trace the landscape changes over time, the NPS commissioned a consultant to conduct research and prepare the first volume of the cultural landscape report: site history and existing conditions (Child Associates and Zaitzevsky, 1994). The report documents the history of the landscape and includes a detailed inventory of existing conditions.

Research reveals that the landscape known to Weir and Young was far more open than the landscape visitors see today. The majority of the wooded areas that now exist are less than 50 years old and arose through natural processes of vegetative succession after Dorothy Weir Young ceased to farm the land. The numerous large oaks dispersed throughout the farm, surrounded by smaller second-growth woods, once provided shade for grazing animals in open fields.

The second volume of the report, initiated in 1995, will include an analysis of the significance and integrity of the landscape and a treatment plan.

Dam Evaluation
In 1896, with money won at the Boston Art Club, J. Alden Weir built a pond on his Branchville property by blocking a watercourse with a stone dam that is now nearly a century old. At some later point, the spillway was made higher to raise the water level in the pond, increasing the load on the dam. Staff of the North Atlantic Region evaluated the dam to address park managers’ concerns regarding the condition of the structure (NPS, 1993a).

The report found the structure in fair condition and advised that it be stabilized by lowering the spillway so as to drop the water level in the pond slightly and by filling one weakened section of the structure. The method and material for repairing this structural weakness is now under study.

Development Feasibility Study for Visitor Orientation Center and Maintenance Facility
In the preferred alternative of the draft plan, the planning team identified the need for a visitor center and an administration and maintenance facility, and recommended that those facilities be developed outside of the park’s current boundaries to help protect the fragile, intimate environment of Weir Farm. To determine where such facilities could best be located, the NPS commissioned an architectural firm to conduct an analysis of the development potential of properties adjacent to and nearby the park (Heritage Partners, 1994).

The architectural firm recommended that, based on access, road conditions, public comments, impacts on neighbors, topography, conditions of existing structures, and willingness of property owners to sell their property, that lands to the northeast of the park, in between Nod Hill Road, Old Branchville Road, and Route 7 in Ridgefield, would be the best location for such facilities. Of particular potential are the Goldsmith, DiNapoli, and Meines properties. Use of these properties for park facilities would afford minimal visual and aural impact on park neighbors, allow park
traffic to be diverted to the visitor center parking area before it reaches Nod Hill Road, and permit visitors to walk from the visitor center to the park via existing woodland trails.

Ecological Inventories
To develop data on the ecology of the farm, the NPS relied on two ecological inventories prepared earlier, one of the Weir-Leary-White Preserve conducted by The Nature Conservancy’s Connecticut chapter (The Nature Conservancy, 1976) and the other of the national historic site itself, conducted by the Division of Natural Resources, North Atlantic Region (NPS, 1991).

The 1991 survey identified four major plant communities at Weir Farm—an oak/maple-leaved viburnum forest, a maple/ash/New York fern forest, a red maple/sweet pepperbush forest, and a red maple/spicebush forest. These plant communities are typical of Connecticut; there are no threatened, rare, or endangered species or critical habitats found within the national historic site.

Environmental Evaluation of Buildings at Weir Farm
Because they are central to understanding the work of artists associated with the site, collections of art and art-related artifacts must be acquired. The site will also build other major collections, such as furnishings historically used in the main house, the Weir studio, and the Young studio, and will acquire documents associated with Weir, Young, and Andrews. Parts of these collections will be exhibited in these three structures, either in exhibitions or in furnished rooms.

To determine the capacity of these historic structures to maintain an environment in which collections can be safely exhibited and preserved, and to suggest means of improving interior environments that would not pose potential long-term threats to the integrity of these structures, the NPS commissioned an environ-

mental evaluation of the buildings at Weir Farm (Art Preservation Services, 1992).

This report concluded that noninvasive measures—such as exhibit cases with microclimatically controlled environments for such sensitive materials as paintings and certain furnishings—will be needed to provide adequate environmental control in these historic spaces.

Garden Plan
In 1990, prior to NPS management of Weir Farm, the Ridgefield Garden Club commissioned Rudy Favretti to prepare a restoration plan for the “secret garden,” the small garden area north of the Weir studio (Favretti, 1990). After the report was prepared, new information became available that provided additional documentation for the project. Based on the new information and additional research, the Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation prepared detailed restoration plans for all garden features, including plantings, fences, and gates (NPS, 1994a). A related part of this project involved archeological investigations conducted by the Cultural Resource Center, North Atlantic Region. The archeological investigations documented the garden’s configuration, and in particular, the location of the wood fence which historically encircled the garden (NPS, 1994).

Historic Furnishings Report
The historic structures at Weir Farm contain furnishings from the Weir, Young, and Andrews tenures. To determine the appearance of these interiors over time, staff of the Division of Historic Furnishings, Harpers Ferry Center, NPS, interviewed Weir, Young, and Andrews family members and conducted extensive documentary research. This information was presented in a historic furnishings report (NPS, 1994b), which also includes furnishing plans for the main house, the Weir studio, and the Young studio.

The document indicates that the interiors of the first floor of the main house changed very little between 1919, when Weir died, and 1957, when Mahonri
Young ceased to occupy the house. The only major alteration after Weir's tenure, was the library on the first floor. Changes during the Andrews family tenure include the modified kitchen and additional furnishings. The Weir studio today contains some furnishings dating from Weir's use of the building, although the studio appeared much less cluttered during Weir's time than it does today. The Young studio contained additional sinks and modeling equipment during the years that Young sculpted there.

**Historic Structure Report**

The number and appearance of structures on the site also changed over the years that the Weir, Young, and Andrews families occupied the place. Staff of the Building Conservation Branch, Cultural Resource Center, North Atlantic Region, researched the evolution of the site's structures and evaluated their significance and integrity. This information has been compiled into a draft historic structure report (NPS, 1995), which includes historical information and a detailed inventory of existing features.

The draft report reveals that all of the known structures on the site were either already present, built, or modified during the years these artists lived at Weir Farm. The last significant structure to be built was the Young studio, completed in 1934. Of the minor outbuildings, the last was the Burlington garden shed, built in 1940.

**Painting Sites Study**

The farm's landscape inspired J. Alden Weir's art for nearly four decades and may indeed have affected his transition to Impressionism. Additionally, many of Weir's friends and colleagues, including Childe Hassam, John Twachtman, Albert Pinkham Ryder, and Emil Carlsen, painted scenes on the farm during visits there.

Park staff conducted a survey suggesting that Weir completed more than 250 paintings of the Branchville farm (NPS, 1994c). Of these, about 50 scenes have been discovered and documented. In conjunction with works of art depicting this landscape, these sites offer insight into Weir's artistic process and permit a precise understanding both of how the site appeared during Weir's tenure and how it has changed. Weir used the whole property for his work. The study documents Weir's connection to the landscape as well as the landscape's significant cultural and natural resources.

Analysis of the connection between Mahonri Young's art and the Weir Farm landscape will be conducted in the future with images from the Young collection at Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

**Survey of Comparable Sites**

Because Weir Farm NHS was established so recently, visitation figures exist for only five years; ten years of data are normally required to provide statistically relevant projections of future visitation. To develop projections without this information, planning staff of the North Atlantic Region surveyed more mature sites with similar themes to assess visitation patterns and facility development (NPS, 1992a).

Based on an examination of 16 comparable sites, the survey estimated that annual visitation will range between 25,000 and 40,000 persons.

**Visitor Study**

The University of Vermont conducted a survey of visitor attitudes, perceptions, and demographics to establish baseline data that will help staff assess the site's effectiveness in the future (Manning, 1994). Manning surveyed 149 persons, whose responses to questions about crowding and the elements that constitute a pleasant or disagreeable experience helped the team develop alternative proposals for managing visitors.

Despite the lack of visitor facilities and interpretive programs at the time of the survey, visitors reacted strongly to the "peace and quiet of the area" and the opportunity to "enjoy the natural environment."
addition, 56 percent of visitors stayed at least two hours; 19.4 percent stayed three hours or longer. These lengths of stay are noteworthy in view of the undeveloped nature of the site.

The survey also showed an overwhelming opposition (63 percent and higher) to horseback riding, bicycling, and walking dogs at the site. Visitors instead felt strongly that only bird watching, nature study, walking, and ice skating should be allowed at Weir Farm.

Almost three quarters of the respondents thought the site should recreate portions of the pastoral landscape that J. Alden Weir created and the Youngs maintained. In addition, the majority of visitors (56.7 percent) felt that visitor facilities should exist outside of the historic site’s boundaries. Respondents reported a preference for guided tours, as opposed to the option of receiving information from staff stationed in various parts of the historic structures and grounds.

The survey also sought to ascertain visitors’ perception of the site’s carrying capacity—that is, how many people can visit Weir Farm at any given time without making visitors feel that the site is crowded. Respondents answered that they felt no more than fifty visitors should be present on the site at any one time. This response will help site managers establish the site’s carrying capacity in experiential terms.

Water Quality Analysis
Area residents have reported that the size of the pond has decreased and its algal blooms have increased in magnitude (and odor) over the years. The NPS contracted with the Natural Resources Conservation Service, Bethel Field Office, Connecticut, to determine the condition of the pond and evaluate water quality on a parkwide basis (Natural Resources Conservation Service, 1994).

The Natural Resources Conservation Service determined that the pond can be described as eutrophic. This state may be more a function of water depth than elevated levels of nutrients, as the pond is a relatively shallow water body - seven feet at its deepest point. Water clarity ranges from four to five feet, with no evidence of planktonic algae bloom. Groundwater appears to contribute to the majority of the base flow of the pond.

If surrounding land use—unmanaged Weir Farm woodland and low density residential development—remains constant, the water quality will also remain constant. Water quality could also be maintained, or even improved, if nearby residential landowners adopt low maintenance landscape design principles and follow environmentally benign management practices for lawn and landscape maintenance.

Weir Farm Traffic Counting Operations Report
Residents of the area use Nod Hill Road as a commuter route, and both park managers and neighbors want to ensure that Weir Farm visitors will not create traffic congestion. To determine the potential impact visitors will exert on traffic patterns, consultants measured current vehicular travel rates on Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane and calculated the percentage increase in traffic based on predicted visitation figures (Baloffit, 1995).

The study determined that, in the future, an average of 42 vehicles can be expected to enter and leave the park each day (84 total trips), which represents between 3 and 4 percent of total traffic. Some seasonal and day-of-week variation in Weir Farm traffic is expected: if twice as many vehicles visit the site on a Saturday during peak season, then Weir Farm traffic will be about 7 percent of total traffic on the local road system. Total Weir Farm traffic, estimated at 40,000 visitors per year, would thus constitute between 3 and 7 percent of the volume of total traffic. The study considered such increases in auto travel on Nod Hill Road to be minimal, and likely to not be noticeable to local commuter drivers.
Wetlands Assessment
The United States Fish and Wildlife Service determined the location, extent, and drainage patterns of the site’s wetlands (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1992). The assessment determined the site contains seven major wetland areas. Together, they occupy approximately one-third of the park’s total acreage. The wetlands are the farm’s most fragile ecological community and constrain the placement and methods of any construction on site.

White-Tailed Deer Issues and Concerns
Vegetation at Weir Farm shows clear evidence of deer browse, and deer are seen every day in the fields near the Burlington and main houses. Concerned about the changes in vegetation that result from browsing, North Atlantic Region staff conducted a preliminary investigation of the deer population at the site (NPS, 1992b).

The investigation revealed that deer have browsed moderately on area vegetation for about ten years and that deer population density in the area ranges from about 30 to 60 animals per square mile. The area’s deer population is expected to increase, which will increase the level of browsing and change the character of vegetation further. The study recommended that, while removal of deer should not be summarily dismissed, the question should be approached from the perspective of vegetation management, not deer management. For example, vegetation along the perimeter of the park could be managed to control deer browse (e.g. by wrapping plants in burlap below the browse line and by placing wooden protective coverings over younger vegetation) helping to accomplish the planning team’s objective to screen views to adjacent residences.

Weir Farm of the Future
One of the few intact reminders of a milieu that no longer exists, Weir Farm offers the unparalleled opportunity to preserve and interpret a place central to the development of American Impressionism. Weir Farm has inspired artists for more than a century and continues to do so today. Very few public resources of this type exist.

In addition to the specific proposals outlined in the plan, site managers have adopted the following management objectives and long-term strategies for developing, managing, and interpreting Weir Farm and its resources.

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Objective: To implement effective resource management and land protection strategies that safeguard the site’s cultural and natural resources, including its historic setting.

Landscape
The Weir Farm landscape, like the site’s structures and collections, is a primary cultural resource because it reflects changes J. Alden Weir and his children made and it is the subject of much of the art created at the farm. A program of routine and cyclic landscape preservation maintenance will protect surviving features of the site’s historic landscape, such as the fields, hedgerows, gardens, pond, and pond plantings Weir created and installed while he lived at the farm. Site managers will monitor the condition of trees close to historic structures and, when needed, will prune them to minimize the threats they pose to these structures. The later changes to the landscape surrounding the Burlington house will also be preserved; doing so will involve different management and treatment than required of the older landscapes Weir created.
The first volume of the cultural landscape report has located evidence of landscape features from the years of Weir’s occupancy that are no longer intact, and has produced a map of known painting sites. This information aided planners in siting the 15-car parking area and the proposed Burlingham complex septic system. No additional major alterations will be made to the landscape until the treatment plan, the final phase of this report, is completed.

With other agencies and trail management organizations, Weir Farm will develop and implement a trail management plan consistent with the cultural landscape report. This systematic approach to trail maintenance, restoration, and improvement, will aim to minimize the impact of walking trails on historic resources.

The site’s wetlands have been included in a protected natural zone, an NPS designation that protects their ecological values by permitting only minimal human intrusion. The NPS will adhere to all local, state, and federal wetland protection regulations (for additional zoning information, see the “Management Zoning” section in Part One of this document).

Any construction planned near water resources must mitigate the possibility of erosion and subsequent siltation and sedimentation. New facilities will be designed to filter runoff so that any contaminants associated with the operation of these facilities will not affect the site’s water resources.

In consultation with federal, state, and local agencies, site managers will continue to monitor the quality of pond and stream water and will compile all data from previous testing to establish a baseline. Results will be available to the public and shared with other agencies. With other agencies and adjacent landowners abutting the pond, the NPS will develop a management program for the pond and streams based on the results of the monitoring program that will outline all necessary repairs to the dam and assign priority to accomplishing these actions as funding becomes available.

The capacity and functioning of the site’s three septic systems have been assessed. Two cesspools serve the Weir house. A 300-gallon stone-lined cesspool is located to the west of the house, which processes gray water from the kitchen and laundry. This system is working well and will not be upgraded. Bathroom waste is piped to a 1,500-gallon stone-lined cesspool located to the north of the main barn. This system has failed and is scheduled to be replaced by two 1,500-gallon holding tanks in 1995.

The Burlingham house is served by a 750-gallon brick-lined cesspool. This system is adequate for the present level of use. However, design work is under way to upgrade the system to accommodate living quarters for the artists-in-residence program. This work is scheduled to commence in 1995. The caretaker’s house has a well-functioning cesspool with a leach field of unknown size and age. New septic systems will be carefully located to minimize alteration of the cultural landscape.

Habitat Preservation
The NPS will collaborate with other public agencies, colleges and universities, and nonprofit conservation organizations to inventory and monitor the flora and fauna of the site. Existing habitats and threats to them will be identified and monitored. In consultation with these other organizations, site managers will develop natural resource management plans for the primary habitat areas of woodland, wetland, pond edge, and meadow that identify and set priorities for necessary actions.

Hunting and trapping will not be allowed on the site, but, as state and local regulations allow, visitors may fish in the pond.

Land Protection
As currently configured, Weir Farm NHS encompasses approximately 60 of the 238 acres J. Alden Weir purchased between 1882 and 1907. The site is largely surrounded by homes on sparsely wooded lots. The
NPS will maintain recently acquired Lot 18 as open space to protect the historic character of Weir Farm.

Any acquisition of private property or interest in property will be accomplished through donation or on a willing-seller, willing-buyer basis. The intent of site managers is to acquire properties from owners who wish to sell, not to pressure landowners to sell their property unwillingly.

The NPS will work with other area landowners, such as the State of Connecticut and the Towns of Ridgefield and Wilton, to maintain existing walking trails and encourage development of new trails and promote preservation of adjacent open space.

The NPS will work cooperatively with park neighbors on the planting of screens of vegetation appropriate to Weir Farm. These screens will minimize the visual intrusion of contemporary development adjacent to the park and enhance the privacy of neighboring property owners. The NPS will also allow existing vegetation to mature along certain areas of the site’s periphery. Site managers will conduct a comprehensive boundary survey and clearly mark all boundaries between Weir Farm and abutting property.

Recreational Opportunities

Among their many other pursuits, J. Alden Weir, Mahonri Young, and Doris and Sperry Andrews have all been interested in the study of nature. Residents and visitors enjoyed bird-watching on the property and fished in the pond. These historical recreational activities will continue to be permitted and encouraged, as will a moderate level of cross-country skiing.

To reduce trail-use conflicts, motorized vehicles, bicycles, horses, and dogs will not be permitted within the national historic site, just as they are not permitted in the Weir-Leary-White Preserve. The use of motorized vehicles is prohibited on the adjacent Town of Ridgefield conservation land. To ensure that the peaceful quality of the site is maintained and its carrying capacity not exceeded, site managers will monitor periodically the number of visitors using the trails and the site, in general.

Human Resources

Weir Farm and Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site in Cornish, New Hampshire, are the only sites in the national park system that are primarily concerned with art. Staff for these sites require knowledge and skills in art history, art education, and exhibitions, a background not usually required at NPS sites.

Weir Farm will maintain a staff with a high degree of professionalism and with appropriate skills and expertise. This staff will help ensure that the site’s preservation, collections, research, and interpretive requirements are met. Staff will be experienced specifically in managing and exhibiting art and other collections. In addition, a resident park ranger is needed to provide first-line response in the event of fire, vandalism, theft, or other emergency and to increase site security. (For a complete list of staffing requirements, see Appendix C.)

FACILITIES

Objective: To maintain the feeling and the historical, pastoral character of Weir Farm while providing safe, accessible facilities that support visitation levels appropriate to the site’s intimate scale.

Design Criteria for the Development of New Facilities

Any construction within the boundary of Weir Farm National Historic Site will meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, which guide preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction activities. While these standards are not intended to dictate design, they do require that the integrity and historical character of a property be retained. The Standards for Rehabilitation apply when changes to a historic property are needed to accommodate a contemporary use.
At Weir Farm, any contemplated new construction needs to be sensitive to issues of location, scale, and materials. Any new development will be sited in such a way as to avoid damage to historic features or sites and to avoid affecting views from the Weir complex, from the woodland surrounding the pond, and from significant fields, gardens, or other important landscape features. Careful consideration will also be given to the scale of proposed new construction. The materials and design of new elements will be compatible with the vernacular character of Weir Farm. For example, new plantings will avoid a formal, suburban appearance and will be compatible with existing vegetation on the site.

Siting new construction must also take into account the presence of site neighbors, significant archeological sites, and such environmental constraints as extensive wetlands and ledges.

Pedestrian Safety
Touring the entire site will require crossing Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane. The NPS will work with the Towns of Wilton and Ridgefield to increase pedestrian safety by, for example, reducing the speed limit on Nod Hill Road, posting caution (‘Pedestrian Crossing’ and ‘Go Slow’ signs on Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane, installing a three-way stop sign at the intersection of these roads, and providing crosswalks. Two crosswalks—one on Nod Hill Road between the Burlingham house and the parking area, the other across Pelham Lane at its intersection with Nod Hill Road—are advised.

An off-road pedestrian path will be developed from the Burlingham house to the main house. Paths will be mown through the fields and vegetation along these paths will be cut often, both to minimize opportunities for Lyme disease infection and to protect the landscape generally from soil compaction and erosion. Off-trail travel will be discouraged for the same reasons. Trails will be maintained and surfaces improved as necessary to mitigate erosion.

Accessibility
In accordance with federal law and NPS guidelines, site managers will make every reasonable effort to ensure that facilities and services at Weir Farm are accessible to and usable by all people, including those whose mobility is impaired. Special, separate, or alternative facilities, programs, or services will be provided only when existing ones cannot reasonably be made accessible. Weir Farm will consult with persons with such impairments or their representatives to determine what facilities and services are inaccessible and what must be done to make them accessible.

Measures to improve access to historic structures will be pursued only when they will not require the removal of historic fabric and will not adversely affect the significant qualities of the historic landscape.

Using the findings of the cultural landscape report, site managers will improve access to the grounds by analyzing and modifying trail surfaces. Trail maps designed so that persons with visual impairments can read them easily will identify surfaces, slopes, widths, distances between points of interest, and the location of potential barriers to enable users to decide whether to navigate the trail.

Parking
Due to the site’s scale, configuration, and geophysical features, the development of expansive on-site parking areas is not appropriate. Small “pods” of soft-surfaced, limited parking with extensive vegetative screening (like the 15-space parking area across from the Burlingham house) will be the prototypical parking style for the site.

Site managers will identify suitable locations within the nearby commercial district off Route 7 for off-site overflow parking during special events and peak visitation periods and will negotiate agreements with landowners for parking cars, tour buses, and recreational vehicles. Site managers will prohibit bus and RV idling beyond certain prescribed time limits to
minimize the impact of bus and R.V. parking. Temporary signs will divert visitors to these lots when necessary.

Buses will not be permitted to park on the site at any time. They will, however, be able to drop passengers off at the site before they park in an overflow lot off-site. Site managers will evaluate the feasibility of establishing a shuttle service between the site, the overflow parking lot, and local train and bus stops.

Road Character
The winding, narrow, rural character of Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane contributes to the aesthetic quality of the visitor’s experience and also to the site’s historic setting. The NPS will support efforts of Ridgefield and Wilton citizens to pass an ordinance designating Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane as town “Scenic Roads.” This designation will protect the roads’ scenic and rural qualities by requiring formal review of all applications for alterations, such as road widening.

COLLECTIONS

Objective: To collect and exhibit art, realizing the unprecedented opportunity that exists at Weir Farm to reunite the historic property—domestic interiors, studios, and landscape—with the art it inspired.

Interpreting the work of Weir and his colleagues at Weir Farm, as well as that of contemporary artists on the site, presents an opportunity to join art with the place that inspired its creation. The existing landscape permits visitors to see scenes depicted in the works of many noted American artists. Because a great number of these works are privately owned, they are potentially available to Weir Farm through direct donation or the donation of funds with which they might be purchased.

Museum collections will be acquired because of the critical role they play in helping visitors understand not only the lives and creative vision of the artists associated with the site but also the value of the site itself. Collections will include works by J. Alden Weir and his Impressionist colleagues, Mahonri Young, Sperry Andrews, and other contemporary artists. They may also include furnishings used in the main house, the Weir studio, and the Young studio, as well as documents associated with these artists.

In 1993, Weir Farm developed a scope of collection statement (NPS, 1993) based on these principles, and staff will develop an acquisition plan in conjunction with the Weir Farm Heritage Trust to assign priority to the acquisition of certain works and to guide the Trust as it seeks donations or raises funds for purchases.

In addition to exhibitions of fine art at the visitor center (see “The Plan” in Part Two of this document), collections will be exhibited in the main house, the Weir studio, and the Young studio either as furnished rooms or arranged in formal exhibitions. Non-intrusive climate controls (see “Environmental Evaluation of Buildings at Weir Farm,”) will protect paintings and other artifacts in these historic spaces.

Like collections at most NPS units, the Weir Farm collection may be larger than can be adequately exhibited at any one time. Certain archeological, archival, and other materials may never be exhibited. Museum-quality storage will be provided for those collections that are not on exhibit. Given the value of the collection, particularly of its works of art, it will be protected from theft, vandalism, fire, and other threats. In addition, the collection will be cataloged, documented, and fully researched.

Before works of art may be exhibited in Weir Farm’s historic structures, staff must complete selected exhibit plans. A collection management plan and collection condition survey will be required to identify and assess the preservation and restoration needs of the collections in accordance with recommendations contained in the historic furnishings report.
ARTISTIC ACTIVITY

Objective: To perpetuate the site's long and unbroken artistic tradition by providing programs and facilities for ongoing artistic activity.

Artists-in-Residence
Since 1882, artists have lived at Weir Farm and have drawn inspiration from its landscape. The cornerstone of the Weir Farm Heritage Trust's programs, and central to Weir Farm as a national historic site, is the development of an artists-in-residence program that preserves and continues the tradition of creative response to the site. Providing the opportunity for serious artists to live and work at Weir Farm builds on its past, enriches the farm's artistic legacy, nurtures artists, and enhances the visitors' experience of this rare cultural resource.

The Trust has sponsored a visiting artist program at Weir Farm for three years (see "Existing Interpretation and Visitor Use" in Part Three of this document). In the future, up to twelve artists a year (three to five at a time) will be invited to live, work, and teach at the site. A panel of artists, art administrators, and art educators will choose artists for the program through a competitive process. Residencies will last, on average, one to two months, but they may be longer. As part of their participation in the program, artists will be encouraged to conduct painting demonstrations, open their studios, present illustrated talks, and offer other programs for the public. The Trust will establish and keep an ongoing written and photographic (and perhaps video) record of art created at the farm. When appropriate and possible, the Trust will acquire works by the participating artists for the site's collection.

Weir's descendants, who were instrumental in saving the farm and remain closely involved through the Weir Farm Heritage Trust, strongly support the artists-in-residence program in part because it perpetuates J. Alden Weir's lifelong commitment to teaching and nurturing other artists.

Arts Education
A vital arts education program is another effective way of ensuring that the artistic tradition of Weir Farm survives. The existence of a large school enrollment in the surrounding area and the current need to supplement available arts education in primary and secondary schools throughout the nation position Weir Farm well to meet one of its most important objectives.

The art education program will be developed with an interdisciplinary approach that promotes using art to teach a variety of subjects, including history and geography. It will integrate the art and landscape of Weir Farm with the social histories of its occupants in an effort to explain how they lived on, used, and felt about the landscape. The program will emphasize both the practice and understanding of art.

The NPS will seek the cooperation of area schools and the Weir Farm Heritage Trust in developing and implementing this program. This program will be conducted through the combination of aggressive outreach activities in schools and such on-site activities as art workshops.

During the summer, when schools are not in session, some aspects of the program will be available to the general public. The NPS will seek the participation of other organizations to coordinate educational programs outside the school system.

Special Exhibitions
An ongoing program of special exhibitions will supplement permanent exhibitions of art and furnishings and will flesh out the overall interpretive objectives of the site by focusing on different aspects of the farm's history. Special exhibitions will also continue the site's artistic tradition by featuring contemporary art created at Weir Farm. These short-term exhibitions will draw from site and other collections to explore the works of Weir, his contemporaries, Young, Andrews, and other contemporary artists, particularly those in the visiting artist and artists-in-residence programs.
Temporary exhibitions will be installed both on the site and at interested museums in the area. The NPS will work with the Weir Farm Heritage Trust and other museum organizations interested in supporting such a cooperative venture.

Other Programs
Lecture series held both on and off the site will present topics associated with the farm’s history, art history, or contemporary art, or they will be tied specifically to other activities occurring at the site. Similarly, NPS partners, including the Trust, will from time to time offer guided walks and other activities appropriate to the site’s objectives.

VISITOR EXPERIENCE

Objective: To provide a diverse visitor experience that encourages enjoyment of the natural beauty of the site and that promotes understanding of the farm’s role in American Impressionism and its continuous use by artists from 1882 to the present.

Visitors to historic sites generally arrive with some expectations and preconceptions. Their encounter with tangible resources and information may satisfy, augment, alter, or frustrate these notions. “Visitor experience” is the term used to indicate the combination of these factors with certain ancillary features, such as the adequacy of parking, the legibility of signs and brochures, and the clarity of directions to the site. Visitors to Weir Farm should appreciate the site as a home, a workplace, and a source of artistic inspiration. They should also understand why the idea of a farm, and the site itself, appealed to Weir and what farm life signified to him and his contemporaries.

Interpretation will be presented in both static (such as brochures and signs) and interactive ways (such as guided tours and videodisc) to build on visitors’ orientation to the site. Visitors will encounter historic structures (due to building code requirements, the public will be permitted to tour only the first floor of the main house), historic and contemporary works of art, and the landscape that inspired these works. In this way, they will be directly encouraged to contemplate the vision and method of these artists, the significance of American Impressionism, in general, and in this key setting, and the relationship between landscape and art.

TRANSPORTATION

Objective: To promote train, bus, pedestrian, and bicycle travel to the site in order to encourage resource conservation and reduce pollution and traffic congestion.

In the 1930s, the Connecticut Department of Transportation began planning for a Route 7 bypass, commonly referred to as “Super 7,” that would have passed approximately 1,000 feet from the eastern boundary of the national historic site. The Department of Transportation has since removed “Super 7” from the state’s 10-year master plan, but the NPS has serious concerns about the bypass should efforts to build it be revived in the future. In that event, the NPS will pursue measures to mitigate its impact on the site, such as the installation of sound barriers, vegetative screening, or dedicated greenspace buffers, aligning the road on the far side of the right-of-way from the site, and improving access to the site by means of Route 102. The NPS will also promote access by foot and bicycle by improving bike and pedestrian ways to Weir Farm.

Through the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA), the NPS will work on transportation planning with the Towns of Wilton and Ridgefield, regional planning agencies, and the State of Connecticut to improve access to Weir Farm from the Branchville train station and other mass transit routes by shuttle (using alternative-fuel vehicles as possible) and bicycle and pedestrian pathways. The NPS will also work with these agencies to identify the best routes for visitors to take to the site and to design and install directional signs along these routes.
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Park brochures will include train and bus information to encourage visitors to take public transportation to the site. Directions to the site and park information will be available at the Branchville, Norwalk, and Westport train stations, as well as at other appropriate train and bus stations.

The NPS will support the development of safe bikeways in the area and will provide bike racks and other amenities for bicyclists at the site. Bicycle riding is prohibited on all trails within the adjacent Nature Conservancy property, the Weir-Leary-White Preserve, and on most of the trails within the adjacent Town of Ridgefield conservation land. Within Weir Farm, bicycle riding will also be prohibited to avoid resource degradation and use conflicts on the site's narrow trails.

PARTNERSHIPS

Objective: To continue to work in close partnership with the Weir Farm Heritage Trust and others to establish an art collection and to support park activities, including implementing the plan.

Weir Farm Heritage Trust
At Weir Farm, the primary partnership for planning and programs is between the NPS and the private, nonprofit Weir Farm Heritage Trust. Weir Farm's enabling legislation refers specifically to the Trust as a potential cooperator, and this relationship, formalized in a cooperative agreement between the two organizations, is expected to be a long-term affiliation.

Since the beginning of NPS operations in 1992, the Trust has provided art and education programs, with particular emphasis on planning and developing an artists-in-residence program. It offers art workshops, special art exhibitions, lecture series, and other programs. The Trust has also begun to establish an art collection for the site. Finally, the Trust conducts sales at the site and is expected to continue to serve as the cooperating sales association for Weir Farm.

The Trust follows site issues and outside activities that threaten the long-term preservation of site resources. In addition, the Trust provides advocacy for the historic site as needed and works to build community support for the park through its membership program.

Other Partnerships
Because Weir Farm and the Weir-Leary-White Preserve share a common audience (one property is the physical extension of the other) and some of the same management concerns, the site anticipates forming a partnership with the preserve. The preserve borders the southwest corner of the site, and 37 of its 113 acres were historically part of Weir Farm. In the future, the historic site and the preserve may cooperate on special programs and share or exchange maintenance responsibility for such resources as trails and signs.

A similar geographic relationship exists with the Town of Ridgefield, which owns approximately 33 acres on the northeast border of Weir Farm. The site and the Town may cooperate on visitor programs, trail management, and other efforts.

Other cooperative efforts with local organizations exist to accomplish specific programs or projects. Area garden clubs are helping to rehabilitate historic gardens, and organizations such as the Junior League of Stamford/Norwalk have assisted in developing volunteer programs for the site. The museums and historic sites in Connecticut that share a focus on American Impressionism—the Bush-Holley House Museum (Cos Cob), the Florence Griswold Museum (Old Lyme), the Lyman Allyn Art Museum (New London), the William Benton Museum of Art (University of Connecticut, Storrs), the Wadsworth Atheneum (Hartford), the New Britain Museum of American Art, and the Mattatuck Museum (Waterbury)—are also potential partners for such programs as staff training and recruitment, new employee and volunteer orientation, interpretive programs, curriculum development, and symposia, lectures, and seminars relating to Weir and American Impressionism.
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Modifications Made to the Preferred Alternative to Form the Final Plan

This document outlines a proposal or "the plan" (a modification of Alternative 1, the National Park Service's preferred alternative in the draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement) and two other alternatives for the management, development, and use of Weir Farm National Historic Site. Each option presented fulfills the site's purpose as outlined in its enabling legislation and provides for both the preservation of its resources and its safe and effective operation.

The plan and the alternatives differ in the conceptual framework that guides each management approach. The plan focuses on reuniting the historic property—presented as it appeared historically—with the art it inspired. Alternative 2 focuses on preserving the farm's artistic heritage without restoring structures and landscapes to their appearance during the time Weir and Young lived and worked on the farm, and thus without making a direct connection between art and the landscape. Alternative 3 focuses on taking only those actions necessary for preserving the farm and offers very limited site interpretation and programs.

The plan presented in this document is largely similar to Alternative 1, the preferred alternative as outlined in the draft plan/statement. The modifications made are a result of information received during the public review period and of further analysis. The substantive changes are outlined below.

1) Due to public suggestions, the plan includes recommendations that place greater emphasis on the interpretation of Doris and Sperry Andrews as preservationists and artists. The main house will be interpreted to reflect its continuous use by the Weir, Young, and Andrews families. Interpretive exhibits focusing on Mr. and Mrs. Andrews will be placed in both the visitor center and in the Young Studio.

2) The preferred alternative included recommendations to redevelop parcels adjacent to or near the park for a visitor center and administration and maintenance facility. Since the draft plan was published, a development feasibility study for the location of such facilities was completed. This study indicates that properties between Nod Hill Road, Old Branchville Road, and Route 7 (northeast of the park) have the greatest potential for redevelopment for park purposes.

The plan includes recommendations for acquisition and redevelopment of properties near—not directly adjacent to—the park and indicates that parcels in Ridgefield—the Goldsmith, DiNapoli, and Meineks properties—would be appropriate for these uses. Facilities located on these properties would allow visitors to walk, off-road, on upgraded existing woodland trails to visit the pond, main house, and park resources. A shuttle service (approximately a three-minute ride) would be necessary for those visitors who choose not to walk three quarters of a mile to the main house.

3) Several people commented on the cost estimates for implementing the preferred alternative and suggested that the NPS consider other options for revenue generation. As a result of these comments, the final plan includes recommendations for site managers to pursue fee area designation to allow revenue to be generated from charges for special programs, tours and general admission. Although fees may help offset costs for park operations, fees will not be relied upon for major revenue generation. In addition, the plan includes recommendations for the NPS to work closely with the Weir Farm Heritage Trust to pursue alternative funding sources for plan implementation, such as corporate, foundation, and private support. Finally, staffing projections have been decreased to lower operational costs and to reflect the ongoing NPS "streamlining" effort.
4) After the draft plan was published, Congress enacted legislation authorizing the inclusion of Lot 18 in Wilson and its associated unbuilt road within the park’s boundaries. Therefore, all discussions regarding the proposed inclusion of Lot 18 within the park’s boundaries have been deleted from this document.

The Plan: Weir Farm as the Marriage of Landscape and Art

CONCEPT
Awareness of our nation’s artistic heritage and its relationship to the American landscape converge at Weir Farm. The plan emphasizes the relationship of art to landscape in two ways, 1) by reuniting works of art with the landscapes that inspired them and 2) by presenting the farm’s buildings and landscape to the visitor as they appeared to their historic occupants.

Unlike conventional museums, where visitors see only the creative products of artists’ lives, Weir Farm provides the opportunity to acquaint them with the domestic, personal, and creative dimensions of the lives of Weir and his successors. Domestic interiors will be furnished and gardens, farm fields, and other landscape features will be rehabilitated to appear as they did to the farm’s historic figures and their guests.

Ample facilities are required for visitor services, administration, and maintenance; art and artifact collections need museum-quality exhibition and storage conditions. However, building new facilities on the site would be inconsistent with the preservation and historic presentation of this landscape, and artifacts cannot be stored or displayed in the site’s historic farm structures without significantly altering them and threatening their long-term survival. Thus, in the plan, an existing structure or structures north of the national historic site will be acquired and rehabilitated for use as a visitor center. The center will be designed for art exhibition according to the most current museum standards. By rehabilitating nearby structures located on properties that were not part of the historic farm, the site’s landscape can be returned to its historic appearance, and adequate space will exist nearby to operate the site properly and effectively.
VISITOR EXPERIENCE

Future visitors will encounter restored buildings and landscapes based on documentation from the Weir and Young periods. To familiarize visitors with the significance and career of the artists who have lived and worked at Weir Farm, exhibitions, audiovisual presentations, and other media will initially orient them to the site at the visitor center. Because of the connection between art and the landscape, the visitor center should be as close as possible to the site so that visitors can return easily after site tours to look at paintings and other interpretive materials in a more informed and comprehensive way. Thus, although the visitor center will introduce site resources, it will also exhibit works of art tied in varying degrees to the immediate landscape. Exhibits at the visitor center will also address the grass-roots efforts, spearheaded by Cora Weir Burlingham, Doris and Sperry Andrews, and others, that led to the preservation of the farm.

Guided tours of the house and studios will be a major focus of the site’s interpretive program. Tours will be scheduled at regular intervals according to group size and frequency. Visitors will be encouraged to walk the grounds while they wait for a guided tour.

In terms of the impact on both resources and a visitor’s experience, carrying capacity is a more critical consideration in the structures than on the grounds. No more than ten people per tour is advised to protect the structures and their contents and provide a quality visitor experience; a majority of the visitors polled in the visitor use survey conducted in 1993-94 indicated that groups touring the main house and studios should not be larger.

Because it is the structure on the site that is most closely associated with J. Alden Weir, the Weir studio will be furnished to interpret his use of the structure (see preliminary rendering of the interior of the historic Weir studio). Occupied by Weir, by Dorothy and Mahonri Young, and later by Mr. and Mrs. Andrews, the main house will be furnished as much as possible and interpreted to reflect continuous use by the Weir, Young, and Andrews families. The Young studio will be furnished to interpret Young’s use of the structure and will house exhibits on Sperry Andrews.

Although outbuildings and landscapes are usually interpreted in wayside signs and exhibits, such features may constitute an intrusion upon the historical scene of Weir Farm. Instead, an interpretive brochure, including trail information, will be available to visitors. A separate guide to historic painting sites will continue to be part of the interpretive offerings.

WEIR COMPLEX

Landscape

The landscape surrounding the Weir complex will be restored to its appearance in about 1940, to reflect the continuous use of the site while conveying the historic character of the landscape that prevailed through both the Weir and Young periods. By that time, all the major buildings and other features of the landscape that survive today were present; the Youngs were still actively farming the property and the landscape retained the open character that defined it during the Weir’s time. Many of the landscape features Weir created, including most of the fields, orchards, and gardens, were retained when the Youngs alone occupied the farm. Features of the historic landscape that the Weirs and the Youngs created but that no longer exist will be replaced if documentation is sufficient to guide this replacement. Plans are under way to restore the garden north of the Weir studio, or the “secret garden.” Other landscape features, such as the wagon shed, which came down sometime after 1960, will be reconstructed and interpreted. The structure could be used, if suitable, for much-needed storage. The landscape restoration work will be guided by the second volume of the cultural landscape report.

Overgrown fields will be cleared and their specimen trees protected. Priority will be assigned to restoring those areas that contain the largest concentrations of documented painting sites. Should historical evidence
be insufficient to support an accurate restoration of any given landscape or landscape feature, the area will be preserved rather than restored.

**Structures**
The exteriors of the structures within the Weir complex will be restored to their appearance in about 1940 and interpreted, like the landscape, to reflect their continuous use by Weir and his successors. The historic structure report will guide the restoration of building facades. In some cases, historic features that are missing from the facades may be replaced, based on documentation in the historic structure report.

The barn will be restored and will be interpreted to reflect the Weir and Young era farming practices, which were discontinued by the Andrews family.

**Collections**
The interiors of the main house, the Weir studio, and the Young studio will be furnished as much as possible. The historic furnishings report, and the availability of objects and furnishings, will guide the selection and placement of furnishings in these structures; some objects, including horse tack and agricultural equipment, may be exhibited in the main barn. To the greatest extent possible, objects will appear where they did historically.

To protect the collection, the environmental conditions of the main house and the studios will be stabilized by non-intrusive means (see “Environmental Evaluation of Buildings at Weir Farm” in Part One of this document) but no work of art will be exhibited in these historic structures if its condition or composition makes it vulnerable in such settings. Moreover, because of the need to protect the collections from the potential hazards of environmental conditions and public access, the structures will house fewer artworks than they would have historically.

**BURLINGHAM COMPLEX**

**Landscape**
Landscapes at the Burlingham complex will be rehabilitated rather than restored so that the changes Cora Weir Burlingham made after 1940 are retained. A cyclical preservation and maintenance program will focus on overcoming the deteriorated condition of many portions of these grounds. Mowing regularly and pruning woody vegetation will reclaim existing but overgrown fields, and site managers will evaluate the possibility of rehabilitating Cora Weir Burlingham’s gardens.

**Structures**
The Burlingham house and the Burlingham barn will be rehabilitated, the dwelling to house artists in the artists-in-residence program and the barn to provide year-round space for school and other programs. The woodshed and tool house in this complex will be preserved and used for storage.
Works of art inspired by the site exhibited in a visitor center located in rehabilitated structure near the site. Visitor center also features site orientation, interpretive materials and exhibits, some offices, collections management area, and library.

Weir complex structures and landscape restored to their historic appearance and interpreted.

Artistic tradition of the site kept alive through artists-in-residence and school programs.

Administration/maintenance facility located within a one-mile radius of the site.

Peak visitation, special event, bus and large vehicle parking located off-site in a commercial district.

Nearby properties acquired for visitor center and administration/maintenance facility.
POND AND WOODLAND AREA

Landscape
Based on the treatment plan in the cultural landscape report, site staff will clear limited areas of the woodland east of Nod Hill Road to recreate the open appearance of this area circa 1940. The boundaries of the site will be left wooded. Additional vegetation may be planted to screen views of contemporary development.

Consistent with the treatment of the Weir complex landscape, missing historic features in this area will be replaced if sufficient information exists to do so. If information needed to support an accurate landscape treatment is lacking, landscapes surrounding the pond and woodland area will be preserved rather than restored.

The present system of pedestrian paths will be expanded to create a loop that links the Weir complex, the Burlington complex, the pond and woodland area, and adjacent open space. Historic routes, such as the wagon road, will form the basis of this circulation system. As funding and resources allow, new connectors will be developed in accordance with the recommendations of the cultural landscape report and in consultation with the managers of adjacent parcels of open space.

Structures
The caretaker’s house will be rehabilitated to provide housing for an on-site park ranger. The caretaker’s garage/barn will be rehabilitated and enlarged, by building a compatible new addition following the footprint of the missing section, to create studio space for the artists-in-residence program.

NEW FACILITIES
To retain the farm’s peaceful environment and to keep the historic landscape free of modern development, on-site construction will be kept to a minimum. A visitor center and an administration and maintenance facility will be developed at off-site locations, preferably in rehabilitated structures north of the park. Extreme care will be taken to minimize the impact of the new facilities on abutting properties by siting them carefully and possibly by installing sound barriers and vegetative screens.

Visitor Center
The visitor center will include space for reception, rest rooms, orientation, interpreters’ offices, and sales. It will also feature 1) exhibitions and other interpretive media about Weir, his colleagues, and his successors at the site, as well as about the site’s history; 2) a permanent exhibition of site-related art, primarily by Weir and his colleagues, Young, and Andrews; 3) temporary exhibitions that illuminate site themes; and, 4) exhibits on the grass-roots efforts, spearheaded by Cora Weir Burlington, Doris and Sperry Andrews, and others, that led to the preservation of Weir Farm. Finally, the center will incorporate a museum-quality collections care and storage area, curatorial offices, and a library. To accommodate these functions, the structure is estimated to require 8,000 to 9,000 square feet of space. Limited parking (for approximately 25 cars) will be provided for visitors at this location.

Because the visitor center will not be directly adjacent to the park, a shuttle service will be necessary to transport visitors. A shuttle drop-off will be located either to the north of the chicken house or in the new 15-car parking lot located across from the Burlington house.

Park Administration and Maintenance
Another property north of the current park boundaries will be used to support offices for administrative and maintenance staff, office equipment, a carpentry shop, a painting shop, and equipment repair. To accommo-
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BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS
AND LAND PROTECTION

Vegetative Screening

Twenty-four residential properties surround the park and, except for three parcels, were once part of Weir’s historic farm. These properties have been developed, some in ways that intrude visually on the historic character of Weir Farm.

The NPS seeks to work cooperatively with the owners of the adjacent properties to plant vegetation along the periphery of the park. Additional plantings would screen views of contemporary development from key park sites, such as the wagon road and the pond, as well as enhance the privacy of park neighbors. The NPS will also work with property owners within the pond’s watershed to help maintain and upgrade water quality within the pond.

Boundary Adjustments

Additional properties will be acquired for the visitor center and the administration and maintenance facility. Criteria for acquiring these properties will include, but will not be limited to, adequate access, proximity to resources, appropriate topography, absence of wetlands, adequate lot size and configuration, least impact on neighbors, and the presence of appropriate existing structures for redevelopment.

Properties between Nod Hill Road, Old Branchville Road, and Route 7 (northeast of the park) have the greatest potential for redevelopment for park purposes. The Goldsmith, DiNapoli, and Meines properties have been evaluated for development of such facilities and have been determined to be appropriate for these uses. Because these properties are bordered on two sides by open space, park development here would have minimal impact on neighbors. Park traffic could be diverted off Old Branchville Road, never reaching Nod Hill Road and thereby posing minimal impact on the Nod Hill, Strawberry Ridge, Weir Farm Lane, Pelham Lane, and Tall Oaks Road neighborhoods. In addition, facilities located on these properties would allow visitors to walk, off-road, on existing woodland trails to visit the pond, main house, and park resources. Acquisition of easements or rights-of-way over State of Connecticut and Town of Ridgefield properties would be necessary to allow for pedestrian/visitor access to the park. A shuttle service (approximately a three-minute ride) would also be necessary for those visitors who choose not to take the three-quarter-of-a-mile-trail to the main house. This shuttle service could also pick up passengers at the train station, the overflow lot, and at other locations deemed appropriate.

The NPS (and/or the Weir Farm Heritage Trust) will acquire additional properties and interests in properties through donation or on a willing-seller, willing-buyer basis. If structures that can be rehabilitated for the identified purposes become available, new construction may not be necessary. Congressional legislation will be required to authorize NPS acquisition of properties. Without legislation, the park could make only minor adjustments to its boundaries.

Overflow Parking

The NPS will pursue cooperative agreements with the Towns of Wilton and/or Ridgefield or with private property owners for use of a parking lot (in the commercial district) to accommodate overflow parking.

PROGRAMS

Artists-in-Residence

Maintaining a vital artistic tradition at the site is a priority for Weir Farm managers. The plan calls for full development of an artists-in-residence program. Artists will be provided with both housing and studio space at the site; they will live in the Burlingham house, already designed for domestic use, and work in the rehabilitated and expanded caretaker’s garage/barn. The kitchen and bathrooms of the Burlingham house will require complete rehabilitation.

The artists-in-residence program does not preclude other artists from using the farm. Artists will be allowed to visit and use the site whenever it is open.
**Arts Education**

Arts education is also central to this alternative and, like the artists-in-residence program, will ensure ongoing artistic activity at the site. The arts education program combines outreach in the schools with on-site programs, including workshops in the Burlington barn. This barn will thus require rehabilitation for year-round use. School programming will also make use of the site facilities open to all visitors, including the historic house and studios, the visitor orientation and gallery spaces, and the landscape.

**Special Exhibitions**

In addition to permanent and temporary exhibitions at the visitor center, special exhibitions arranged in cooperation with other museums will also be promoted.

**Other Programs**

Special programs that require an indoor facility, including lectures or workshops, will be conducted off-site or in the Burlington barn when it is not being used for arts education programs.

**ESTIMATED COSTS TO IMPLEMENT THE PLAN**

Estimates for one-time capital costs for development of facilities and preservation of historic resources is approximately $11 million. Annual operation and maintenance costs are estimated to be $850,000. Additional costs for art acquisition, which cannot be conducted with federal dollars, and for land acquisition will also be incurred (see Appendix C).

To help defray federal expenditures, site managers will work with the Weir Farm Heritage Trust and other partners to pursue alternative avenues for funding, such as corporate, foundation, and private support. Various partnership efforts will be explored to leverage federal dollars, such as generating private funding for land acquisition and facility construction. In addition, site managers will evaluate the potential for generating some operating revenue from charging fees. Although fees may help offset costs for park operations, fees will not be relied upon for major revenue generation.

**Alternative 2: Weir Farm as a Work of Art**

**CONCEPT**

In this alternative, Weir Farm would have been treated as a “work of art” in itself. Artists at the planning team’s workshop suggested that the farm be stabilized, conserved, and presented to the viewing public as “a unique collection, accretion, and accomplishment of American artists.” This alternative was designed not to crop and highlight the picture, but to take the site as it is and illuminate it through interpretation. The changes made to the farm throughout the tenures of the Weir, Young, and Andrews families would have been retained. The current appearance of the site would not have been altered: the evolution of the landscape from open farm field to forest would have been preserved and structures would have remained as they are to enhance visitors’ appreciation of the site’s continuous use since 1882.

The opportunity to view works of art inspired by the farm was just as important to the visitor experience in this alternative as in the plan. But because the site would have retained its contemporary appearance, the actual connection of the works with the land would not have been as visible and therefore not as critical to the interpretive plan. In this alternative, art exhibitions and other visitor services would have occurred off-site, and visitors would have been shuttled to the farm.

**VISITOR EXPERIENCE**

In this alternative, visitors would have parked and been greeted at an off-site visitor center within a three-mile radius of the site. There they would have received much the same orientation described in the plan, except the narrative would have focused less on the theme of the site’s continuous use, because that concept would have been more directly observable on the
site itself than in the plan. Thorough orientation at the visitor center would have been more critical in this alternative than in the plan because visitors would have had limited access to orientation materials once at the site.

The number of visitors on the site would have been controlled through the shuttle system. From the on-site shuttle stop north of the chicken house, visitors would have walked to a visitor station in the main barn to gather for guided tours of the main house and studios. As in the plan, these tours would have been a major focus of the site’s interpretive program, would have been scheduled at whatever regular intervals demanded and frequency suggested and would have included no more than ten persons. Visitors would have been encouraged to walk the grounds while waiting for guided tours. A brochure that illustrated the areas of the farm most often painted would have also been offered.

Interpretation at the Weir studio would have focused on Weir’s, Dorothy Weir Young’s and Sperry Andrews’ use of the structure. Interpretation of the main house would have focused on the lifestyles of all three families who lived in it. Interpretation of the Young studio would have focused on Mahonri Young’s and Sperry Andrews’ use of the structure.

WEIR COMPLEX
Landscape
The existing character of the landscape in the Weir complex would have been preserved. A preservation maintenance program would have retained and cared for existing landscape features. Existing fields would have been mowed yearly to discourage vegetative succession and to preserve the existing woodlands (that were farm fields prior to the 1950s). Horticulturally significant shrubs near the Weir complex structures would have been pruned as needed to ensure or revive their health and vigor. If severely deteriorated, historic plant material would have been removed and replaced in kind. Severely deteriorated historic plant material would also have been propagated on site.

Existing remnants of deteriorated or lost landscape features would have been retained. The current project to restore the “secret garden” and provide limited replacement of missing plantings and features would have continued, but no more garden restoration projects would have been initiated. In this alternative, no attempts would have been made to replace missing landscape features.

To accommodate the shuttle service from the visitor center, a turn-around where the shuttle could drop off and pick up passengers would have been developed north of the chicken house. An off-road pedestrian path would have been developed from the drop-off to the visitor station in the main barn.

Structures
The structures within the Weir complex would have been preserved as they are, not restored. A portion of the main barn would have been rehabilitated for an on-site visitor station; rest rooms would have been added in the barn. All building exteriors would have been repaired and stabilized to preserve their current appearance. Deteriorated exterior elements would have been replaced in-kind as necessary.

Collections
Art equipment and studio furnishings associated with J. Alden Weir, Dorothy Weir Young, and Sperry Andrews would have been exhibited, to the greatest extent possible, in the Weir studio. Because of environmental constraints, the need to protect the collections, and the hazard posed by visitor traffic, the studio would have housed far fewer objects than at present. Similarly, the Young studio would have exhibited selected works and furnishings associated with Young and Andrews according to their environmental vulnerability and their capacity to represent the continuous use of this studio and would have housed far fewer objects than at present. The historic furnishings report
would have guided the placement of furnishings and works of art in these studios and in the house.

To protect the collection, the environmental conditions within the main house and the studios would have been stabilized by non-intrusive means (see "Environmental Evaluation of Buildings at Weir Farm," in Part One of this document). These structures would have housed fewer objects than they do currently. Some objects, including horse tack and agricultural equipment, could have been exhibited in a portion of the main barn.

**BURLINGTON COMPLEX**

**Landscape**
As within the Weir complex, the landscape at the Burlington complex would have been preserved as it exists at present, and a preservation maintenance program would have retained and cared for existing landscape features. No garden rehabilitation would have been pursued.

**Structures**
The structures within the Burlington complex would have been rehabilitated for contemporary uses. All of the building exteriors would have been repaired and stabilized to preserve their present appearance.

A limited number of offices and a small archival space would have been created in the Burlington house. Three studios for the artists-in-residence program would have been created in the Burlington barn, which would have been rehabilitated to improve its climatic controls and lighting and to provide running water.

**POND AND WOODLAND AREA**

**Landscape**
The landscape in the pond and woodland area would have been preserved as it exists at present. A preservation maintenance program would have retained and cared for existing landscape features. The existing trail system would have been clearly marked and mapped.

**Structures**
The caretaker’s house would have been rehabilitated to provide housing for an on-site park ranger. The caretaker’s garage/barn would have been rehabilitated to store maintenance equipment and supplies. All building exteriors would have been repaired and stabilized to preserve their present appearance.

**NEW FACILITIES**
Visitor services not easily housed in the existing historic farm structures would have been provided at a remote location, outside of the existing site boundaries. The site’s administrative and maintenance functions would have been housed in a new facility that would have been built at the eastern end of Weir Farm Lane.

**Visitor Center**
An off-site structure would have been rehabilitated for a visitor center. This center would have included space for reception, orientation, rest rooms, interpreters’ offices, and sales. It would have also featured 1) exhibits and other interpretive media about Weir, his colleagues, and his successors at the site, as well as about the site’s history; 2) a permanent exhibit of site-related art, primarily by Weir and his colleagues, Young, and Andrews; 3) temporary exhibits of works from the collection; and 4) exhibits on the grass-roots efforts, spearheaded by Cora Weir Burlington, Doris and Sperry Andrews, and others, that led to the preservation of Weir Farm. The visitor center would have incorporated a museum-quality space for collections care and storage, curatorial offices, and a library. Most administrative offices would have been located here, while a few would have been on the site in the Burlington house. Finally, the center would have provided space for lectures, art classes, and other special programs.

These functions were estimated to need between 10,000 and 12,000 square feet of space. This estimated spacial requirement was larger than that estimated for the visitor center in the plan (8,000 to 9,000 square feet). In the plan, the visitor center’s proximity to the
park and surrounding residences restricts its scale. Such constraints were absent in this alternative. If acquisition of such a facility was not feasible, the NPS would have considered leasing a facility for the visitor center.

Near the center, parking would have been provided for cars, buses, and recreational vehicles. A frequent shuttle service would have operated between the site and the visitor center. The shuttle would have also stopped at local train and bus stations and at other locations (as determined through consultation with local groups) during scheduled arrivals and departures.

**Park Administration and Maintenance**

A new administration and maintenance facility would have been developed at the end of Weir Farm Lane to include space for offices, office equipment, a carpentry shop, a painting shop, and equipment repair. To accommodate these functions, the structure would have required approximately 4,500 square feet of interior space and 1,000 square feet of unheated space. In addition, limited parking (10 to 15 cars) for staff would have been provided at this location. The facility and its parking area would have been built into the existing slope to minimize its visual impact on the abutting properties and on the trail to the pond. The building and parking would have been screened with native shrubs and evergreens.

**BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS AND LAND PROTECTION**

**Vegetative Screening**

In Alternative 2, as in the plan, the NPS would have worked with adjacent landowners to plant vegetative screening along the periphery of the park to enhance the privacy of park neighbors and screen views of residential development from the park. The NPS would also have worked with property owners within the pond's watershed to help maintain and upgrade water quality within the pond.

**Boundary Adjustments**

In Alternative 2, properties for the visitor center, within three miles of the site, would have been acquired. The parcel would have offered adequate interior space to accommodate the functions earlier described for the center with a minimum of new construction. The NPS hoped to locate an existing building with the required 10,000 to 12,000 square feet of space and an interior configuration that would have permitted maximum flexibility for developing floor plans. The appropriate location would have also offered adequate space for visitor and staff parking. The NPS had identified several parcels as possibilities for remote off-site development. One was the Gilbert and Bennett Wire Company site in the village of Georgetown in the southwestern corner of the town of Redding. A former industrial site proposed for redevelopment, the site is approximately 2.7 miles from Weir Farm and contains a number of historic and non-historic industrial buildings no longer actively used.

**Overflow Parking**

Overflow parking for special events would have been available at the visitor center. If adequate space was not available, the NPS would have developed a cooperative agreement with the Towns of Wilton and/or Ridgefield or with a private owner to park vehicles during peak visitation and special events.

**PROGRAMS**

**Artists-in-Residence**

In this alternative, the site would have offered artists in the artists-in-residence program studio space in the Burlington barn, which required rehabilitation for year-round use. No housing would have been provided.
Arts Education
Certain components of the arts education program would have taken place at the historic farm, while others, including workshops, would have been conducted at the off-site visitor center. A triangular transportation system—between schools, the site, and the visitor center—would have been required for a successful arts education program.

Special Exhibitions
A program of special exhibitions would have been presented in the off-site visitor center and at other museums in the area. In this alternative, the visitor center would have included more exhibition space than the visitor center proposed in the plan.

Other Programs
Programs that required indoor workshop or lecture space would have been offered only at the visitor center or at other locations.

Alternative 3: Weir Farm as a Protected Cultural Resource

CONCEPT
Alternative 3 proposed to manage the site only minimally, acting only when necessary to preserve and interpret park resources modestly and according to a scenario of continued economic uncertainty. This alternative indicated how the park would have been managed if neither the plan or Alternative 2 could have been implemented. It also reflected the current site management approach, which emphasizes stabilizing park resources and deferring major actions pending the completion of this General Management Plan and related studies.

This approach concentrated staff efforts on protecting the site’s cultural resources. Visitor services and interpretive programs, of secondary importance to resource protection, would have been developed on a very limited basis as space, facilities, and funds allowed.

No additional facilities would have been developed in Alternative 3.

VISITOR EXPERIENCE
In this alternative, visitors would have been greeted in an on-site visitor station (complete with rest rooms) in the main barn. Some form of interpretive media, focusing on only the major interpretive themes, would have introduced them to Weir Farm and its occupants. Because substantially less effort would have been put toward portraying historic periods in this alternative than in the plan and Alternative 2, the on-site visitor station assumed greater importance despite its limited space.

The main house would have been used as a space for art exhibitions, with a primary concentration on interpreting art associated with the site rather than on the lives and activities of the artists who lived there.

Interpretation at the Weir studio would have focused on Weir’s, Dorothy Weir Young’s and Sperry Andrews’ use of the structure. The Young studio, because it is larger and associated with other artists, would have interpreted the continuous use of the site. As in the plan and Alternative 2, visitors would have been encouraged to walk around the grounds, but guided tours and brochures offering self-guided tours would have only been offered as resources allowed.

WEIR COMPLEX

Landscape
The landscape would have been protected and maintained as it currently exists through a program of mowing, pruning, and other actions designed to discourage vegetative succession and preserve the existing landscape pattern.

Structures
The main barn would have been rehabilitated for use as a visitor station, which would have included rest rooms, orientation, and limited exhibits on the artists who occupied the site. The Weir and Young studios
would have been preserved and interpreted as they are today, not restored. The main house would have been presented not as a historic house but as a space for the exhibition of art, objects, and furnishings from all periods of the site’s history.

Collections
A state-of-the-art storage facility would have been developed for works of art and artifacts in a rehabilitated portion of the main barn. Additional storage space would have been provided off-site, if possible, in cooperation with area museums.

Art equipment and studio furnishings associated with J. Alden Weir, Dorothy Weir Young, and Sperry Andrews would have been exhibited, to the greatest extent possible, in the Weir studio, but because of environmental issues and the need to protect and preserve the collections, the studio would have housed far fewer objects than at present. Similarly, the Young studio would have exhibited works of art and furnishings associated with Young and Andrews according to their vulnerability to the environment and their capacity to represent fully the continuous use of the studio. The historic furnishings report would have guided the placement of furnishings in the studios. In order to protect the collections, art and artifacts would have been rotated from collections storage to the main house and other appropriate spaces.

BURLINGHAM COMPLEX
Landscape
The landscape would have been preserved as it is at present and protected by a regular maintenance program. No garden rehabilitation would have been pursued.

Structures
The structures within the Burlingham complex would have been rehabilitated for contemporary uses. All building exteriors would have been repaired and stabilized to preserve their current appearance.

Both floors of the Burlingham house would have been used for administrative offices and research space. The Burlingham barn would have been adapted to house special educational programs and cultural events.

POND AND WOODLAND AREA
Landscape
The landscape would have been preserved as it currently exists and protected by a regular maintenance program.

Structures
As in Alternative 2, the caretaker’s house would have been rehabilitated to provide housing for an on-site park ranger, and the caretaker’s garage/barn would have been adapted to store maintenance equipment and supplies. Building exteriors would have been repaired and stabilized to preserve their current appearance.

NEW FACILITIES
The new 15-car parking area across from the Burlingham house would have been expanded to accommodate a space where buses and shuttles could discharge and pick up visitors.

This alternative would have required leasing a facility for site administration and maintenance and possibly curatorial functions. This facility would have contained at least 4,500 square feet of heated interior space and 1,000 square feet of unheated storage area. It would also have offered limited space for staff parking.

BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS AND LAND PROTECTION
This alternative proposed no property acquisition.

Overflow Parking
The NPS would have pursued informal agreements with the towns of Ridgefield and/or Wilton or with private property owners to secure space for bus and overflow car parking during peak visitation and special events.
PROGRAMS

Artists-in-Residence
No artists' studios or accommodations would have been provided in this alternative, though the site would have welcomed visiting artists as the Weir Farm Heritage Trust has in the past (see the “Existing Interpretation and Visitor Use Programs” in Part Three of this document).

Arts Education
Art workshops for schools would have taken place in the Burlingham barn, which would have required rehabilitation for year-round use. School programming would have also taken place in the facilities on the site that are open to all visitors, including the main house, the studios, and the landscape. Because staffing would have been extremely limited in this alternative, teachers themselves would have needed to organize and staff school programs at Weir Farm.

Special Exhibitions
This alternative could not have accommodated temporary or permanent exhibitions because no museum quality exhibition space would have been available. The special exhibition program would have been conducted exclusively through the cooperation of area museums.

Other Programs
Programs requiring indoor space, including lectures or workshops, would have taken place in the Burlingham barn when school programs were not in session there.

Alternatives Considered But Rejected

The planning team considered numerous other issues and proposals as it developed alternatives for Weir Farm, but for the reasons outlined here they were not included in any alternative.

DEVELOPING AN ON-SITE VISITOR CENTER

The planning team's second newsletter included a proposal in the article, “Weir Farm: the Gathering Place” to build a new visitor center on the site. As more information became available on the farm’s historic painting sites and its cultural landscape, however, the team realized that locations where access and geophysical features would permit the construction of a visitor center were also locations with high concentrations of historic painting sites. Because of the fragility of the cultural landscape and the need to preserve its historic features, the team rejected this proposal.

RESTORING THE LANDSCAPE TO THE WEIR PERIOD

The second newsletter also included a proposal to restore the landscape throughout the site to the period from 1882 to 1919 when J. Alden Weir occupied the site. This proposal would have entailed removing all structural and landscape features added since Weir’s death. Because doing so would involve a great deal of removal and replacement of historic features and would make it impossible to achieve the objective of demonstrating the site’s continuous use by artists, this recommendation was modified. The Weir studio, the structure associated most closely with J. Alden Weir, would be furnished and interpreted to the time of his use of the structure, and the landscape of the Weir complex would be restored to about 1940 to show those features Weir built or modified that the Youngs later retained.
REFURNISHING THE MAIN HOUSE
TO THE WEIR PERIOD
The second newsletter included a proposal to restore the main house to the time that Weir lived in it. As more information on historic furnishings became available, the team realized that the Youngs retained many of Weir’s furnishings on the first floor; only the installation of the library and wall treatments were substantially different. As with the landscape, refurbishing the house to the Weir period would have substantially limited presentation of the property’s continuous use by the Young and Andrews families, therefore providing a more limited experience for visitors.

PROVIDING MUSEUM QUALITY ENVIRONMENTS IN HISTORIC STRUCTURES
The structures at Weir Farm National Historic Site are historically significant. Originally constructed for people to live and work in, none were designed specifically to exhibit works of art. Thus they lack the appropriate environmental and security controls. They do not have the physical capacity to stabilize or control relative humidity, one of the principal requirements for preserving works of art and artifacts such as historic furnishings over long periods of time. The team considered extensive structural modifications and the installation of more sophisticated environmental controls for the sustained exhibition of art, but rejected these proposals on the grounds that such actions would alter the historic fabric of the structures and could threaten their long-term survival.

EXPANDING THE SITE TO INCLUDE A PROTECTION AREA
During the planning process, the team considered a proposal to enlarge the site’s boundaries to encompass a “protection area,” 24 additional residential properties. The proposed change would have added approximately 43 acres to Weir Farm. Acquiring these parcels would have permitted the NPS to modify or remove the structures on them and thus to create a buffer zone protecting the historic center of the farm from any visual intrusions. Such an action would have been taken to enhance visitors’ appreciation of the site and to ensure its protection from encroachment in the long term. After careful analysis, however, the team concluded that this proposal was too costly and infeasible to be seriously considered at this time.

ALLOWING AN ARTIST-IN-RESIDENCE TO OCCUPY THE UPSTAIRS OF THE MAIN HOUSE
The team considered a proposal to allow an artist-in-residence to occupy the upstairs of the main house while offering public tours of the first floor. The team rejected this proposal because occupation of the house would result in visitor/occupant conflicts; increase potential for hazards resulting from fire or water damage; and would also place greater stress on the house’s historic fabric.
## SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE PLAN</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 2</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVE 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concept</strong></td>
<td><strong>Concept</strong></td>
<td><strong>Concept</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presents the farm as it appeared historically and reunites the landscape with the art it inspired.</td>
<td>Emphasizes the site's continuous use by preserving it as a &quot;work of art&quot; where three generations of artists worked and lived.</td>
<td>Preserves the farm with only those actions necessary to protect and minimally interpret its current resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Visitor Facilities

| Visitor center in a rehabilitated structure near (within one-mile radius of) the site. | Visitor center in rehabilitated building off-site (within three-mile radius). | Visitor contact station in main barn. |
| Site orientation, interpretive materials and exhibitions in visitor center, including works of art inspired by the site, and exhibits on site preservation. | Site orientation, interpretive materials and exhibitions in visitor center, including works of art inspired by the site and exhibits on site preservation. | Limited site orientation and interpretive exhibits in visitor contact station. |
| Visitor parking (25 cars) at visitor center; shuttle conveys visitors who choose not to walk to the site; bus/special event parking in commercial district. | Visitor parking at off-site location; shuttle conveys visitors to contact station in main barn that contains rest rooms and assembly area for tours; bus/special event parking at off-site center or in commercial district. | Visitor parking opposite the Burlington house, across Nod Hill Road; bus/special event parking in commercial district. |
| Lectures, art classes, school and other programs in the rehabilitated Burlington barn. | Lectures, art classes, school and other programs in the off-site visitor center. | Lectures, art classes, school and other programs in the Burlington barn. |

### Historic Structures

| Weir complex historic structures restored and interpreted. Weir studio restored to interpret life and work of Weir; main house interpreted to reflect use by Weir, Young, and Andrews families; Young studio restored to interpret work of Young. Family artifacts and furnishings displayed in documented locations whenever possible. | Weir complex historic structures preserved as is and interpreted. All structures to reflect continuous use by Weir, Young, and Andrews families. Family artifacts and furnishings displayed in existing locations whenever possible. | Weir complex historic structures preserved as is and interpreted. Weir and Young studios appear as they do today, with family artifacts displayed in existing locations whenever possible, to reflect the Weir, Young, and Andrews family tenures; main house used as art exhibition space; main barn rehabilitated for visitor contact/collection storage. |
| Young studio also contains exhibits on Sperry Andrews. | Young studio exhibits art and art materials used by Young and Andrews. | Young studio exhibits art and art materials used by Young and Andrews. |
| NPS seeks to acquire family artifacts. | NPS seeks to acquire family artifacts. | NPS seeks to acquire family artifacts. |
| Burlington complex historic structures rehabilitated for contemporary uses: house adapted for artists-in-residence housing; barn adapted for school/other programs. | Burlington complex historic structures rehabilitated for contemporary uses: house will contain administrative offices/archival space; barn will be adapted for artists-in-residence studios. No on-site artists-in-residence housing. | Burlington complex historic structures rehabilitated for contemporary uses: house will contain staff offices/archival space; barn will be used for school/other programs. No on-site artists-in-residence housing or studio space. |
| Caretaker's house rehabilitated to house on-site park ranger. | Caretaker's house rehabilitated to house on-site park ranger. | Caretaker's house rehabilitated to house on-site park ranger. |
| Caretaker's garage/barn rehabilitated and expanded (following footprint of missing section) for artists-in-residence studios. | Caretaker's garage/barn rehabilitated to store maintenance equipment and supplies. | Caretaker's garage/barn rehabilitated to store maintenance equipment and supplies. |
### SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weir complex landscape restored to ca 1940s appearance to reflect use by the Weir and Youngs; features of landscape during their tenures to be repaired or replaced (research permitting).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington complex landscape rehabilitated to retain changes Cora Weir Burlington made after 1940.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pond and woodland area landscape restored to re-establish select farm fields and other missing features that existed circa 1940.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path system expanded to form loop that links key park sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All landscape preserved as is and maintained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration / maintenance facility in a rehabilitated structure nearby park property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections care and storage area, curatorial offices, and library in visitor center near site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing for on-site park ranger in rehabilitated caretaker’s house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak visitation/special event overflow parking in commercial district, at off-site locations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration / maintenance facility in new structures at northeast end of park, off Weir Farm Lane. Administrative offices and archival space at off-site visitor center and in Burlington house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections care and storage, curatorial offices, and library in remote, off-site visitor center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing for on-site park ranger in rehabilitated caretaker’s house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak visitation/special event overflow parking at off-site visitor center or commercial district.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance operation in off-site, leased space. Administrative offices in rehabilitated Burlington house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection care and storage in rehabilitated main barn. Curatorial offices and research area in rehabilitated Burlington house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing for on-site park ranger in rehabilitated caretaker’s house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak visitation/special event overflow parking in commercial district at off-site locations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpretation and Programs</th>
<th>Interpretation and Programs</th>
<th>Interpretation and Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs, printed materials, exhibits, and other interpretive media will emphasize the site's continuous use by artists, while highlighting the site's historic significance.</td>
<td>Programs, printed materials, exhibits, and other interpretive media will emphasize the site's continuous use by artists, while highlighting the site's historic significance.</td>
<td>Programs, printed materials, exhibits, and other interpretive media will emphasize the site's continuous use by artists, while highlighting the site's historic significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretative programs held at farm and nearby visitor center.</td>
<td>Interpretative programs held at farm and at remote visitor center.</td>
<td>Limited interpretative programs, on site, as space and staff allow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artists-in-residence program will offer studio space and housing.</td>
<td>Artists-in-residence program will offer studio space. Housing will not be provided.</td>
<td>Visiting artist program offered; no artists-in-residence program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts education program in rehabilitated Burlingham barn and in area schools.</td>
<td>Arts education program at off-site visitor center and area schools.</td>
<td>Arts education programs at rehabilitated Burlingham barn and staffed by teachers of visiting school groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided tours of main house and studios.</td>
<td>Guided tours of main house and studios.</td>
<td>Self-guided tour of main house art exhibitions; guided tours of studios available as resources allow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming practices interpreted in restored main barn.</td>
<td>Portion of main barn used for visitor contact station.</td>
<td>Brochures, available as resources allow, permit self-guided tours of grounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures permit self-guided tours of site history and painting sites.</td>
<td>Brochures permit self-guided tour of painting sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Land Protection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Protection</th>
<th>Land Protection</th>
<th>Land Protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NPS works with adjacent neighbors to promote vegetative screening between site and residential properties.</td>
<td>NPS works with adjacent neighbors to promote vegetative screening between site and residential properties.</td>
<td>No land acquisition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of nearby properties for a visitor center and administration / maintenance facility. Land acquisition by NPS will require a congressionally authorized boundary change.</td>
<td>Acquisition of properties for a visitor center. Land acquisition by NPS will require a congressionally authorized boundary change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART THREE:
AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

J. ALDEN WEIR, Landscape, Branchville, NOT DATED, ETCHING, 4 5/8 X 7 15/16 IN.
WEIR FARM HERITAGE TRUST
Cultural Environment

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

J. Alden Weir’s Place in American Art

J. Alden Weir (1852–1919) was a much admired artist in his time and a pioneer of the Impressionist movement in America. He was also an influential teacher and cultural leader who greatly aided the cause of American art in the years when the United States was becoming a world power. His warm personality made him the natural focus of a large circle of gifted colleagues, who eagerly sought his company, advice, and approval.

That Weir won great fame as an Impressionist around the turn of the century is somewhat surprising, because both art critics and the public found his paintings difficult to appreciate. Weir’s Impressionism is not bright and pretty but quiet, complex, elusive. Duncan Phillips (founder of the Phillips Collection, Washington, D.C.) was among those who recognized that Weir’s art needs to be lived with for a long time before its profound serenity and unity of purpose can be understood. Weir’s daughter Dorothy remembered that her father disliked “having everything taken in at a glance but preferred instead that things should disclose themselves to you gradually, when you were least expecting it.”

Weir was, moreover, an experimenter for whom, as fellow artist Kenyon Cox once wrote, each picture was a new problem for which a new solution had to be found. Some critics of his era were keenly aware of Weir’s experimentation, yet others who looked at his quiet, unpretentious art regarded the artist as “anything but a revolutionist,” as one of them phrased it. If Weir’s Impressionism was not easily understood in his own time, it is no more accessible in our own. It remains rewarding, however, for people who make the effort to look and comprehend.

Weir’s central role in American Impressionism cannot be disputed. It was recognized in his own day and it continues to be in ours. Weir was one of the first American artists to turn to Impressionism, he was the close friend of John Henry Twachtman, Theodore Robinson, and Childe Hassam, who are regularly cited as other leaders of the movement, and he was a founding member of The Ten American Painters, the group that came to be thought of as the core of Impressionism in America. While turn-of-the-century critics and connoisseurs enjoyed some other American Impressionists more than Weir (or Twachtman, who was even less understood), they agreed that Weir was one of the foremost painters of his day.

Present day art historians also readily acknowledge J. Alden Weir’s importance to the American Impressionist movement, even as some of them, too, continue to dispute the value of his art. Some maintain he was uneven in quality, behind the times, or not totally committed to Impressionist concepts and techniques. Others respond that Weir chose to reject certain aspects of Impressionism, that uneveness is inevitable when an artist is an experimenter, and that far from being a decade or two behind the work of the French artists who inspired him, Weir was often abreast or even ahead of the most advanced art ideas of his era.

Outmoded and ignored while abstract art dominated the art world, American Impressionism itself was rediscovered only about 15 years ago. Some art historians still dismiss the entire movement as a pallid imitation of French Impressionism. Increasingly, however, art experts are saying that its mingling of American ideas about nature and landscape painting with elements of both French Impressionism and Post-Impressionism resulted in an aesthetic that deserves consideration on its own terms. That there is now intense interest in American Impressionism on the part of both art experts and the public is attested to by the spate of recent books and exhibitions about it. American Impressionism is now so firmly embedded in the story of American art that there seems little chance of its being forgotten again.
Two paintings by J. Alden Weir are hailed as masterpieces of American painting in virtually every published history of American art or American Impressionism. They are The Red Bridge, ca 1895, and The Factory Village, 1897 (both at the Metropolitan Museum in New York). Their subject matter, as commonplace as any in Weir’s work, is arresting because, unlike most earlier American works, it represents the intrusion of the industrial age into American life (Weir’s father and elder brother created two rare early examples). Yet it is more than subject matter that accounts for The Red Bridge and The Factory Village being regarded as exceptional works of art. They represent nothing less than a new “modern” way of seeing.

Other Weir paintings are also admired, including, among others, Upland Pasture, ca 1905 (National Museum of American Art), Building a Dam, Shetucket, ca 1908 (Cleveland Museum of Art), The Fishing Party, ca 1915 (The Phillips Collection), and Windham Village, ca 1914 (The Saint Louis Art Museum). Were his œuvre limited to only these paintings, J. Alden Weir would have a prominent place in American art history, but there are many other fine Weir paintings — portraits and still lifes as well as landscapes — and watercolors, drawings, pastels, and etchings.

At Weir Farm the public and art scholars alike can see the sites of many Weir paintings, drawings, and etchings. Such an opportunity is exceedingly rare. As people perceive the relationship between the man, the place, and the work, the work will be better understood. And since so many famous artist friends visited Weir in Branchville and painted there — Albert Pinkham Ryder, John Henry Twachtman, Childe Hassam, John Singer Sargent, J. Appleton Brown, William Glackens, among others — the site offers the opportunity to gain a better understanding of American Impressionism in general. Even Ryder’s art, though not Impressionist, has connections with the landscape of Weir Farm.

Life and Works

Julian Alden Weir was born at West Point, New York, on August 30, 1852. He grew up in a heady artistic environment. His father, Robert W. Weir, was the drawing professor at the military academy and a successful painter. He was known for historical, religious, and landscape subjects, including Embarkation of the Pilgrims in the Capitol rotunda in Washington D.C. Robert Weir had been one of New York’s Knickerbocker circle of artists, writers, and patrons, and he remained friends with several, including the artist Asher Durand and the poet William Cullen Bryant, who often visited him after his move to West Point.

Brother John, older than Julian by fourteen years, was already a professional artist in New York when Julian arrived in 1868 to study at the National Academy of Design. A year later, John Ferguson Weir became the founding director of the art school at Yale University, the first in the nation to be part of an academic institution. He continued to teach there for many years. Once he had established a reputation of his own, J. Alden Weir visited classes there and critiqued students’ work. The brothers always had a close, mutually supportive relationship.

J. Alden Weir, William Merritt Chase, and Albert Pinkham Ryder were fellow students at the National Academy of Design, and they became lifelong friends. Weir made friends easily and kept them. When he died in 1919, several obituaries called him the best loved artist in America. His godmother, Mrs. Bradford R. Alden, had been so fond of him that she had financed his years of study in Paris, from 1873 to 1877. To express his gratitude he had taken “J. Alden Weir” as his professional name, remaining Julian to his family and simply Weir to his friends.

In Paris he studied at the prestigious École des Beaux-Arts with Jean-Léon Gérôme, who instilled in him a strong concern for drawing and the structural modeling of form. An outstanding student, Weir received the
highest award in Gérôme’s studio that an American could attain, and three of his paintings were accepted for the annual exhibitions at the Paris Salon. Such hard-won achievements were prizes in more ways than one, for in the years after the Civil War a European art education and recognition by juried exhibitions such as the Salon were virtual prerequisites for a successful career in America.

Although Weir was training to work at portraiture, he did some landscape painting on his own, especially when traveling in Brittany, Belgium, Holland, and Spain. Frans Hals was an idol, but he also admired and became the close friend of the young Frenchman, Jules Bastien-Lepage, whose ability to capture the light and atmosphere of outdoor settings and integrate well-drawn figures into them appealed to many young artists.

When Weir returned to New York in October 1877, he quickly became a leading figure in the American art scene. He was active in the new Society of American Artists, the venerable National Academy of Design, the American Water Color Society, and later, in the 1880s, the new Painters in Pastel. He was a member of the lively Tile Club, whose artist members ostensibly met to decorate ceramic tiles but mostly to socialize. Weir taught at the Art Students League, Cooper Union, and privately.

Weir also advised American art collectors, such as Henry Marquand and Erwin Davis, on the acquisition of European art by both Old Masters and living painters. Such commissions enabled him to make several trips abroad, including one in 1881, when he painted in Holland with his brother John, Bastien-Lepage, and Twachtman, whom he had met in New York and who had become a close friend.

In 1882 he fell in love with Anna Dwight Baker of New York City and Windham Center, Connecticut. He and Anna were married in the spring of 1883, and the list of wedding ushers ranged from artists like Chase to architect Stanford White to Elliott Roosevelt, younger brother of Theodore. Before their wedding trip to Europe, the couple spent several weeks at what is now Weir Farm National Historic Site. Weir had acquired the property the previous summer from Erwin Davis, who traded the farm for a still-life painting Weir had bought for $560 at a New York gallery. (New York art dealer F.N. Price’s memoirs say it was by a painter named Procter and Weir had sacrificed his summer to buy it, but no proof has been found.) The deed for the farm was transferred to Weir on July 19, 1882, after a token payment of $10.

Weir was unsure where Branchville was before going in mid-June 1882 to inspect the property Davis had offered him, but he knew Ridgefield, presumably the town rather than the township of which Branchville is a part. His family was vacationing there just then and probably not for the first time. When Anna wrote to Weir at Ridgefield during the June 1882 visit, she imagined him “surrounded once again with those green hills and fields of which you are so fond.”

Weir at first thought he would use the Branchville farm only occasionally. He already had plans well under way to build a summer home for himself and Anna in the Keene Valley area of the Adirondacks. He had bought land, had his friend Stanford White draw up house plans, and spent much of the summer of 1882 clearing brush and working on the foundation. He had hoped for a finished house by the fall, but so much construction was going on in the area that he had failed to get enough seasoned timber.

Weir at Branchville
On their honeymoon trip abroad in the summer of 1883, Weir and Anna began shopping for furnishings for the Keene Valley place. Weir had arranged for repairs at Branchville and moved some belongings in, and he and Anna had enjoyed their stay at the farm, but they still did not expect to make a home there. They must have been surprised at experiencing intense homesickness for “the quiet plain little house among the rocks.”
as Weir called it, just a few weeks into their honey-
moon. John Ferguson Weir, staying at the farm that
summer, encouraged his brother to “hang on to this
place, old boy...and you will find it a haven of refuge.”
Weir and Anna cut short their wedding trip by several
weeks and were happily back in New York and
Branchville by October. Talk of an Adirondacks house
disappears at this point, and Weir sold the Keene
Valley property a few years later. The words “Here
shall we rest and call content our home,” offered by brother
John in an 1883 letter as a testament to the plain little
house, were later painted over its front door.

The Weir family began staying at Branchville every
summer from May to late fall. Although Weir had a
farm manager and other help, he wanted to do so
much farm work himself that for a while he com-
plained of little time to paint while he was in the
country. He had an orchard and a vegetable garden,
raised grains and grasses, kept cows, horses, oxen, and
chickens, and planted trees.

Weir did not finish building a studio at Branchville
until 1885. The Branchville landscape was not yet a
motif in his work (although a small watercolor dated
1882 has recently been discovered). In the 1880s he
generally did strong figure paintings, often of family
and friends in interior settings, as well as flower pic-
tures that are dark and dramatic, the delicacy and
coloring of the blooms often contrasting with glisten-
ing metal or porcelain. This figural and still-life work
established him in the New York art world.

Conservative though his paintings of the 1880s might
at first appear, they were often daringly experimental.
In watercolor and gouache works like Anna Sewing
(1885) and Anna and Care in the Twelfth Street House
(1887), Weir’s treatment of space emphasizes forms and
their relationships on the surface of the paper rather
than in the third dimension. As early as 1881 Weir had
shown a similar strong interest in surface design, and
disregard of traditional perspective, in the cityscape
Snowstorm in Mercer Street. Such works reveal an

interest in and understanding of the work of Whistler
(briefly a student of Robert Weir at West Point) and of
Edouard Manet, although Weir’s way with color,
form, and abstract composition is not imitative.

In the late 1880s, Weir tried landscape painting again
for the first time since his student days, and he took
chances with this genre as well. Lengthening Shadows
(1887), exhibited in the 1889 Universal Exposition in
Paris, employs an illogical vertical perspective, with
detail and color as rich in the distance as in the fore-
ground, an interlocking design, and an unnatural
golden sunlight that seems to distill and freeze the
scene. The abstract composition becomes a visual
metaphor for Weir’s understanding of the permanence,
harmony, and spirituality underlying nature. While a
beautiful work and daringly “modern,” Lengthening
Shadows is not an Impressionist work.

Weir and Twachtman, best friends from the time they
first met, began to be able to spend more time together
in the late 1880s when Twachtman was again living in
the east. He probably rented a house in Greenwich,
Connecticut, as early as 1886, and in the summer of
1888 he leased a place near Branchville before perma-
nently settling in Greenwich a couple of years later.
Train travel made it easy for the artists and their
families to get together, and they often did, both in the
country and New York. Weir and Twachtman
exhibited together in New York in 1889. At
Branchville, they experimented with etching and
worked extensively on pastels. At least once, after
Weir had closed his farm for the season, they boarded
at a nearby house so that they could paint winter
landscapes.

Twachtman had always concentrated on landscape
work, and Weir now began to. Although he had loved
nature from boyhood, he had seemed to need time to
absorb the Branchville countryside around him. The
pastels that he and Twachtman did in Branchville in
the late 1880s may have spurred Weir’s turn to land-
scape painting. The passion the two artists shared for
Japanese landscape prints may have inspired them both. From about 1889, when he turned to landscape work, Weir's art changed. His colors were lighter, and he was employing new techniques that appeared strange, or even crude, to many viewers. By 1891 critics were calling him an Impressionist, often derisively, for Impressionism was still somewhat new and strange in America. His brother John tried to steer him away from what Weir called "the mystery of a new path," but to no avail. And while Weir's art was undergoing change, his personal life was suddenly in turmoil. Anna Weir died February 8, 1892, a few days after giving birth to the couple's third daughter Cora. Daughter Caroline had been born in 1884 and Dorothy in 1890. An only son, born in 1887, had died suddenly in 1889, just weeks before Weir's father died. Although the earlier deaths had hit hard, the pain J. Alden Weir experienced at the death of Anna almost undid him.

For many months, Weir would not set foot on the Branchville farm because the place was so intertwined with memories of his wife. Instead he spent much of the summer of 1892 painting a mural for the Manufactures and Liberal Arts Building at the World's Columbian Exhibition at Chicago. He taught summer classes with Twachtman at Cos Cob, Connecticut, in 1892 and 1893. He returned to Branchville regularly only after he married Ella Baker, Anna's sister, on October 29, 1893.

The 1890s saw the development of Weir's personal interpretation of Impressionism. From about 1895 to about 1910 Weir produced his finest paintings in an Impressionist manner, with broken but not aggressive brushwork and colors that are somewhat tonal, with a limited palette of varied hues. His landscapes are of rural scenes, often of open hill country in midsummer around noontime. On visits to his in-laws' place in Windham, a farm that he eventually inherited, he painted a factory and an iron bridge as well as countryside. The Branchville pictures are always pastoral, however. Branchville was the place he loved the most and painted the most. Weir's landscape paintings celebrate place, and the place is homeground. His love of a place of his own — of "Home, Sweet Home" — is as American as Weir was.

Late in 1897 Weir became one of the founders of The Ten American Painters, a group dissatisfied with the exhibition practices of the Society of American Artists. He exhibited with The Ten every year until the group disbanded in 1919. In 1899 he gave up teaching to devote himself to painting. In the 1910s he developed heart disease, but he continued to be an active painter even as he became ever more involved in artists' societies. In 1911 he was elected the first president of the Association of American Painters and Sculptors, the group that was to form the International Exhibition of Modern Art (the Armory Show) of 1913, but he resigned when it was imputed that the Association was formed in opposition to the National Academy, of which he was a devoted member. He exhibited in the Armory Show, however, and he was, as always, open to what he saw there that was new. In 1915 he told a reporter that modernists were to be credited for "breaking through traditions that are dead." In 1915 he also became President of the National Academy of Design and of The Metropolitan Museum of Art. In 1919, shortly before his death on December 8, he became a founding member of the New Society of American Painters, Sculptors and Gravers.

He had continued to be an active exhibitor in his later years. In 1911-12, Weir had been much involved in organizing a retrospective exhibition of his work that was shown in Boston, New York, Pittsburgh, and Buffalo. He exhibited in major exhibitions of the early twentieth century, such as the 1900 Universal Exposition in Paris, where he won a bronze medal, the Pan-American Exposition, in Buffalo in 1901, and the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, in San Francisco in 1915, where he was both medal-winner and jury member.
THE ARTISTIC PROCESS CONTINUES AT WEIR FARM

Through the years Weir made improvements to the farm, including adding acreage, expanding the house, and constructing a tennis court and fishing pond, the latter with prize money from the Boston Art Club in 1896. In 1907, he purchased the Webb farm.

Weir Farm was a gathering place for artists in Weir’s time and continued to be after his death, but the farm was not an art colony. Artists who came to the site were visitors, not residents. They came for a day or, at most, several weeks in order to be with Weir, to relax, to paint, and to talk about art.

Evidence to date suggests that Weir attracted the most visitors, and he taught classes at the farm from 1897 until 1901. But virtually nothing about these classes or their students is currently known, and much more research needs to take place to document artists who visited and painted at the farm between 1882 and the present.

Nonetheless, Weir Farm is one of very few historic sites to offer, intact, the home, studio, and grounds of an important late-nineteenth century American artist whose attitude toward his family, friends, and nature was integral to his artistic vision. The site was also the home of a noted American sculptor.

Mahonri Young

After Weir’s death, his daughter, artist Dorothy Weir Young inherited her father’s farm. In 1931, she married Mahonri Mackintosh Young (1877-1957), a grandson of the Mormon leader Brigham Young and a prominent sculptor whose small bronzes of laborers and boxers had won him wide recognition. His monumental public works include This Is the Place (Immigration Canyon, Utah) and The Seagull Monument (Salt Lake City, Utah); at his sculpture studio at Branchville, which he built just steps away from Weir’s studio, Young sculpted the figures and friezes that grace This Is the Place. Known also as an outstanding draftsman, Young frequently sketched, painted, and etched the Branchville landscape. After his death in 1957, the Weir Farm property was purchased by the artists Doris and Sperry Andrews.

Doris and Sperry Andrews

In 1952, when he was a student at the Art Students League, Sperry Andrews first visited Weir Farm to meet Mahonri Young, whose name was well known at the school (Weir Farm Heritage Trust, 1993). Thus began the Doris and Sperry Andrews’ friendship with Young and their decades-long association with the farm, first as frequent visitors, then as its owners. Doris and Sperry Andrews are the current resident artists, amateur historians, and most importantly, painters of the farm’s light, moods, intimate views, and landscapes. The Andrews family has sustained the farm’s continuous use by artists into the present.

CHANGES IN THE LANDSCAPE

The landscape at Weir Farm reflects its continuous use by artists since 1882. The most historically significant changes are those Weir made; after his death, Cora Weir Burlington, Dorothy Weir Young, and Mahonri Young made other alterations.

The Weir landscape was shaped from an existing farm to include a wide variety of functional and aesthetic features. These elements were created on a glacial landscape marked by undulating topography, areas of exposed bedrock, sporadic ridges and sloped areas with prominent rock outcroppings, and surface boulders.

The landscape is significant for its association with the work of J. Alden Weir and his associates; its pastoral qualities were reflected in many of Weir’s paintings. Weir’s residence here allowed him to develop an emerging interest in painting en plein air as well as to indulge his interests in agriculture and horticulture.

Through time, the boundaries of Weir Farm changed greatly. Weir initially purchased 153 acres, which included the structures in the site’s Weir complex, in
1882. In 1895, he acquired 10 more acres near the pond, and, five years later, he bought 32 acres north- west of the main house. His final land purchase, in 1907, was the 50-acre Webb Farm (now known as the Burlington Complex). In sum, Weir purchased 238 contiguous acres in Branchville during his lifetime; 60 of these now comprise Weir Farm.

Although natural vegetative succession has occurred throughout the site, Weir Farm’s landscape, except for the Young studio and Cora Weir Burlington’s gardens, remains essentially unchanged from the days that Weir occupied the site. The cultural landscape report presents more detailed information about the historical landscape.

**Weir Complex**

Both Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane existed as early as 1745 in maps of the area. However, little else is known about the character of the farm’s landscape before Weir acquired the property in 1882.

During the 40 years after the initial property purchase, Weir cleared fields and planted both crops and orchards on the property; he also planted gardens, ornamental trees, and shrubs. During his years here, Weir added trails and walkways, fences, a tennis court, stone terraces, outbuildings, a pond, and additional gardens, orchards, and fields.

After Dorothy Weir Young ceased active farming on the site in the mid-1940s, invasive vegetation began to grow up in abandoned fields, and many of the farm-related structures Weir added to the landscape, and landscape features, such as the gardens and stone pig pens, began to deteriorate. The mid-1930s wagon shed came down shortly after 1970.

**Burlington Complex**

Little is currently known about the history and character of this area’s landscape before Weir acquired it in 1907. It was known as the Webb farm (owned by William Webb from the 1840s to 1906), but how and when the property was farmed is not yet clear. It is also not known how Weir initially used and developed the house and land, though it is thought that he may have grown hay, potatoes, and possibly other crops in its fields until his death in 1919.

In 1931, Cora Weir Burlington, her husband Charles Burlington and their sons, Bill and Charles, Jr. moved into the Burlington house. Between 1931 and her death in 1986, Cora altered the landscape in substantial ways. She developed an elaborate system of stone walls in the 1930s. In the early 1940s, she added a sunken garden, a terrace garden, and outbuildings such as the granite tool house. Cora Weir Burlington donated 37 acres of the Burlington property to The Nature Conservancy in 1969.

**Pond and Woodland Area**

Weir acquired these areas as part of the original land purchase in 1882 and later in 1895. He built the pond and dam in 1896 and later constructed a small summer house on the island, a boathouse, a fishing bridge, and paths. Many stone walls, some of which predate Weir’s occupancy of the site, exist in this area; Weir painted them often.

The character of this landscape changed most dramatically when the land ceased to be farmed. Second-growth woodland began to appear in the late 1940s. Such historic features as the open fields, the fishing bridge, the summer house, and the boathouse are no longer extant, but survive in artistic depictions, photographs, and archeological remains.

**HISTORIC STRUCTURES**

**Weir Complex**

**Main House.** Deeds indicate that the main house was built as early as 1779. The structure was remodeled in Greek Revival style around 1825. Weir bought it in 1882. Weir also added to and modified the house, first modifying it in 1888 and then hiring the noted architect Charles A. Platt in 1900 and then Frederick J.
Adams of the firm of McKim, Mead and White in 1911. In 1932, Dorothy Weir Young, Mahonri Young, Cora Weir Burlingham, and Charles Burlingham, Sr. converted the former front hall into a library with elaborate wood and glass built-in cabinets. After Doris and Sperry Andrews purchased the house in 1957, they renovated the kitchen. The house is 5,500 square feet, and both its interior and exterior are in good condition.

**Weir Studio.** According to the National Register of Historic Places nomination, the Weir studio may have been built on an earlier foundation or as an adaptation of a smaller, earlier structure. Weir finished the studio by 1885 and later added the water tower (1901) and the lean-to. Only 850 square feet in area, the modest one-room studio contains a wood-burning stove, Young's etching press, and many books, papers, and pictures. Resident artist Sperry Andrews continues to use it as a secondary studio. Most of the works of art and art materials now in the structure belong to the Andrews family. The interior and exterior of the structure are in fair to poor condition.

**Young Studio.** Mahonri Young built this large studio (1,600 square feet), complete with a mezzanine, in 1933-34 based on designs by the architect and his son-in-law Oliver Lay. The National Register nomination for Weir Farm and architectural evidence suggest that the small west-wing addition (called the etching room) may have been an earlier structure that was attached to the studio. Sperry Andrews continues to use the structure as his primary studio, and most of the materials in it are his works of art and art materials. The interior and exterior of the building are in good to fair condition.

**Main Barn.** Deeds record a barn on the site as early as 1821, but architectural evidence suggests that the main barn may have been built in the late-eighteenth century. By 1861, a property inventory described the farm as having, "a barn, cow house, wash house, and carriage house." A U-shaped, gable-roofed structure covered with weathered shingles, the barn is 2,250 square feet. It was a working barn, home to many farm animals in Weir's day as well as the subject of many of his paintings. Today, the structure is mainly used for storage. Its interior and exterior are in poor condition.

**Outbuildings.** The chicken house, 310 square feet, may have been constructed as early as 1886 as an ice house and then reconstructed in this century as a chicken house. The tack house, 15 square feet, was built sometime before 1904. The construction dates of the tool house, the animal shelter, and the corn crib, each also 15 square feet, are unknown. These five buildings are all in poor condition. The wagon shed, about 200 square feet, was built in the 1930s. It came down after 1970. The well houses, 30 square feet, may have been built before 1930. Another well, located on private property across Nod Hill Road, north of the park, was probably part of the original farm. Other structures, not yet documented, may have been part of this farm.

**Burlingham Complex**

**Burlingham House.** Constructed ca 1750, a 1782 probate deed described the dwelling on this property as "a small dwelling house on the southwest corner of Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane." Weir acquired the house, then known as the Webb house, and its surrounding 50 acres in 1907. In 1931, his daughter, Cora Weir Burlingham, assumed sole ownership of the property. Within the next few years, Cora enlarged the house and added an ell containing a dining room and kitchen, resulting in the current 2,650 square foot configuration. All exterior and interior alterations were made in the then popular colonial revival style. In 1938, she commissioned local architect Nelson Breed to design the greenhouse addition. Breed also designed the kitchen renovation between 1947-48. Administrative offices and the site's visitor center and sales outlet currently occupy this house. Its interior and exterior are in good condition.
**PART THREE: AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**

**Burlingham Barn.** Although its construction date is unknown, architectural evidence suggests that the barn was built sometime between the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries. Nine hundred square feet, the barn was the subject of etchings Weir created between 1889 and 1893, and it became part of his property in 1907. The NPS currently uses the barn for special programs and events. Its interior and exterior are in poor condition.

**Woodshed.** Part of the 50-acre property Weir acquired in 1907, the woodshed, constructed of fieldstone and timber, is 720 square feet. The NPS uses the woodshed for storage. The interior and exterior of the structure are in poor condition.

**Outbuildings.** The ashlar granite tool house (130 square feet) was built in 1940 to designs by architect Nelson Breed. The interior is in fair condition and the exterior is in good condition.

The small concrete and stone well house (about 20 square feet) south of the drive was also probably built during Cora Weir Burlingham’s ownership of the property. The exterior is in good condition.

**Pond and Woodland Area**

**Caretaker’s House and Garage/Barn.** Architectural elements of the vernacular caretaker’s house, 1,100 square feet in area, suggest that it was built in the mid-1800s. Records suggest that Weir may have extensively renovated it in 1883. The Andrews family again extensively renovated the house in ca 1960. The house is currently used as a private residence. The interior of the building is in good condition; its exterior condition is fair.

Although its construction date and original use are still unknown, the caretaker’s garage/barn (about 200 square feet) is only a remnant of the barn complex. The extant garage portion was originally an ell connected to a barn. It is currently used for storage. The interior and exterior of the building are in poor condition. The barn was south of and roughly the same size as the present garage. It was dismantled after 1970. The rubble stone foundation still remains, however.

This area probably had other outbuildings typically associated with working farms of its period that may have been developed separately from the Weir property.

**ARCHEOLOGY**

**Historic Resources**

Although little is known of the potential historic archeological resources at Weir Farm, they are most apt to exist around existing structures, building foundations, garden terraces, stone fences, roads, and abandoned roads and trails. There may also be trash dumps and privy pits located near the residences. Near the pond, archeologically significant sites may exist near the foundations for the boat house, dock, summer house, and bridge.

The existence, condition, and significance of potential historic period archeological resources have been only partially evaluated. These resources would probably be contributing elements to the existing National Register district.

**Prehistoric Resources**

There are no recorded prehistoric sites at Weir Farm in the Connecticut state archeological files, although small sites may exist along the creek feeding the pond.

**COLLECTIONS**

At present, the park and Trust own a modest collection of oil paintings, watercolors, drawings, photographs, etchings and furnishings. From the site’s conception, the acquisition of site-related art and furnishings has been a major goal. Collections also include archeological artifacts and records associated with archeological research undertaken on the site, as well as building and landscape artifacts undergoing emergency stabilization.
Art
According to the site’s scope of collection statement (NPS, 1993), “The purpose of the art collection at Weir Farm National Historic Site is varied . . . . The collection will include artistic works representing a variety of media including, but not limited to: oils, pastels, etchings, watercolors, pencil drawings, and sketches.” Collection priorities follow:

Highest-Priority Collections:
1. Works by Weir, with emphasis on site-associated works.
2. Works by other artists including members of the Ten and others who visited Weir Farm; those works with site association; works owned by J. Alden Weir and the Weir family at the farm; artists who significantly influenced J. Alden Weir, including Robert W. Weir and John Ferguson Weir; and portraits of J. Alden Weir and other family members at the farm painted during Weir’s lifetime.

Secondary-Priority Collections:
1. Representative collection of works by Mahonri Young, with priority placed on site-associated pieces for use in the interpretation of his life and work at the farm.
2. Representative collection of works by other Weir family members completed at the site, with priority placed on site-associated pieces and those needed to interpret family life at the farm.
3. Representative collection of site-associated works by Sperry Andrews and pieces needed to interpret the studio interiors as working spaces as identified in the historic furnishings report.
4. Site-associated contemporary works by visiting artists sponsored by Weir Farm or the Weir Farm Heritage Trust.

Furnishings
Historic furnishings will be collected in accordance with the recommendations outlined in the historic furnishings report. Emphasis will be placed on collecting pieces in good condition. The interpretive emphatic

sis of each structure will guide efforts to create a collection of furnishings for the historic structures.

Main House. The main house is already furnished with numerous pieces of furniture and other objects dating from the years during which Weir/Young lived in the house; family members own other pieces. A few pieces of furniture that once furnished the house are now in the main barn and the Weir and Young studios. In general, these objects are in fair to good condition.

Weir Studio. Several pieces of furniture now in the Weir studio are documented to have been there when J. Alden Weir used the structure. It is possible, too, that painting equipment and materials in the studio may have a documented connection with Weir, although most of the materials currently in the Weir studio are primarily associated with subsequent users. The contents of the Weir studio are generally in fair condition, although their long-term preservation is at risk under current conditions. The wood-burning stove currently on the west side of the studio was installed in the mid-1940s. The original Weir stove was probably located in the northeast corner of the studio.

Young Studio. In the Young studio, several objects, including furniture, are associated with Weir, but a much larger number of objects—including art equipment and preliminary or partial works of art—date from Young’s use of this structure. While a large body of Young materials and art is owned by Brigham Young University, the objects in the Young studio are also significant evidence of Young’s creative process and are directly associated with the site. A third and significantly larger group of materials is from later occupancies. The contents of the Young studio are generally in fair condition, although their long-term preservation is at risk under current conditions.

Main Barn. The main barn contains furniture, farming and livestock equipment probably associated
with Weir, plaster molds from Young’s monumental sculpture *This Is the Place*, and an accumulation of other objects from other occupants of the site. The condition of these objects is poor. The NPS has also used the barn to store architectural artifacts removed from the buildings that are undergoing emergency stabilization. These are generally significant objects that will be catalogued as part of the permanent collection, and are generally in poor to fair condition.

**Natural Environment**

**CLIMATE AND AIR QUALITY**

Weir Farm is located in the southwestern hills climatic region of Connecticut. This region is characterized by warm, humid summers and cold winters, moderated by its proximity to Long Island Sound. Mean annual temperature is 50 degrees Fahrenheit, winter mean low temperature is 5 degrees, and summer mean high temperature is 85 degrees. The mean annual precipitation is about 45 inches, with the mean annual snowfall about 40 inches.

**TOPOGRAPHY, GEOLOGY, AND SOILS**

The site is located on coastal upland, within 25 miles of Long Island Sound. Weir Farm is in a well-elevated area considering its proximity to the sound. The outfall of the pond is 560 feet above sea level. The main house is 650 feet above sea level. Slopes range within the park from 3 to 50 percent.

The developed core of Weir Farm along Nod Hill Road lies atop a north-south ridge. Wetlands buttress the ridge on both sides. Surficial features include glacial boulders and rock outcroppings underlain mostly by metamorphic bedrock, and gneisses and schists complexly folded into north-trending belts.

Soils on the site are derived solely from glacial till, are relatively youthful (of the Wisconsinan age), and have formed under a hardwood forest of oak, hickory, birch, and maple. Little organic matter has accumulated in the generally rocky upper soil layers.

The primary soils are:

**Charlton:** well-drained, stony to extremely stony soils formed in loamy glacial till that generally occur on hills and ridges of glacial till uplands. This is the predominant soil of the farm.

**Hollis:** excessively drained, stony to extremely stony soil formed in a thin mantle of loamy glacial till that occurs on hilltops, ridge tops, and side slopes of bedrock-controlled uplands. This soil type is found in the northeast and southwest parts of the farm where it was mapped as a complex with Charlton soil and rock outcrops.

**Leicester:** poorly drained, stony soil formed in loamy glacial till that occurs in depressions and drainage ways of uplands. It is found in the wetland areas as a complex with Ridgebury and Whitman soils.

**Ridgebury:** poorly drained, extremely stony soil formed in loamy compact glacial till that occurs on side slopes in slightly concave positions and in drainageways.

**Whitman:** very poorly drained, extremely stony soil formed in compact loamy glacial till that occurs in drainageways and depressions in uplands.

**WATER RESOURCES**

The farm lies within the Norwalk River drainage basin. The site drains to the north to the Cooper Pond Brook, which flows into the Norwalk River, and to the south to the Barrets Brook, which flows into Streets Pond. Streets Pond empties into Comstock Brook and into the Norwalk River. Several springs and streams, some intermittent, drain into the four-acre pond, which was artificially impounded in 1896.

Aquatic habitats include the wetlands, the pond, the stream, and intermittent streams. The pond can be described as eutrophic. This state may be more a function of water depth than elevated levels of nutri-
ents, as the pond is a relatively shallow water body—seven feet at its deepest point. Water clarity ranges from four to five feet, with no evidence of planktonic algae bloom. Groundwater appears to contribute to the majority of the base flow of the pond.

**FLOODPLAIN**

Based on the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s Flood Insurance Rate Map, there are no areas of floodplain within the park’s boundaries.

**WETLANDS**

Seven wetland areas have been identified and mapped on the site (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1992). The wetland areas drain into the Norwalk River or into the pond on the site.

The open space of the wetland areas consists of an understory or shrub layer and herbaceous vegetation, including seasonal wet meadows, small broad-leaved deciduous palustrine wetlands, and emergent wetlands transitioning into a broad-leaved deciduous wetlands with an understory of dogwood (*Cornus florida*), arrowwood (*Viburnum recognitum*), swamp honeysuckle (*Lonicera sp.*), highbush blueberry (*Vaccinium corymbosum*), and speckled alder (*Alnus rugosa*).

**VEGETATION/HABITATS**

About three-quarters of the site is covered mainly by forest, except the fields west of Nod Hill Road, those areas too wet to support trees, and areas that have been clearcut and maintained as fields. The edges of the remaining fields are experiencing successional growth.

The following four forest types are present on the site:

Oak/Maple-Leaved Viburnum Forest: northern red oak (*Quercus rubra*) with a mixture of other species such as black birch (*Betula nigra*) and red maple (*Acer rubrum*) with an understory of maple-leaved viburnum (*Viburnum acerifolium*), beaked hazelnut (*Corylus cornuta*), and witch hazel (*Hamamelis virginiana*). The community is predominant in the well-drained areas throughout the farm.

Maple/Ash/New York Fern Forest: sugar maple (*Acer saccharum*) and white ash (*Fraxinus americana*) with a mixture of red maple (*Acer rubrum*), northern red oak (*Quercus rubra*), and black cherry (*Prunus serotina*). The understory is maple-leaved viburnum (*Viburnum acerifolium*) and spice bush (*Lindera benzoin*); the herb layer is dominated by ferns. The community is limited to two moist, fertile areas of the farm.

Red Maple/Sweet Pepperbush Forest: red maple (*Acer rubrum*) and scattered black gum (*Nyssa sylvatica*) with an understory of sweet pepperbush (*Clethra alnifolia*), a variable herbaceous cover, and an often well-developed moss layer. The community is located in undrained depressions and along slow-moving streams where seasonal flooding occurs and soils are saturated.

Red Maple/Spicebush Forest: red maple (*Acer rubrum*) with a well-developed shrub layer of spicebush (*Lindera benzoin*) and variable herbaceous cover. The community occurs on the lower slopes or along gently sloping streams and brooks with groundwater seepage. Though seasonally flooded, the water table lies well below the soil surface during the vegetative season.

**WILDLIFE**

Complete scientific surveys of the wildlife of Weir Farm National Historic Site have not been undertaken.

**Fish, Amphibians, and Reptiles**

Weir stocked the pond with black bass and, although the pond is no longer stocked, black bass can still be found in it. Various types of panfish have also been observed in the pond.

The ecological survey of Weir Farm (NPS, 1991) identified green frogs. Other amphibians common to the area are toads, spring peepers, wood frogs, and salamanders.
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The ecological inventory of the Weir-Leary-White Preserve (The Nature Conservancy, 1976) identified the common garter snake. Other reptiles common to the area are box turtles and snapping turtles.

Mammals
The ecological inventory of the Weir-Leary-White Preserve identified the presence of eastern chipmunk, eastern gray squirrel, woodchuck, and white-tailed deer. Additional mammals common to the area are rabbits, opossums, raccoons, skunks, mice, voles, and fox. Coyotes have also been seen at the farm.

Birds
The ecological survey of Weir Farm identified the mourning dove, belted kingfisher, downy woodpecker, northern flicker, eastern wood pewee, bluejay, American crow, black-capped chickadee, gray catbird, and red-eyed vireo.

The ecological inventory of the Weir-Leary-White Preserve identified the eastern bluebird, mourning dove, common nighthawk, common flicker, downy woodpecker, eastern phoebe, tree swallow, barn swallow, bluejay, common crow, black-capped chickadee, tufted titmouse, white-breasted nuthatch, house wren, Carolina wren, gray catbird, American robin, veery, black-and-white warbler, blue-winged warbler, ovenbird, common yellowthroat, common grackle, brown-headed cowbird, cardinal, rufous-sided towhee, field sparrow, song sparrow, and woodcock.

Other birds common to the area are the wood duck, mallard duck, pileated woodpecker, and ruffed grouse.

THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES/CRITICAL HABITATS
No federal- or state-listed endangered, threatened, or special concern species were observed during the 1991 ecological survey of Weir Farm. Moreover, no unusual, critical, or essential habitats were observed.

The butterfly sedge skipper (Euphyes dion), proposed for state listing as a species of critical concern, was observed just north of Weir Farm in 1984. None were found at the farm in the 1991 survey.

PRIME OR UNIQUE AGRICULTURAL LANDS
According to the United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, there are no prime or unique agricultural lands at Weir Farm.

STATE GROUNDWATER QUALITY STANDARDS
According to the State of Connecticut Water Quality Standards, effective May 15, 1992, the groundwater resources on Weir Farm are streams in class GA because no domestic sewage or industrial waste is discharged into them. Surrounding septic systems should not affect the quality of the groundwater. Designated uses for class GA groundwater include existing private drinking water supply and potential public drinking water supply.

STATE STREAM CLASSIFICATIONS
According to the State of Connecticut Water Quality Standards, effective May 15, 1992, the Weir Farm streams are assigned a class A rating for inland waters because no domestic sewage or industrial waste is discharged into them. Designated uses for class A water include potential drinking water supply, fish and wildlife habitat, recreational use, agricultural and industrial water supply, and such other legitimate uses as navigation.

With permission of the Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Protection, water from public or private drinking water treatment plants, water from dewatering of dredging and dredge material, and other clean water discharges may be discharged into class A waters.
MARINE SANTUARIES/
COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT

The site is not coastal and so is not embraced by the
Coastal Zone Management Program for Connecticut.

Socioeconomic Environment

Fairfield County, Connecticut, has a population of
approximately 800,000, the majority of which is
concentrated in the communities along the Long Island
Sound. Weir Farm, located in western Fairfield
County, is expected to have an economic impact only
on the two towns in which it is located.

Wilton and Ridgefield together cover 61.65 square
miles and, according to the 1990 census, contain about
36,908 persons, 15,989 in Wilton and 20,919 in
Ridgefield. The population is predominantly white
(97.5 percent) and is not densely settled; there are
593.5 persons per square mile in Wilton and 598
persons per square mile in Ridgefield.

The area’s per capita income is among the highest in
the state—$31,485 in Wilton and $25,903 in
Ridgefield. Ninety-two percent of Wilton’s housing
stock and 85 percent of Ridgefield’s is owner-occu-
pied, single-family homes, and the average value of
homes in these towns ranges between $300,000 and
$400,000.

The area’s economy is mainly commercial and light
industrial. Although some residents live and work in
the area, Wilton and Ridgefield are primarily “bed-
room communities” for those employed in the greater
metropolitan New York City area.

LAND OWNERSHIP AND USE

Open space/conservation land and low-density resi-
dential development are the predominant surrounding
land uses.

The Weir-Leary-White Preserve (owned and operated
by The Nature Conservancy), Ridgefield conservation
land (managed by the Town of Ridgefield), and
Connecticut Department of Transportation open space
(acquired for “Super 7”) are in the former category; all
other lands immediately adjacent to Weir Farm are
privately owned and residential.

Both Wilton and Ridgefield are zoned for two-acre
residential development. Under current zoning regu-
lations, the area is now or soon will be developed to its
maximum permissible limit. Many developed lots are
situated immediately along the site’s boundary, and the
structures on these lots are visible from the site.

Moderate to intensive commercial development is
concentrated along Route 7 in both Wilton and
Ridgefield. Most commercial development and
higher-density housing occurs approximately five miles
north of the site in Ridgefield and a similar distance
south of the site in Wilton.

Weir Farm is bisected by Nod Hill Road, a narrow,
winding road under the jurisdictions of Wilton and
Ridgefield. Nod Hill Road is often used by commut-
ers avoiding the traffic congestion of Route 7. Bus,
truck, and other large vehicular travel is permitted.
Nod Hill Road is heavily used and often traveled at
unsafe speeds.

Pelham Lane, a road under the jurisdiction of
Ridgefield, runs perpendicular to Nod Hill Road and
separates the Weir property from the Burlington
property. Pelham Lane receives considerably less traffic
than Nod Hill Road, but, is also much more narrow
and less suited for heavy use.
Existing Interpretation and Visitor Use

The Burlingham house currently serves as the site's visitor center as well as administrative headquarters. The visitor center is open seven days a week for most of the year from 8:30 a.m. until 5:00 p.m.

The visitor center offers changing exhibits, site orientation, a video introducing visitors to Weir Farm, a video laser disc displaying art related to the site, and a small sales area. Site staff offer guided tours of the Weir studio Wednesday through Saturday at 10:00 a.m. Tours begin at the visitor center and last approximately one hour. Site staff also offer guided walks at regularly scheduled times during the warm season. A self-guided "Painting Sites Trail" interprets the landscape of Weir Farm to its visitors. Special events, art demonstrations, and programs for children are also offered.

Visitors are able to use the landscape at Weir Farm in many ways. Professional and amateur artists use the site year round, often spending the entire day in front of an easel on the grounds. Trails encourage walking on the property. Some visitors choose to fish in Weir pond, while others enjoy bird-watching in the Burlingham gardens.

PROGRAMS

The visiting artist program, seen as the first phase of an artists-in-residence program, invites accomplished visual artists, selected through a competitive application process, to work at Weir Farm over the course of a year. Artists are encouraged to present slide shows, demonstrations, and other programs for the public. At the end of their year, their works are exhibited (usually off-site), and a catalog is developed to accompany each exhibition. For most artists—but particularly for those who are younger or less established—the program is a great opportunity; it gives them time to focus on their work away from the distractions of family and making a living. In the future, the Weir Farm Heritage Trust hopes to provide financial aid, according to an artist's need, so that the site can attract talented artists from diverse geographic and socioeconomic backgrounds. The Trust has developed a community art program featuring art classes and workshops for all ages, on- and off-site exhibitions, a lecture series, and other special programs for the public.
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MAHONRI MACKINTOSH YOUNG, Mowing at Branchville, Not Dated, Ink Drawing 10 x 12 In.
Provo, Brigham Young University
Impacts Common to the Plan and Alternatives

IMPACTS ON VISITOR EXPERIENCE
As Weir Farm evolves as a national historic site and as a destination, visitation is expected to increase from its current level of 7,500 persons a year. Within the life of this plan, an increase to 25,000, and possibly up to 40,000 annually is anticipated. Most visitors are likely to come from northeastern and mid-Atlantic states, but an increasing proportion of national and international visitors are expected to make their way to Weir Farm. Residents of southwestern Connecticut will probably comprise the majority of repeat visitors to the site.

Visitors to Weir Farm will be able to enjoy nearly 300 acres of contiguous open space, including the farm, The Nature Conservancy’s Weir-Leary-White Preserve, the Town of Ridgefield’s conservation land, and the Connecticut Department of Transportation property (the State property was acquired for the proposed Route 7 bypass). Recreation will be limited to passive pursuits, but these are ample: the opportunities to walk, hike, paint, photograph, tour historic houses, and simply appreciate the pastoral landscape are enhanced by the farm’s public ownership and management.

Access for visitors with disabilities will be improved wherever possible. However, in cases where barrier-free access is impossible in historic structures or landscapes, alternative media will present inaccessible resources to such visitors.

Visitors will have educational and interpretive opportunities to varying degrees in each alternative, such as brochures, interpretive exhibits, and ranger-led or self-guided tours.

Off-road trails, crosswalks, and signs will make it safer for pedestrians to cross Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane to tour the entire site. Informational materials and a program of trimming vegetation near trails will minimize the potential for Lyme disease infection, a problem posed by the site’s white-tailed deer and mouse populations.

IMPACTS ON CULTURAL RESOURCES
Historic structures and cultural landscape features will be preserved and protected for future generations.

The non-intrusive environmental controls installed to improve environmental quality within buildings will have minimal impact on historic building fabric. These controls and a security system will protect objects in historic structures.

The new 15-car parking lot across from the Burlingham house affects a small area east of Nod Hill Road. Careful siting and vegetative screening has minimized its visual impact.

IMPACTS ON NATURAL RESOURCES
The national historic site does not currently have the capability to monitor air quality, nor has the site’s air quality been assessed. Because acid rain has been identified in New England (mainly caused by distant large sources of pollution) and the use of automobiles has generally increased, some degradation of the site’s air quality is probable; however, the increase of vehicular traffic from future Weir Farm visitors, expected to be between 3 and 7 percent, will have a minimal negative effect on air quality.

Buses will be required to drop off passengers at the farm and park off-site, to limit idling of motors, and to pre-register prior to arriving at the farm. Directional signage will be installed to identify drop-off areas and off-site parking. Even without bus parking on-site, buses will have a visual and aural effect on site neighbors.

During construction activities, there will be a temporary increase in noise, dust, and vehicle exhaust at the site.
Groundwater must be protected from potential effects of increased seepage resulting from the site's public access. Replacement or improvement of the existing septic systems associated with historic structures and with rehabilitated structures will be required to preserve both groundwater and surface water. No long-term impacts will result from this work. Periodic monitoring of the pond and wetlands will be instituted to help preserve water quality.

Because no development is proposed in any wetland area of the site, no impacts on wetlands are anticipated. When repairs are being made on historic structures or during any other construction activity that the National Park Service may undertake, measures will be taken to ensure that silt and contaminated runoff do not reach surface waters or wetlands. Wetlands will continue to be protected from park-related development on or near park property.

No threatened or endangered species, critical habitats, floodplain, or prime or unique soils are found within the park or in any of the areas under consideration for acquisition; therefore, no impacts on these types of resources are anticipated.

The overall condition of wildlife on the site will remain unaffected by the implementation of the plan and any of the alternatives.

The new 15-car parking lot across from the Burlingham house required removal of second-growth vegetation in an area approximately 150' by 40'. The number of larger trees removed was kept to a minimum. Grading for the lot was minimal. A visual buffer will be maintained by planting vegetation similar to the existing plant material.

The dams will be stabilized by lowering the spillway to drop the water level in the pond slightly and by filling one weakened section of the structure. The method and material for repairing this structural weakness is now under study. Vegetation, aquatic life, and wildlife may be adversely impacted by the remedial work on the dams due to downstream flow interruption. Additional environmental documentation will be prepared prior to stabilization of the dam.

IMPACTS ON PARK OPERATIONS
The creation of a maintenance facility and administrative offices will allow park staff to maintain and operate the site more efficiently.

IMPACTS ON THE SOCIOECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT
Construction will require the short-term services of construction professionals. When the site is fully operational, increased visitation to the Wilton/Ridgefield area may result in a higher demand for retail services, such as shops and restaurants, and overnight accommodations. Weir Farm staff are also likely to purchase goods and services locally. Thus, a limited increase in retail sales is anticipated, which could in turn result in the creation of a limited number of jobs.

Expanding tourism and related activities may require increased services, such as fire and police protection. Varying amounts of land will be removed from Wilton and/or Ridgefield tax rolls.

CUMULATIVE/UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS
Traffic on Nod Hill Road is expected to increase marginally (3 to 7 percent) at the projected level of visitation. The NPS will make every effort to install proper directional and traffic signs so that both drivers and pedestrians can negotiate Nod Hill Road and Pelham Lane safely.

IRREVERSIBLE OR IRRERetrIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES
Adaptive use of the Burlingham house, Burlingham barn, the caretaker's house, and caretaker's garage/barn will result in some loss of historic building fabric.
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Impacts Unique to Each Alternative

IMPACTS ON VISITOR EXPERIENCE
Educational Opportunities
A wide range of programs, including arts education, will be available to visitors in the plan, which will enhance visitors’ appreciation of the site. The same would have been true for Alternative 2. Only a very limited range of programs would have been available to visitors in Alternative 3.

Orientation
By providing orientation to visitors before they enter the site, as proposed in the plan, visitors will be able to approach and use the site with greater understanding, and greater sensitivity to the nature and fragility of its resources. The same would have been true for Alternative 2.

In the plan, visitors receive orientation at an off-site visitor center before they walk or take a shuttle bus to the site. Their ability to understand and use the site will be enhanced by comprehensive orientation, but the distance between the visitor center and the park may make it harder for them to understand the layout of the site. The same would have been true for Alternative 2.

The visitor station in the main barn, as proposed in Alternative 3, would have allowed visitors to understand and become oriented to the site’s layout more easily. However, the space available in the barn would have allowed only limited orientation to take place.

Understanding the Resource
In the plan, the art of Weir, Young, and others will be exhibited in proximity to the farm’s landscape in which these works were created. Visitors will be able to move relatively easily between exhibitions of the art and documented painting sites. They will thus gain a fuller appreciation and understanding of the historic resources. The same would have been true for Alternative 3.

Although visitors would have been able to see works of art in Alternative 2, they would not have been able to make a direct connection between art produced at Weir Farm and the actual landscape. The greater distance between the visitor center and the farm would have limited visitors’ ability to move freely between interpretive exhibitions in the visitor center and the site, although interpretation on the shuttle itself could have made visitors’ experience more fluid.

The space available in the barn for the visitor center in Alternative 3 would have restricted interpretive exhibits and programs. Understanding the resource would have depended more on personal contact with staff, yet office space for staff would also have been limited.

Adequate space will be provided for interpretive programming in the plan. Restoration of studio interiors will provide the opportunity to interpret artistic life on the farm and the variety of artistic processes (sculpture, painting, drawing, and printmaking) that took place there.

Restoration of the landscape of the Weir complex to its appearance in about 1940, as proposed in the plan, presents a major opportunity to interpret the relationship of art to the historic landscape. Vegetative screening along the periphery of the park will have a positive effect on the visitor experience by minimizing views to adjacent residential development.

Preserving the current appearance of the historic structures on the site, as proposed in Alternative 2 and 3, would have presented ample opportunity to interpret the work, lifestyle, and preservation efforts of the current resident artists. However, preserving the structures in their current state would have presented few opportunities to interpret the lives and work of Weir and Young effectively and would have limited the ability to interpret the sculpture and etching processes. Preserving the grounds in their current state would have restricted opportunities to interpret the historic landscape.
Using the main house for art exhibitions, as proposed in Alternative 3, would have limited discussion of the lives of any of its occupants.

Preservation of the Weir and Young studios in their current state as proposed in Alternative 3 would have allowed the interpretive program to address current artists’ work, but it could only cover Weir’s and Young’s lives on the farm and the sculpture and etching processes to a limited degree.

Circulation
Guided tours of all primary historic resources and a loop circulation system of trails as proposed in the plan, will make travel through the site easy and clear and will increase opportunities for interpreting and understanding the relationship between art and the land, especially the areas of the site that were often painted.

The nearby location of the visitor center as proposed in the plan will allow visitors to walk to the park, if they so desire. A short shuttle ride will also be available to those who choose not to walk. Because visitors will be able to walk to the site, as well as take a shuttle in Alternative 1, the shuttle will not be an effective mechanism for visitation control.

The remote location of the visitor center in Alternative 2 would have curtailed walking to the park. Shuttle service proposed in Alternative 2 would have allowed more effective control of the level of visitation at any one time; it would have thus contributed to preserving the peaceful character of the site. To maintain and operate a continual shuttle service would have required extensive resources. Moreover, ensuring that visitors use the shuttle and not attempt to visit the site in their own vehicles would have been difficult and would have required additional resources.

Guided tours of the site and upgraded trail surfaces proposed in the plan will improve the circulation system. Without expansion of the existing trail net-work, site circulation would have remained inadequate in Alternatives 2 and 3.

In Alternative 3, visitors would have guided themselves through the exhibition of art in the main house, which would have provided the greatest flexibility for visitors but the least amount of control for site managers.

Barrier-free Access
Improvements for visitors with disabilities will provide greater access to site resources in the plan. A new visitor center will provide barrier-free access to programs, exhibits, and offices. A new administration and maintenance facility will provide barrier-free access for park employees. The same would have been true for Alternative 2.

The improved trail network proposed in the plan will create a more enjoyable, simplified, and accessible experience.

Because all visitor services would have been located in historic structures in Alternative 3, access would have been more limited than in the other alternatives.

IMPACTS ON CULTURAL RESOURCES
Historic Structures
Historic structures will be preserved and protected for future generations. This would have been true in Alternative 2 and 3, also. Historic structures, however, would have been under the greatest stress in Alternative 3, because they would have been used to support basic visitor services.

Landscape
Restoration of the cultural landscape as specified in the plan may result in the selective removal of non-historic trees in areas where farm fields existed. Historic trees will not be disturbed unless they are in a hazardous condition; in this case, they will be pruned or removed and replaced in kind. The scope of this work will be determined in the treatment plan of the cultural landscape report. Vegetation will not be cleared along
the site's periphery to mitigate visual intrusion both from and to adjacent residences.

Although it would have been sited in a remote section of the site, the on-site administration and maintenance facility proposed in Alternative 2 would have created a major negative impact on the cultural landscape both during and after its construction. Sensitive siting and vegetative screening would have helped mitigate the new facility's intrusion on the historic scene and on park neighbors.

Development of the loop circulation system proposed in the plan may have a negative impact on the historic landscape by introducing non-historic elements, such as directional signs.

Collections
A new state-of-the-art facility proposed in the plan will provide museum-quality storage and conservation space for collections not on exhibition. State-of-the-art controls will protect those artifacts and works of art on exhibit in the visitor center. The same would have been true for Alternatives 2 and 3.

The relatively centralized nature of the curatorial functions in the plan is cost-efficient and promotes a high standard of collection care. The same would have been true for Alternative 3. The dispersed nature of the collections and collections care in Alternative 2 would have been less cost-efficient and would have required additional resources and safeguards.

In Alternative 3, the size of the main house and of the collections storage area would have limited the size and nature of the site's collection. Fewer works of art and artifacts would have been exhibited than in other alternatives, and because the historic structures would not have been modified to provide proper environmental and security conditions, exchange of artwork with other institutions would have been far less likely to occur. Collections would have been exposed to greater environmental fluctuations in Alternative 3.

Archeological Sites
The enlargement of the caretaker's garage/barn on the foundation of its missing section and the development of a loop circulation system proposed in the plan may have some impact on archeological sites. Construction will not take place, however, until archeological investigations are conducted.

The development of a new administration and maintenance facility in Alternative 2, could have had some impact on archeological sites. Alternative 3 would have had the lowest potential for adverse impact on archeological sites.

IMPACTS ON NATURAL RESOURCES
Scenic Quality
Landscape restoration proposed in the plan will alter the aesthetic character of the site. The development of a new visitor center and of an administration and maintenance facility, both on previously disturbed areas (existing residential properties), will result in minimal impacts on scenic quality. The greatest impact will occur from parking, which is necessary to provide even a modest level of public and staff access. This visual intrusion will be minimized by careful siting and vegetative screening.

The new administration and maintenance facility proposed in Alternative 2 would have had a negative effect on scenic quality. Vegetative screening and sensitive siting would have minimized this impact. The off-site visitor center would have had no effect on the farm's historic character.

The current views to adjacent residential development would not have been screened in Alternative 3.
Wildlife
Because historic fields will be restored in the plan, "transition area" habitat for birds, white-tailed deer, and other species will be enhanced. Development of the new visitor center and the administration and maintenance facility on previously disturbed areas will result in minimal additional impacts on the natural resources of the area.

In Alternative 2, about 0.7 acres of forested land would have been lost in the area identified as the site of the administration and maintenance facility. Developing the new visitor center on previously disturbed land off the site would not have affected the natural resources of the area.

The condition of natural resources, particularly vegetation and wildlife would have remained unaffected by implementation of Alternative 3.

IMPACTS ON PARK OPERATIONS
The presence of a state-of-the-art administration and maintenance facility near the park will support a high level of resource maintenance. In Alternative 3, the maintenance facility would have operated at a greater cost than the plan and Alternative 2, due to its remote location and leasing cost. The leased facility would have required additional staff travel and the duplication of certain kinds of equipment.

Extensive garden restoration and landscape restoration proposed in the plan will require long-term care and a high level of maintenance. Weeding, mowing, and planting will require more time and staff.

In an administrative and operational sense, the remote location of the visitor center and staff offices in Alternative 2 would have been less efficient and would have required additional time and resources, such as office equipment.

In the plan, adequate staff will exist to support desired programs and adequate work space will be provided for efficient operation of the site. The same would have been true for Alternative 2. In Alternative 3, available space would have limited the number of staff, the programs available to visitors, and the level and range of the interpretive program and staff would not have been adequate to support desired programs.

IMPACTS ON THE SOCIOECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT
Job Creation
The development of a visitor center and an administration and maintenance facility on nearby properties, and the improvements made to the historic resources proposed in the plan, will result directly in a short-term increase in construction jobs. If the preferred off-site location is close to a commercial district, the park's impact on retail services will be more pronounced than in other alternatives and could result in an increase in the number of retail jobs.

The development of the remote visitor center and the on-site administration and maintenance facility, as well as the improvements made to the historic resources proposed in Alternative 2, would have resulted directly in a short-term increase in construction jobs.

Alternative 3 would have resulted in the creation of fewest jobs because minimal construction was proposed.

Retail Sales
If the remote visitor center proposed in Alternative 2 would have been located in a commercial district, this alternative could have resulted in an increase in retail sales.

Municipal Revenues
The plan will remove at least two properties from local tax rolls. Alternative 2 would have removed at least one property from local tax rolls. Alternative 3 would have removed no property from the tax rolls.
Adjacent Properties
Specific impacts associated with the location of new facilities proposed in the plan will vary depending upon the particular location. Once the actual location has been determined, additional public involvement and environmental compliance documentation will be undertaken. The same would have been true for Alternative 2. The on-site administration and maintenance facility proposed in Alternative 2 would have resulted in additional traffic on Weir Farm Lane.

IRREVERSIBLE OR IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES
Construction of a bus drop-off in the plan will result in loss of historic fabric.

Construction of the new maintenance and administration facility and bus drop-off, and use of the main barn as an on-site visitor contact station in Alternative 2 would have resulted in loss of historic fabric.

Adaptive use of the main barn in Alternative 3 would have resulted in some loss of historic building fabric.

Compliance with Federal, State, and Local Laws, Executive Orders, and Regulations
The NPS will comply with all applicable laws, regulations, and executive orders, including those listed here, upon implementing the General Management Plan for Weir Farm National Historic Site.

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT COMPLIANCE
As required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, the draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement was on public review for 60 days. This final General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement responds to public comments on the draft document. After a 30-day no-action period, the NPS will prepare a Record of Decision and circulate it to interested parties to complete the NEPA process.

CULTURAL RESOURCE COMPLIANCE
The National Park Service’s mandate is to preserve and protect its cultural resources through the Organic Act of August 25, 1916, and through specific legislation such as the Antiquities Act of 1906, NEPA, and the National Historic Preservation Act (described below). Cultural resources at Weir Farm will be managed in accordance with these acts and in accordance with Chapter 5 of NPS Management Policies, the Cultural Resource Management Guideline (NPS-28), The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, Guidelines for the Rehabilitation of Historic Buildings, The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Archeology and Historic Preservation, and other relevant policy directives.

As part of its cultural-resources management responsibilities, the NPS surveys and evaluates all cultural resources on lands under its jurisdiction. Cultural resources are evaluated by applying the criteria for the National Register of Historic Places. In addition, the NPS maintains two inventories: 1) the List of Classified Structures, which includes all above-grade and prehistoric structures, and 2) a Cultural Landscape Inventory, which includes all significant landscapes within the national park system. All cultural resources eligible for the National Register will be recorded and/or measured according to the highest professional standards.

In accordance with the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 (42 USC 4151 et seq.), the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 USC 701 et seq.), and Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards, all facilities and programs developed at Weir Farm will be made as accessible as possible given the site’s historic preservation constraints.

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 USC 470, et. seq.) requires that federal agencies having direct or indirect jurisdiction over undertakings take into account the effect of
those undertakings on National Register properties and allow the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) an opportunity to comment. Toward that end, the NPS is working with the Connecticut State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the ACHP to meet the requirements of the August 1990 programmatic agreement among the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, the ACHP, and the NPS. The programmatic agreement requires the NPS to work closely with the SHPO and the ACHP in planning new and existing areas.

This agreement also provides for a number of programmatic exclusions or actions that are not likely to have an adverse effect on cultural resources. These actions may be implemented without further review by the SHPO or the ACHP, thus reducing required consultation with the SHPO. Actions not specifically excluded in the programmatic agreement must be reviewed by the SHPO and the ACHP during the design stage and prior to implementation.

Internally, the NPS will complete a 106 form (Assessment of Actions Having an Effect on Cultural Resources) prior to implementing any proposed actions. The form documents any project effects, outlines actions proposed to mitigate such effects, and documents that the proposed action flows from the General Management Plan. Regional office cultural-resource specialists, as specified in NPS-28, will use the 106 form to review and certify all proposed actions affecting cultural resources.

All ground-disturbing actions will be preceded by an archeological evaluation to determine the level of archeological investigation required before construction can begin. Should any such resources be identified, the SHPO and the NPS will evaluate their potential for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places; if eligible, appropriate measures will be undertaken to preserve them. Archeological survey and testing will be carried out prior to, or in conjunction with, construction.

Appendix B lists actions that are either programmatic exclusions or are subject to further consultation by the SHPO and ACHP. Should the NPS and the SHPO so decide, other actions not meeting the programmatic exclusion definition may be determined to need no further review. Any such agreement, however, must be mutually determined and fully documented.

**NATURAL RESOURCE COMPLIANCE**

Through Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, the Environmental Protection Agency recommends that all wetlands, streams, brooks, ponds, and intermittent drainage not also bordered by wetlands be included in any permitting action filed by the NPS.

Weir Farm is designated as a class II clean air area. According to the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 USC 7401 et seq.), maximum allowable increases of sulfur dioxide, particulate matter, and nitrogen oxide beyond baseline concentrations established for class II areas cannot be exceeded.

These class II increments will allow modest industrial activities within the vicinity of the site. Section 118 of the Clean Air Act requires all federal facilities to comply with existing federal, state, and local air pollution control laws and regulations. The NPS will work with the State of Connecticut to ensure that all site activities meet the requirements of the state air quality implementation plan.

Executive Order 11988 ("Floodplain Management") requires that all federal agencies avoid construction within the 100-year floodplain unless no other practicable alternative exists.

Executive Order 11990 ("Protection of Wetlands") requires that all federal agencies avoid, wherever possible, impacts on wetlands.
Federal agencies are required to analyze the impacts of federal actions on agricultural lands, in accordance with NEPA (45FR 59189). This policy was developed to minimize the effect of federal programs in converting prime, unique, or locally important farmland to non-agricultural uses.

Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 USC 1531 et seq.) requires all federal agencies to consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to ensure that any action authorized, funded, or carried out by the agency does not jeopardize the continued existence of listed species or critical habitat.

STATE PERMITTING REQUIREMENTS
During the design phase of project implementation, the NPS will contact the State of Connecticut’s Public Information and Permitting Office, a clearinghouse for the various state offices, to determine application procedures for state water pollution control, underground storage tanks, utility siting, and other permits.

LOCAL REGULATIONS
The NPS will work with the Towns of Ridgefield and Wilton to determine how conservation zoning rules apply to any proposed development.
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J. ALDEN WEIR, The Barn Lot, 1887, Etching, 7 5/8 x 10 1/4 in.
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Public Involvement

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC SCOPING
During the planning process, the NPS published two informational newsletters, a draft General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement, and a summary of the draft plan. The planning team also held three formal public meetings and numerous informal, smaller meetings to introduce the public to the planning process, to engage discussion, and to solicit comments.

The first formal public meeting was an open house at the Wilton Library on July 15, 1992. The meeting, a question-and-answer session designed to discuss the planning process and provisions for public involvement, also gave members of the public an opportunity to express their concerns and expectations about the preservation and use of Weir Farm.

In October and November 1992, the planning team held three day-long workshops with artists, art educators, and art historians to engage their thoughts on how Weir Farm should be managed.

On March 25, 1993, a second formal public meeting was held at the Ridgefield Public Library. Here, team members described the preliminary alternatives for Weir Farm and sought public reaction to them.

On July 16, 1994, a third formal public meeting was held at the Aldrich Museum in Ridgefield. Here, team members described the alternatives presented in the draft plan and discussed people's suggestions and concerns. On July 27, 1994, the team made a presentation at Ridgefield's selectmen meeting.

Team members also met with numerous agencies and individuals including the Weir Farm Heritage Trust, Wilton and Ridgefield selectmen and town planners, the executive directors of the Housatonic Regional and Southwest Regional planning agencies, the State Historic Preservation Officer, immediate neighbors, representatives of the Weir-Leary-White Preserve, and representatives of the Gilbert and Bennett Wire Factory.

Team members contacted the following offices within the state Department of Environmental Protection for resource information — the Office of Planning, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Environmental Conservation Branch, State Park Division, Land Acquisition and Management, and the Water Resources Unit. Team members also contacted the Connecticut Trust for Historic Preservation, the Wilton and Ridgefield Parks and Recreation divisions, the Wilton Historical Society, the Ridgefield and Wilton conservation commissions, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Connecticut Natural Diversity Data Base, and the Fairfield County Natural Resources Conservation Service.

The team distributed approximately 2,500 copies of a draft plan summary to interested citizens and park neighbors and about 30 copies of the unabridged draft to appropriate agencies for review and comment. The summary documents contained a mail-back form. The team received 63 responses in total.

Of the 63 total responses, 34 indicated a preference for the plan, five indicated a preference for Alternative 2, 12 indicated a preference for Alternative 3; and 12 responses indicated no preference for a particular alternative. Examples of comments received are located in Appendix I. The substantive issues addressed in the final plan are described in the “Modifications Made to the Preferred Alternative to Form the Final Plan” section in Part Two.
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APPENDIX A: ENABLING LEGISLATION

PUBLIC LAW 101-485—OCT. 31, 1990 104 STAT. 1171

Public Law 101-485
101st Congress

An Act

To establish the Weir Farm National Historic Site in the State of Connecticut.

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 "Weir Farm National Historic Site Establishment Act of 1990".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—
(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.
(2) The term "historic site" means the Weir Farm National Historic Site established in section 4.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—
(1) the Weir Farm in Connecticut is listed on the National Register of Historic Places as a historic site associated with major American artists and several artistic developments;
(2) the Weir Farm, acquired in 1882 by J. Alden Weir, a founder and principal exponent of American Impressionism, has been continuously occupied by working artists and their families who have maintained its significance and integrity as a historic site; and
(3) the Weir Farm, including the house, barns, studios, pond, field, and woods thereon, and the approximately 113 acres of adjacent natural areas owned by the Nature Conservancy and the Town of Ridgefield, Connecticut, provide opportunities for illustrating and interpreting cultural themes of our Nation’s heritage and provide opportunities for public use and enjoyment.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—
(1) to preserve a significant site of the tradition of American Impressionism;
(2) to maintain the integrity of a setting that inspired artistic expression and encourages public enjoyment; and
(3) to offer opportunities for the inspirational benefit and education of the American people.

SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF WEIR FARM NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established, as a unit of the National Park System, the Weir Farm National Historic Site in the State of Connecticut.

(b) DESCRIPTION.—The historic site shall consist of—
(1) the approximately 2-acre core parcel containing the Weir house, studio, and barn; and
(2) the approximately 60 acres and improvements thereon owned by the State of Connecticut;
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both as generally depicted on a map entitled "Land Ownership Map, Weir Farm Historic Site", Figure 5, dated October 1989, as contained in the National Park Service Weir Farm Suitability/Feasibility Study, February, 1990. Such map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

SEC. 5. ACQUISITION OF REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY AND SERVICES.

(a) REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY.—The Secretary is authorized to acquire by donation, exchange, or purchase with donated or appropriated funds, the lands and improvements within the boundaries of the historic site, except that any such lands and improvements owned by the State of Connecticut may be acquired only by donation. The Secretary may also acquire by the same methods personal property associated with, and appropriate for, the interpretation of the historic site: Provided, That the Secretary may acquire works of art associated with the Weir family, J. Alden Weir, and other artists who lived at or visited the site only by donation or purchase with donated funds.

(b) OTHER PROPERTY, FUNDS, AND SERVICES.—The Secretary is authorized to accept and use donated funds, property, and services to carry out this Act.

SEC. 6. ADMINISTRATION OF HISTORIC SITE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the historic site in accordance with this Act and the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916 (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), and the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national historic significance, and for other purposes", approved August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.), except that the Secretary shall take no action with respect to the 50 acres owned by the State of Connecticut within the boundaries of the historic site until such time as the State has transferred all right, title, and interests therein to the Secretary.

(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—(1) The Secretary may consult and enter into cooperative agreements with the Weir Farm Heritage Trust, the State of Connecticut, the American Academy of Arts and Letters, and other organizations and groups in the development, presentation and funding of art exhibits, resident artist programs, and other appropriate activities related to the preservation, development, and use of the historic site.

(c) EXHIBITS.—The Secretary may display, and accept for the purpose of display, works of art associated with J. Alden Weir, the Weir Farm, and the American Impressionist movement, as may be necessary for the interpretation of the historic site.

(d) GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Within 2 complete fiscal years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate a gen-
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eral management plan for the historic site. The plan shall be prepared in accordance with section 12(b) of the Act of August 18, 1970 (16 U.S.C. 1a-1 through 1a-7) and other applicable law.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, except that not more than $1,500,000 may be appropriated for the acquisition of real and personal property.


LEGISLATIVE HISTORY—S. 2059:

HOUSE REPORTS: No. 101–732 (Comm. on Interior and Insular Affairs).
SENATE REPORTS: No. 101–319 (Comm. on Energy and Natural Resources).
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 136 (1990):
June 14, considered and passed Senate.
Oct. 10, considered and passed House, amended.
Oct. 17, Senate concurred in House amendment.

TITLE II—WEIR FARM NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE ADDITIONS

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Weir Farm National Historic Site Expansion Act of 1994”.

SEC. 202. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to preserve the last remaining undeveloped parcels of the historic Weir Farm that remain in private ownership by including the parcels within the boundary of the Weir Farm National Historic Site.

SEC. 203. BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.

(a) ADJUSTMENT.—Section 4(b) of the Weir Farm National Historic Site Establishment Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–485; 104 Stat. 1171) is amended—
   (1) by striking out “and” at the end of paragraph (1);
   (2) by striking out the flush material below paragraph (2); and
   (3) by adding at the end the following:
      “(3) the approximately 2-acre parcel of land situated in the town of Wilton, Connecticut, designated as lot 18 on a map entitled ‘Revised Map of Section I, Thunder Lake at Wilton, Connecticut, Scale 1–100’, October 27, 1978, Ryan and Faulds Land Surveyors, Wilton, Connecticut’, that is on file in the office of the town clerk of the town of Wilton, and therein numbered 3673; and
      “(4) the approximately 0.9-acre western portion of a parcel of land situated in the town of Wilton, Connecticut, designated as Tall Oaks Road on the map referred to in paragraph (3).”.

(b) GENERAL DEPICTION.—Section 4 of such Act, as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:
   “(c) GENERAL DEPICTION.—The parcels referred to in paragraphs (1) through (4) of subsection (b) are all as generally depicted on a map entitled ‘Boundary Map, Weir Farm National Historic Site, Fairfield County Connecticut’, dated June 1994. Such map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.”.
APPENDIX B: SECTION 106 CONSULTATION REQUIREMENTS FOR PLAN UNDERTAKINGS

As required by the Programmatic Agreement for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, the following list indicates those undertakings that are subject to further consultation and the stage of planning at which consultation is most likely to be completed. Undertakings which are programmatic exclusions are indicated. Undertakings encompassed by the cultural landscape report (CLR) treatment plan will be submitted for phased review and be the subject of memoranda of agreement.

If information needed to support an accurate restoration is lacking, the area will be preserved rather than restored.

These requirements apply to actions that take place on Weir Farm NHS property or that are conducted with federal funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selectively restore Weir complex landscape to its ca 1940 appearance, including fields, orchards, gardens, and outbuildings</td>
<td>Requires State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)/Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) review; cultural landscape report (CLR) treatment plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore exterior of structures to their ca 1940 appearance</td>
<td>Requires SHPO/ACHP review; historic structure report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilize environmental conditions of the main house and Weir and Young studios</td>
<td>Programmatic exclusion C1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate Burlingham complex landscape</td>
<td>Requires SHPO/ACHP review; CLR Treatment Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate the Burlingham house for housing; rehabilitate Burlingham barn for year-round educational program use</td>
<td>Requires SHPO/ACHP review; historic structure report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve woodshed and tool house in Burlingham complex</td>
<td>Programmatic exclusion C1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear and restore areas of woodland east of Nod Hill Road</td>
<td>Requires SHPO/ACHP review; CLR Treatment Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate caretaker's house for housing</td>
<td>Requires SHPO/ACHP review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate and expand caretaker's garage/barn for studio space</td>
<td>Requires SHPO/ACHP review; completion of HSR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>SHPO/ACHP Review or CLR Treatment Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate existing structure(s) near the site for a visitor center</td>
<td>Requires SHPO/ACHP review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct parking facility for approximately 25 cars for visitor center;</td>
<td>Requires SHPO/ACHP review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construct bus turn around for shuttle drop-off</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate existing structure(s) near the site for administrative staff</td>
<td>Requires SHPO/ACHP review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and maintenance functions, or if not feasible, construct new structure(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant vegetative screening near site boundaries</td>
<td>Requires SHPO/ACHP review; CLR treatment plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add new paths to connect key park sites to historic path system</td>
<td>Requires SHPO/ACHP review; CLR treatment plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Cultural Resource Management Inventories, Plans, and Studies

NPS-28 (Cultural Resources Management Guideline) requires certain studies and specifies that others be identified in the General Management Plan. Additional studies may be required before undertakings can be carried out. These studies will make it possible for the parks cultural resources to be appropriately managed and preserved.

The following studies have been completed or are in draft:
- Scope of collections statement
- Historic painting sites study
- Historic structure report
- Cultural landscape report, volume 1: site history and existing conditions
- Historic furnishings report
- Historic base map

The following studies should be completed prior to plan implementation:
- Archeological overview and assessment
- Archeological identification study
- Archeological evaluation study
- Ethnographic overview and assessment
- Collection condition survey

Collection management plan
- Cultural landscape report, volume 2: analysis and treatment plan
- The site is listed on the National Register of Historic Places; documentation forms will need to be amended to reflect any boundary enlargement. Additional research will need to be undertaken to further document the collections, including works of art, that become available for display at the site.
- Work requiring ground disturbance—including the expansion of the trail system; the preservation, rehabilitation, or restoration of structures and the cultural landscape; and new construction—will require archeological testing to identify archeological resources and assess their significance.

With respect to Weir Farm National Historic Site, both the Connecticut SHPO and the ACHP were notified in June 1992 shortly after planning began and were invited to participate. A meeting was held with the SHPO to discuss management issues early in the planning phase. The draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement was submitted to both agencies for formal review. Comments have been addressed in this document.
APPENDIX C: COST ESTIMATES

CAPITAL COST ESTIMATES FOR THE PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Gross Construction</th>
<th>Planning &amp; Design</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Conduct Boundary Survey</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Catalogue Collections</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey Condition of Collections</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop Collections Management Plan</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Preserve Weir Complex Structures</td>
<td>1,354,000</td>
<td>310,000</td>
<td>1,664,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitate Burlington Complex Structures</td>
<td>708,000</td>
<td>162,000</td>
<td>870,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitate Caretaker’s House</td>
<td>259,000</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>318,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitate Caretaker’s Garage/Barn for Studio</td>
<td>131,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>161,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stabilize Landscape Features</td>
<td>1,087,000</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>1,336,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>Produce Weir and Burlington Complex Exhibits</td>
<td>262,500</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>294,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,801,500</td>
<td>1,026,500</td>
<td>4,828,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Conduct Natural Resource Monitoring</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Construct Visitor Center</td>
<td>2,366,000</td>
<td>542,000</td>
<td>2,908,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Associated Site Work</td>
<td>608,000</td>
<td>139,000</td>
<td>747,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Associated Parking</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>82,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct Bus Drop-Off</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct Administration/Maintenance Facility</td>
<td>808,000</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>993,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Associated Site Work</td>
<td>206,000</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>253,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Associated Parking</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>Produce Visitor Center Exhibits</td>
<td>632,000</td>
<td>163,000</td>
<td>795,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,730,000</td>
<td>1,111,000</td>
<td>5,841,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Rehabilitate Landscape Park-Wide</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>83,000</td>
<td>443,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>Produce Landscape Exhibits</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>435,000</td>
<td>108,000</td>
<td>543,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11,212,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Costs of establishing an art collection (to be supported by private funds) and purchasing additional land are not included.
Costs developed using the National Park Service Class "C" Cost Estimating Guide.
## CAPITAL COST ESTIMATES FOR ALTERNATIVE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Gross Construction</th>
<th>Planning &amp; Design</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Conduct Boundary Survey</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Catalogue Collections</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey Condition of Collections</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop Collections Management Plan</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Preserve Weir Complex Structures</td>
<td>1,354,000</td>
<td>310,000</td>
<td>1,664,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitate Burlington Complex Structures</td>
<td>708,000</td>
<td>162,000</td>
<td>870,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitate Caretaker's House &amp; Garage/Barn</td>
<td>271,000</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>333,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stabilize Landscape Features</td>
<td>1,087,000</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>1,336,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>Produce Weir and Burlington Complex Exhibits</td>
<td>313,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>338,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,733,000</td>
<td>993,000</td>
<td>4,726,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Phase II | Research | Conduct Natural Resource Monitoring | 10,000 |            |          |
|          | Construction | Construct Visitor Center             | 3,851,000 | 882,000 | 4,733,000|
|          |          | Associated Site Work                | 980,000  | 224,000  | 1,204,000|
|          |          | Associated Parking                  | 67,000   | 15,000   | 82,000   |
|          |          | Construct Bus Drop-Off              | 26,000   | 6,000    | 32,000   |
|          |          | Construct Administration/Maintenance Facility | 808,000 | 185,000  | 993,000  |
|          |          | Associated Site Work                | 206,000  | 47,000   | 253,000  |
|          |          | Associated Parking                  | 17,000   | 4,000    | 21,000   |
|         | Interpretation | Produce Visitor Center Exhibits      | 1,103,000 | 312,000 | 1,415,000|
| Sub-Total |          |                                  | 7,658,000         | 1,685,000       | 8,743,000|

| Phase III | Construction | Maintain Landscape Park-Wide       | 138,000 | 32,000 | 170,000 |
| Sub-Total |             |                                  | 138,000 | 32,000 | 170,000 |

**Total** |                |                                   | 13,639,000 |

Costs of establishing an art collection (to be supported by private funds) and purchasing additional land are not included.

Costs developed using the National Park Service Class "C" Cost Estimating Guide.
### CAPITAL COST ESTIMATES FOR ALTERNATIVE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Gross Construction</th>
<th>Planning &amp; Design</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Conduct Boundary Survey</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Catalogue Collections</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey Condition of Collections</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop Collections Management Plan</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Preserve Weir Complex Structures</td>
<td>1,099,000</td>
<td>252,000</td>
<td>1,351,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitate Burlingham Complex Structures</td>
<td>708,000</td>
<td>162,000</td>
<td>870,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitate Caretaker’s House &amp; Garage/Barn</td>
<td>271,000</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>333,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stabilize Landscape Features</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>81,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>Produce Weir and Burlingham Complex Exhibits</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,189,000</td>
<td>688,000</td>
<td>2,877,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Conduct Natural Resource Monitoring</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Rehabilitate Main Barn for Visitor Contact/Curat</td>
<td>605,000</td>
<td>139,000</td>
<td>744,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construct Bus Drop-Off</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Associated Site Work</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>117,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>Produce Visitor Center Exhibits</td>
<td>585,000</td>
<td>49,000</td>
<td>634,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,311,000</td>
<td>226,000</td>
<td>1,537,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Maintain Landscape Park-Wide</td>
<td>124,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>153,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>124,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>153,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,567,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Costs of establishing an art collection (to be supported by private funds) and purchasing additional land are not included.

Costs developed using the National Park Service Class "C" Cost Estimating Guide.
## APPENDIX C: COST ESTIMATES

### PROJECTED ANNUAL OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE COSTS FOR THE PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Salary w/ Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent (GS-13)</td>
<td>72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (GS-06)</td>
<td>29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Manager (GS-12)</td>
<td>57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (20 hrs) (GS-05)</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Visitor Services and Museum Management (GS-12)</td>
<td>57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Officer (GS-09)</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Interpretation (GS-11)</td>
<td>47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Specialist (GS-09)</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Ranger (GS-07)</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Curator (GS-09)</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and Utilities Foreman (WS-09)</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Worker (WG-07)</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Worker (WG-05)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulturist (GS-09)</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>553,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Salary w/ Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal Park Ranger (20 hrs) (GS-05)</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Worker (20 hrs) (WG-05)</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborer (WG-03)</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>47,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Salary w/ Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weir Farm Heritage Trust (four positions)</td>
<td><strong>private funds</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Salary w/ Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Costs</td>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Costs</td>
<td><strong>250,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Salary w/ Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Annual Operations and Maintenance Costs</td>
<td><strong>850,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PROJECTED ANNUAL OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE COSTS FOR ALTERNATIVE 2

**Permanent Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Salary with Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent (GS-13)</td>
<td>72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (GS-06)</td>
<td>29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Manager (GS-12)</td>
<td>57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (20 hrs) (GS-05)</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Visitor Services and Museum Management (GS-12)</td>
<td>57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Officer (GS-09)</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Interpretation (GS-11)</td>
<td>47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Specialist (GS-09)</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Ranger (GS-07)</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Ranger (GS-05)</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Curator (GS-09)</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Technician (GS-07)</td>
<td>32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and Utilities Foreman (WS-09)</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Worker (WG-07)</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Worker (WG-05)</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulturist (GS-09)</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>611,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Temporary Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal Park Ranger (20 hrs) (GS-05)</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Worker (20 hrs) (WG-05)</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborer (WG-03)</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>47,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weir Farm Heritage Trust (four positions)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance Costs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>300,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Annual Operations and Maintenance Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>958,000</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
APPENDIX C: COST ESTIMATES

PROJECTED ANNUAL OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE COSTS FOR ALTERNATIVE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Salary with Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent (GS-13)</td>
<td>72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (GS-06)</td>
<td>29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Manager (GS-12)</td>
<td>57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (20 hrs) (GS-05)</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Visitor Services and Musem Management (GS-12)</td>
<td>57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Officer (GS-09)</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief of Interpretation (GS-11)</td>
<td>47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Ranger (GS-05)</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Curator (GS-09)</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and Utilities Foreman (WS-09)</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Worker (WG-07)</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulturist (GS-09)</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>483,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Temporary Staff                                               |                      |
| Seasonal Park Ranger (20 hrs) (GS-05)                         | 13,000               |
| Laborer (WG-03)                                               | 22,000               |
| Total                                                         | 35,000               |

Weir Farm Heritage Trust (two positions)                        | private funds        |

| Maintenance Costs                                             |                      |
| Total                                                         | 200,000              |

Total Annual Operations and Maintenance Costs                   | 718,000              |
APPENDIX D: CRITERIA FOR BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS

Application of Boundary Criteria Proposal
A. Revise boundary of park to embrace nearby properties for development for visitor center.
B. Revise boundary of park to embrace nearby properties for development for park maintenance and administration facilities.
C. Acquire easement or right-of-way over State of Connecticut and Town of Ridgefield properties connecting proposed visitor center and parking lot to the park for visitor/pedestrian access.

These proposed boundary adjustments are based on a review of the adequacy of the boundary for Weir Farm National Historic Site established by Public Law 101-485. Based on information currently available about resources and administrative requirements, there are no other adjustments necessary to carry out the purposes of the park at this time.

Consultation
Weir Farm National Historic Site was established in 1990. During the course of the general management planning process, research related to the historic landscape revealed that any substantial, park-related development proposed for land within the present boundary would have a negative impact on cultural landscape features and the historic setting in general. In addition, park staff have noted that the space available in existing park structures is inadequate (and in some cases inappropriate) for park operations and visitor services. Weir Farm requires more space to accommodate these functions in a manner consistent with the purpose of the park.

The Superintendent, and representatives of the Weir Farm Heritage Trust and the planning team have discussed the boundary changes with adjacent landowners. The public, local officials, and state agencies have been made aware that a planning process is under way and had 60 days to comment on the draft document in writing and at public meetings. This document is being made available for 30 days.

APPLICABLE CRITERIA (NPS MANAGEMENT POLICIES, CH. 2 P.8 AND NPS SUPPLEMENT)

A: Parcels for visitor center and administration and maintenance facility. The same criteria for boundary adjustments apply to both of these sites. For the sake of brevity, they will be considered together. Criteria for appropriate parcels has been identified. The parcel will be located within one mile of the park boundary and may include a structure that is appropriate for redevelopment. The parcel should also have few adjacent residential neighbors, good road access, appropriate topography, and positive drainage. A development feasibility study has been completed that identifies properties appropriate for park-related development. These properties (the Goldsmith, DiNapoli and Meines properties) are located to the northeast of the park.

Under criterion 2c, these parcels present the opportunity to locate visitor services and park operations facilities away from the park’s historic scene. Wherever possible, the National Park Service will make use of existing structures and will limit new development, thereby maintaining the present character of the area.

Under criterion 4, these parcels are feasible to administer. However, they will require some level of rehabilitation and/or development in order to meet visitor service and park operation needs. They will increase the workload of the maintenance staff and will require additional funding to develop and maintain.

Acquisition Costs and Priority
Class C cost estimates for development of the affected parcels have been prepared. The cost estimates prepared for the General Management Plan do not include figures for land acquisition.
APPENDIX E: LAND PROTECTION PLAN ADDENDUM

Addendum to Land Protection Plan for Weir Farm National Historic Site

January 1995

This addendum updates the Land Protection Plan for Weir Farm National Historic Site, approved February 7, 1993.

UPDATE OF LAND PROTECTION RELATED ACTIVITIES:

Since the approval of the Land Protection Plan, the following activities have taken place:

(1) NPS purchased the core property with main house and studios from the Trust for Public Land (TPL) in March 1993.

(2) Legislation was enacted to bring Lot 18 and its associated unbuilt road into the park's boundaries and NPS has purchased Lot 18 from TPL.

(3) Lot 19 was privately developed for residential purposes.

(4) The State of Connecticut has transferred the caretaker's house to the NPS.

CHANGES TO THE PLAN:
The proposal described in this document prescribes a number of programs and activities that affect the Land Protection Plan. The plan calls for the acquisition of nearby lands to support the establishment of a visitor center and an administration and maintenance facility and proposes acquisition of an easement or right-of-way over State of Connecticut and Town of Ridgefield properties for visitor/pedestrian access.

Lands for Development. At least two parcels will be acquired to support the development of a visitor center and an administration and maintenance facility. The selected parcels will share the following characteristics.

The parcels will be located within one mile (considered walking distance for the purposes of this plan) of the park boundary and may include a structure(s) appropriate for redevelopment. The parcels should also have few adjacent residential neighbors, good road access, appropriate topography, and positive drainage. The acquisition of these parcels is essential to the implementation of the plan. A development feasibility study has been completed that identifies properties appropriate for park-related development. These properties (the Goldsmith, DiNapoli and Meines properties) are located to the northeast of the park.

METHOD OF ACQUISITION:
Any properties and interest in properties would be acquired by donation or on a willing seller-willing buyer basis.
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Accession - A transaction whereby one or more museum objects or specimens are acquired in the same manner from one source at one time for a museum collection. Accessions include gifts, exchanges, purchases, field collections, loans, and transfers.

Adaptive Reuse - A use for a structure or landscape other than its historic use, normally entailing some modification of the structure or landscape.

Building Conservation - The science of preserving an historic structure’s materials by observing and analyzing their deterioration, determining causes of and solutions to problems, and directing remedial interventions.

Carrying capacity - Carrying capacity refers to the amount and type of public use that can be accommodated within a national park area. Contemporary carrying capacity frameworks focus on indicators and standards of quality. Indicators are specific, measurable variables which reflect the quality of the visitor experience. Standards define the quantitative and measurable condition of each indicator variables; once standards have been exceeded, carrying capacity has been reached. Studies at Weir Farm identified several indicators of the quality of the visitor experience and determined visitor-based standards of quality for the maximum number of people who might visit Weir Farm at any one time.

Cultural Landscapes

Designed Historic Landscapes - Landscapes having significance as a design or work of art, consciously laid out by a landscape architect, master gardener, architect, or horticulturist according to a design principle, or by an owner or other amateur using a recognized style or tradition in response or reaction to a recognized style or tradition; they may have an historical association with a significant person or persons, trend, or event in landscape architecture.

Historic Rural Landscapes - Vernacular landscapes that have been historically used by people, or shaped or modified by human activity, occupancy, or intervention, and that possess a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of land use, vegetation, buildings and structures, road and waterways, and natural features.

Historic Vernacular Landscapes - Landscapes whose use, construction, or physical layout reflect endemic traditions, customs, beliefs, or values; in which the expression of cultural values, social behavior, and individual actions over time is manifested in the physical features and material and their interrelationships, including patterns of spatial organization, land use, circulation, vegetation, structures, and objects in which the physical, biological, and cultural features reflect customs and lives of everyday people.

Preservation - A treatment utilized by the NPS to preserve an historic property in its present condition if a) that condition allows for satisfactory protection, maintenance, use and interpretation, or b) another treatment is warranted but cannot be accomplished until some future time.

Rehabilitation - A treatment utilized by the NPS to rehabilitate an historic property for contemporary use if a) it cannot adequately serve an appropriate use in its present condition, and b) rehabilitation will retain its essential features and will not alter its integrity and character, or conflict with park management objectives.

Restoration - A treatment utilized by the NPS to restore an historic property to an earlier appearance if a) restoration is essential to public understanding of the cultural associations of a park, and b) sufficient data exists to permit restoration with minimal conjecture.

Stabilization - Action to render an unsafe, damaged, or deteriorated property stable while retaining its present form.
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APPENDIX H: EXAMPLES OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT PLAN

WEIR FARM

WEIR FARM NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE
SUMMARY OF DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

What's Your Opinion? We would like to know which aspects of each alternative you favor or dislike.

Do you have comments on Alternative 1: Reuniting the Historic Landscape with the Art it Inspired?

I favor this total approach. The extra cost is more than justified by the visual historic benefits this alternative would generate.

Do you have comments on Alternative 2: Presenting Wein Farm as a "Work of Art"?

Dislike the orientation at a new visitor center off-site. I believe this would distract from the total feeling.

Do you have comments on Alternative 3: Protecting a Cultural Resource?

Not bold enough.

---

WEIR FARM NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE
SUMMARY OF DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

What's Your Opinion? We would like to know which aspects of each alternative you favor or dislike.

Do you have comments on Alternative 1: Reuniting the Historic Landscape with the Art it Inspired?

The best alternative. The sense of continuity of the site is best served by keeping artists who are truly in residence. To avoid confusing visitors, the major focus of interpretation should be on J. Alden Weir.

Do you have comments on Alternative 2: Presenting Wein Farm as a "Work of Art"?

Confusing in that there's too much and too many artists (mostly the same)! J. Alden Weir is the major artist and should be central; too many names, eg. of minor artists, overly confuse visitors.

Do you have comments on Alternative 3: Protecting a Cultural Resource?

This alternative serves mainly the neighboring property owners, and does not directly benefit the foundation, donations and volunteer time that have been devoted to saving Wein Farm.
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WEIR FARM NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE
SUMMARY OF DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

What's Your Opinion? We would like to know which aspects of each alternative you favor or dislike.

Do you have comments on Alternative 1:
Restoring the Historic Landscape with the Art it Inspired?

THANK YOU FOR THE LOVELY BOOK. I ENJOYED IT VERY MUCH.

-PREFER ALTERNATIVE 1. THE ARTIST IN RESIDENCE ARRANGEMENT IS AS FAR AS I KNOW THE ONLY RESIDENCY OF ITS KIND IN CONNECTICUT. HAVING PARTICIPATED IN A RESIDENCY PROGRAM IN 1992 AT JERUSALEM FOUNDATION IN WOODSIDE, CALIFORNIA, I KNOW HOW MEANINGFUL SUCH AN EXPERIENCE IS TO AN ARTIST.

-Carolyn A. Flaherty

Do you have comments on Alternative 2:
Presenting Weir Farm as a “Work of Art”?

Do you have comments on Alternative 3:
Protecting a Cultural Resource?

9 prefer Alternative 1. To 2 + 3, the artist-in-residence and school programs. Acquiring 3 adjacent properties is a good idea — as is off-site parking in a commercial district for special events.

-My husband and I walked around down to The pond and we were very impressed with how the Weir Farm is now, and its potential.

As an artist member of The Silvermine Guild I strongly approve keeping alive the Artistic Tradition aspect of Weir Farm.

Sincerely Yours,

Helen B. Barnes
WEIR FARM NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE
SUMMARY OF DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

What's Your Opinion? We would like to know which aspects of each alternative you favor or dislike.

Do you have comments on Alternative 1: Presenting Weir Farm as a "Work of Art"?

My choice. The appeal to a broader segment of people lies with this alternative. Even if the initial cost is higher, this would yield a greater return. I feel it would also be more interesting to artist and lay person.

Do you have comments on Alternative 2: Protecting a Cultural Resource?

My second choice.

Do you have comments on Alternative 3: Protecting a Cultural Resource?

Only as a last resort.

Although less expensive not as valuable as a Historic Resource.

Unfortunately the later artists are not as well known and the value is only as P to Alternative 2.

I prefer Alternative 1 because of the artists who were Weir's contemporaries.

The possible exhibits for the future will also limit the parking blue shape.

7/1/74
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WEIR FARM NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE
SUMMARY OF DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

What's Your Opinion? We would like to know which aspects of each alternative you favor or dislike.

Do you have comments on Alternative 1: Reuniting the Historic Landscape with the Art it inspired?

without a moment's hesitation I would choose Alternative #1 because it exactly fulfills what I envision in a National Historic Site with “art” as a background. Although I cannot contribute, I hope you have a good fund raiser, so that you can purchase more of Weir's paintings. As I have heard the story, which may well be exaggerated, I think it is an outrage that so many of Weir's works were disposed of as they were. I look forward to seeing some of them if they are put on display in Brigham Young University's new art museum. Yours truly

Margery W. Telfair

LATE 07/16/94

WEIR FARM NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE
SUMMARY OF DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

What's Your Opinion? We would like to know which aspects of each alternative you favor or dislike.

Do you have comments on Alternative 1: Reuniting the Historic Landscape with the Art it inspired?

As an active watercolor artist and National Trust Member, I am in favor of Alternative #1. The artist in residency program can act as a link between past historical events and present possibilities. On-site housing/space allows the artist to fully experience the site and share this with the public. Perhaps weekend or week-long residencies should be considered for artists like myself who rely on a day job to make ends meet? I look forward to the opportunity to paint watercolors on site and assure your efforts fulfills whichever alternative you employ - good luck.

Christopher P. Crane
534 4TH ST NE
WASHINGTON, DC 20002
202-544-7419
WEIR FARM

Please forward any future drafts of the plan. In the coming... Thank you.

WEIR FARM NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE
SUMMARY OF DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

What's Your Opinion? We would like to know which aspects of each alternative you favor or dislike.

Do you have comments on Alternative 1: Reuniting the Historic Landscape with the Art it Inspired?

The plan is ambitious, but too manipulative of the site. It's fine to preserve history, however, there's something to be said for interpretation. As an artist, I feel the site is best preserved with naturalism in the forefront and historical-commercialism in the background.

Do you have comments on Alternative 2: Presenting Weir Farm as a “Work of Art”? The plan nicely centers on the site's interpretive, artistic nature—ever growing & changing like history itself. In keeping with that thought, the existing buildings should be used for park ranger's residence and administrative facilities. Along with a rebuilding of the wagon shed for maintenance facilities. With concern to the shuttle, employ (2) persons to be in charge of traffic flow. Last point—this plan's budget is too expensive—how about $1M instead of $1.5M?

Do you have comments on Alternative 3: Protecting a Cultural Resource? The plan is appealing in its nonsense approach. In that its wisest attitude will control commercialization and overdevelopment of the site. However, the plan needs more attention to restoration & preservation. It needs a more realistic view and foresight on the public's impact on the site.

WEIR FARM NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE
SUMMARY OF DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

What's Your Opinion? We would like to know which aspects of each alternative you favor or dislike.

Do you have comments on Alternative 1: Reuniting the Historic Landscape with the Art it Inspired?

Restoring building interiors to 1940 seems expedient but unsuitable.

This seems better choice in terms of realistic presentation of historical process.

Do you have comments on Alternative 3: Protecting a Cultural Resource?

Better than Alternative 1.
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**WEIR FARM NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE**
**SUMMARY OF DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN**

What's Your Opinion? We would like to know which aspects of each alternative you favor or dislike.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you have comments on Alternative 1: Reuniting the Historic Landscape with the Art it Inspires?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All NPS sites should be self-supporting through admission and parking fees, ranger-led tours and lectures. Concessionaires must pay their fair share. Golden eagle passes should allow entrance by the purchaser, not their spouse, relatives and everyone in the car. They should be mandatory for access to any national park. Fees collected should be returned to each particular site for maintenance, expansion and addition of more money making services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you have comments on Alternative 2: Presenting Weir Farm as a “Work of Art”?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When it can change $18 for a tour, what is Weir Farm to do? Change 9/15, keep it's ranger on food stamps, shorten hours, close seasonally and house inspiring artists for free. Until the NPS restructures its fee schedule, and until the public begins to constantly support its greatest asset, the parks will continue to treat water while their best employees find work in the private sector. Good luck in your desire to get any number of million dollars.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you have comments on Alternative 3: Protecting a Cultural Resource?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continue to wait for Grant NPS to get a parking lot so we can visit one weekend. Time. Weir Farm was shut down last year during our visit for lack of funds. I will be thrilled just to find Weir Farm open with a well-painted enthusiastic ranger on hand to show me a couple of paintings. Do what you can to change what you should. If it was worth saving, it is worth something from my wallet to keep it open.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**WEIR FARM NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE**
**SUMMARY OF DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN**

What's Your Opinion? We would like to know which aspects of each alternative you favor or dislike.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you have comments on Alternative 1: Reuniting the Historic Landscape with the Art it Inspires?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make it own busy hands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you have comments on Alternative 2: Presenting Weir Farm as a “Work of Art”?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too ambitious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you have comments on Alternative 3: Protecting a Cultural Resource?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do a big job of maintenance of present up until any funds available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

93
WEIR FARM NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE
SUMMARY OF DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

What's Your Opinion? We would like to know which aspects of each alternative you favor or dislike.

Do you have comments on Alternative 1: Renaming the Historic Landscape with the Art it Inspired?

Do you have comments on Alternative 2: Presenting Weir Farm as a “Work of Art?”

Do you have comments on Alternative 3: Protecting a Cultural Resource?

P.S. You didn't have to use 29 4 stamp I used 19 4 cards

6/18/94

Do you have comments on Alternative 3: Protecting a Cultural Resource?

manage minimaly = save # for u.s. park land + tax payer: keep simple so that visitors can enjoy peace in rural area. have fund drive to raise money for additional land, maybe own give easement?
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WEIR FARM NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE
SUMMARY OF DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

What's Your Opinion? We would like to know which aspects of each alternative you favor or dislike.

Do you have comments on Alternative 1:
Reuniting the Historic Landscape with the Art it Inspired?

Too much improvement and infrastructure changes which will adversely affect the quality of life of Ridgefield residents.

Same as above

Do you have comments on Alternative 2:
Presenting Weir Farm as a "Work of Art?"

Of the three options, this appears to be the least disruptive to the community. Although Weir Farm is a potential asset to the community, the opportunity to make it a liability is greater. The preservation of Weir Farm should be the objective. In an effort to expand the objectives, many of the quality of life opportunities in the Ridgefield community will be destroyed. The improvement of Weir Farm should not be to the detriment of the town. The potential lack of sensitivity of Federal Government efforts is always a fear of the community.

I would like to see a low profile effort with art exhibits and art education.

Michael P. Ryer
55 East Ridge
Ridgefield
WEIR FARM NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE
SUMMARY OF DRAFT GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

What's Your Opinion? We would like to know which aspects of each alternative you favor or dislike.

Do you have comments on Alternative 1: Restoring the Historic Landscape with the Art it inspired?

I do not like any of the alternatives. The site should be preserved and be accessible for interested visitors, but no special programs should be promoted. Not Hill Rd is busy as it is and I don't want additional parking and/or buses.

Do you have comments on Alternative 2: Presenting Weir Farm as a "Work of Art"?

[Handwritten: Aug 7-31-94]

Do you have comments on Alternative 3: Protecting a Cultural Resource?

[Handwritten: Aug 7-31-94]
Ms. Marie Rust  
Regional Director  
National Park Service  
15 State Street  
Boston, MA 02109-3672

Subject: Weir Farm National Historic Site  
Ridgefield and Wilton, CT

Dear Ms. Rust:

The State Historic Preservation Office has reviewed the draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement prepared by the National Park Service regarding the above-named property. In the opinion of the State Historic Preservation Office, the draft plan is consistent with the programmatic memorandum of agreement ratified by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the National Park Service, and the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers.

This office strongly supports and endorses alternative 1 as the preferred management and development plan for this important historic site. Alternative 1 most effectively and efficiently addresses both Section 106 and programmatic memorandum of agreement historic preservation requirements.

We look forward to a long-term partnership with the National Park Service regarding the continued preservation and public interpretation of the Weir Farm National Historic Site.

For further information please contact Dr. David A. Poirier, Staff Archaeologist.

Sincerely,

Dawn Maddox  
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

DAP
AUG 6 1984

Sarah Olson, Superintendent
Weir Farm National Historic Site
735 Nod Hill Road
Wilton, CT 06897

re: Draft Environmental Impact Statement - Weir Farm National Historic Site, General Management Plan

Dear Ms. Olson:

The Environmental Protection Agency, New England Region, in accordance with our responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Section 309 of the Clean Air Act has reviewed the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Weir Farm National Historic Site, General Management Plan.

Based on our review, we find that the draft Environmental Impact Statement adequately addresses the issues within our jurisdiction and areas of expertise. We support the commitment by the National Park Service (NPS) in the General Management Plan to avoid adverse impacts to wetlands, to protect groundwater and surface water quality by replacing or improving existing septic systems, and the NPS objective of promoting visitor use of public transportation to the Weir Farm National Historic Site. Therefore, we have rated this project "Lack of Objections - Adequate" (LO-1). Please see the attached rating sheet for a full explanation of this rating.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this draft Environmental Impact Statement. Please contact Steven John of EPA's Environmental Review Program (617/565-3426) if you have any questions about our comments.

Sincerely,

John P. DeVillars
Regional Administrator
Ms. Sarah Olson, Superintendent
Weir Farm National Historic Site
735 Nod Hill Road
Wilton, CT 06897

Dear Sarah:

Thanks for the opportunity to review the Weir Farm Summary Management Plan/EIS. I'm aware with the N.P.S. Planning team that Alternative 1 is the most desirable option, although the State DEP with its serious budgetary limitations would have had to settle for a scaled-back Alternative 3 at best! Our main concern is with the protection of the physical site itself and therefore we are pleased to see that no new structures are recommended within this small, fragile property. I might add my prediction that the proposed administration/maintenance building on Weir Farm Lane with Alternative 2 probably would not be acceptable to the neighbors.

Where to locate the proposed visitor center/administration and maintenance complex is of course your problem and one requiring a balancing of preferred proximity, availability, size, physical character, political and zoning acceptability, and ready vehicular access. At one end of the spectrum, an adjacent property meeting satisfying most of these issues may not be available and at the other end Branchville may be too far removed (although potentially ideal from parking, vehicular access and zoning standpoints). Perhaps something along Old Branchville Road near the Junction of Nod Hill Road should be considered, as the proposed construction of new Route 7 in this vicinity may encourage some property owners to consider selling and relocating.

I'd be interested in your reaction.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Joseph Hickey
State Park Planner

JH/sde

cc: file
Weir Farm provides us a rare opportunity to commemorate the quiet marriage of art and tended landscape that so clearly defined the American Impressionist movement. By honoring the vision of J. Alden Weir and the land that he loved so well, we commemorate some of our own best instincts toward the natural world.

—Senator Joseph Lieberman