

## 1. World Heritage Property Data

### 1.1 - Name of World Heritage Property

Monticello and the University of Virginia in Charlottesville

### 1.2 - World Heritage Property Details

#### State(s) Party(ies)

- United States of America

#### Type of Property

cultural

#### Identification Number

442

#### Year of inscription on the World Heritage List

1987



### 1.3 - Geographic Information Table

Name	Coordinates (longitude / latitude)	Property (ha)	Buffer zone (ha)	Total (ha)	Inscription year
Monticello, Charlottesville, Virginia, United States of America	37.999 / -78.458	0	0	0	1987
University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia, United States of America	38.033 / -78.504	0	0	0	1987
<b>Total (ha)</b>		<b>0</b>			

#### Comment

UVA - 11.3312 hectares (property), 0 hectare buffer zone, 11.3312 hectares total  
Monticello - 768.9027 hectares (property), 0 hectare buffer zone, 768.9027 hectares total  
For both sites the total hectares is: 780.2147

### 1.4 - Map(s)

Title	Date	Link to source
Monticello and the University of Virginia in Charlottesville - Map of Monticello	07/07/1987	
Monticello and the University of Virginia in Charlottesville - Map of the University of Virginia	07/07/1987	

### 1.5 - Governmental Institution Responsible for the Property

- Jonathan Putnam  
US National Park Service Office of International Affairs  
World Heritage Program Officer

### 1.6 - Property Manager / Coordinator, Local Institution / Agency

- Gardiner Hallock  
Thomas Jefferson Foundation

### 1.7 - Web Address of the Property (if existing)

- [View photos from OUR PLACE the World Heritage collection](#)
- [The Architecture of Thomas Jefferson \(US National Park Service\)](#)
- [World Heritage in the United States](#)

#### Comment

#2 - Link is broken. Use [http://www.nps.gov/nr/travel/presidents/jefferson\\_monticello.html](http://www.nps.gov/nr/travel/presidents/jefferson_monticello.html) instead? [www.monticello.org](http://www.monticello.org)  
[www.virginia.edu/uvatours/groundstour/](http://www.virginia.edu/uvatours/groundstour/)  
[www.virginia.edu/uvatours/shorhistory/](http://www.virginia.edu/uvatours/shorhistory/)  
[www.virginia.edu/academicalvillage/](http://www.virginia.edu/academicalvillage/)  
<http://www.virginia.edu/architectoffice/historicpreservation.html>

### 1.8 - Other designations / Conventions under which the property is protected (if applicable)

#### Comment

Virginia Landmarks Register (State Level, Virginia - Academical Village at UVA and Monticello National Register of Historic Places (US) - Academical Village at UVA and Monticello National Historic Landmark (US) - Academical Village at UVA and Monticello

## 2. Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

### 2.1 - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value / Statement of Significance

#### Statement of Significance

Thomas Jefferson (1743–1826) was a talented architect of neo-classical buildings, as well as author of the American Declaration of Independence and third President of the United States. He designed Monticello (1769–1809), his plantation home, and his ideal 'academical village' (1817–26), a few miles away, which is still the heart of the University of Virginia. Jefferson's use of an architectural vocabulary based upon classical antiquity symbolizes both the aspirations of the new American republic as the inheritor of European tradition and the cultural experimentation that could be expected as the country matured. Monticello also shows that Jefferson was conscious of the relationship between architecture and the natural landscape.

#### Criteria

- (i) Both Monticello and the University of Virginia reflect Jefferson's wide reading of classical and later works on architecture and design and also his careful study of the architecture of late 18th century Europe. As such they illustrate his wide diversity of interests.
- (iv) With these buildings Thomas Jefferson made a significant contribution to neo-classicism, the 18th century movement that adapted the forms and details of classical architecture to contemporary buildings.
- (vi) Monticello and the key buildings of the University of Virginia are directly and materially associated with the ideas and ideals of Thomas Jefferson. Both the university buildings and Monticello were directly inspired by principles, derived from his deep knowledge of classical architecture and philosophy.

### 2.2 - The criteria (2005 revised version) under which the property was inscribed

(i)(iv)(vi)

### 2.3 - Attributes expressing the Outstanding Universal Value per criterion

(i) Both Monticello and the University of Virginia reflect Jefferson's wide reading of classical and later works on architecture and design and also his careful study of the architecture of late 18th century Europe. As such they

illustrate his wide diversity of interests. (iv) With these buildings Thomas Jefferson made a significant contribution to neo-classicism, the 18th century movement that adapted the forms and details of classical architecture to contemporary buildings. (vi) Monticello and the key buildings of the University of Virginia are directly and materially associated with the ideas and ideals of Thomas Jefferson. Both the university buildings and Monticello were directly inspired by principles, derived from his deep knowledge of classical architecture and philosophy.

**2.4 - If needed, please provide details of why the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be revised**

**2.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to Statement of Outstanding Universal Value**

### **3. Factors Affecting the Property**

#### **3.14. Other factor(s)**

##### **3.14.1 - Other factor(s)**

### 3.15. Factors Summary Table

#### 3.15.1 - Factors summary table

	Name	Impact					Origin
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Buildings and Development</b>						
3.1.1	Housing		-		P	O	
3.1.2	Commercial development		-		P	O	
3.1.4	Major visitor accommodation and associated infrastructure	+		P		O	
3.1.5	Interpretative and visitation facilities	+		P		I	
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Transportation Infrastructure</b>						
3.2.1	Ground transport infrastructure	+		P		O	
3.2.2	Air transport infrastructure	+		P		O	
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Services Infrastructures</b>						
3.3.2	Renewable energy facilities	+		P		I	
3.3.3	Non-renewable energy facilities		-	P		O	
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Pollution</b>						
3.4.4	Air pollution		-	P		O	
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Biological resource use/modification</b>						
3.5.3	Land conversion	+		P		O	
3.5.4	Livestock farming / grazing of domesticated animals	+		P		I	
3.5.5	Crop production	+		P		I	
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Local conditions affecting physical fabric</b>						
3.7.2	Relative humidity		-	P		O	
3.7.6	Water (rain/water table)		-		P	O	
3.7.7	Pests		-		P	O	
3.7.8	Micro-organisms		-		P	O	
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Social/cultural uses of heritage</b>						
3.8.1	Ritual / spiritual / religious and associative uses	+		P		I	
3.8.6	Impacts of tourism / visitor / recreation	+		P		I	
<b>3.10</b>	<b>Climate change and severe weather events</b>						
3.10.1	Storms		-		P	O	
3.10.3	Drought		-		P	O	
<b>3.11</b>	<b>Sudden ecological or geological events</b>						
3.11.2	Earthquake		-		P	O	
3.11.6	Fire (wildfires)		-		P	O	
<b>3.12</b>	<b>Invasive/alien species or hyper-abundant species</b>						
3.12.2	Invasive/alien terrestrial species		-		P	O	
<b>3.13</b>	<b>Management and institutional factors</b>						
3.13.1	Low impact research / monitoring activities	+		P	P	I	
3.13.2	High impact research / monitoring activities	+			P	I	
3.13.3	Management activities	+		P		I	
<b>Legend</b>	Current	Potential	Negative	Positive	Inside	Outside	

**3.16. Assessment of current negative factors**

**3.16.1 - Assessment of current negative factors**

	Spatial scale	Temporal scale	Impact	Management response	Trend	
3.3	Services Infrastructures					
3.3.3	Non-renewable energy facilities	restricted	one off or rare	minor	high capacity	decreasing
3.4	Pollution					
3.4.4	Air pollution	restricted	one off or rare	minor	high capacity	decreasing
3.7	Local conditions affecting physical fabric					
3.7.2	Relative humidity	restricted	frequent	minor	high capacity	decreasing

### 3.17. Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to factors affecting the property

#### 3.17.1 - Comments

Relative Humidity: The Monticello is working with a consultant to address the problem Commercial development: Effects Monticello's extensive view shed. Invasive Species: Emerald Ash Borer a threat to many Ash trees on Lawn. UVA is inoculating trees. Pollution - Effects Rotunda capitals, scrubbers have been placed on UVA's coal plant. Fire: UVA and Monticello have both installed major updates to fire suppression systems 3.5.3: Monticello has returned some land to agricultural use.

## 4. Protection, Management and Monitoring of the Property

### 4.1. Boundaries and Buffer Zones

#### 4.1.1 - Buffer zone status

There is no buffer zone, and it is not needed

#### 4.1.2 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

#### 4.1.3 - Are the buffer zone(s) of the World Heritage property adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value?

The property had no buffer zone at the time of its inscription on the World Heritage List

#### 4.1.4 - Are the boundaries of the World Heritage property known?

The boundaries of the World Heritage property are known by both the management authority and local residents / communities / landowners.

#### 4.1.5 - Are the buffer zones of the World Heritage property known?

The property had no buffer zone at the time of its inscription on the World Heritage List

#### 4.1.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to boundaries and buffer zones of the World Heritage property

The boundaries for both Monticello and UVA's Academical Village are known to local planning authorities and used to help guide local, state, and Federal planning activities.

### 4.2. Protective Measures

#### 4.2.1 - Protective designation (legal, regulatory, contractual, planning, institutional and / or traditional)

Monticello is owned by the Thomas Jefferson Foundation, Inc., a private, non-profit organization, and administered as a national memorial and museum to keep alive the name and

memory of Thomas Jefferson. The Foundation's board of trustees consists of sixteen members.

The University of Virginia and the Commonwealth of Virginia, as owners of the Jeffersonian Precinct, are the principal agents with regard to the administration of the site. They are advised on a routine basis by the Virginia Division of Historic Landmarks and the Virginia Art and Architectural Review Board. Within the University, the property is controlled by the Board of Visitors. Preservation matters are addressed by the Curator and Architect for the Academical Village, the Architect for the University, the Department of Facilities Management, and the School of Architecture.

Monticello (private ownership) and the University of Virginia (public ownership) have been designated National Historic Landmarks.

University of Virginia:

National:

As a designated National Historic Landmark district, all proposed projects are reviewed under Section 106 of the Historic Preservation Act of 1966 whenever the University undertakes projects funded by federal grants or requiring permits from federal agencies, a situation that rarely affects any of the University's historic properties. In reviewing plans submitted by the University of Virginia, The Virginia Department of Historic Resources applies the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Structures and Landscapes.

State:

2.1-488.4B of the Code of Virginia provides that no building or appurtenant structure shall be removed from state-owned property unless approved by the Governor upon the advice of the Art and Architectural Review Board. The Governor further conditions approval upon the recommendation of the Council on the Environment, the Division of Historic Landmarks of the Department of Conservation and Historic Resources and the Department of General Services.

The specific provisions for review of rehabilitation and restoration projects are defined in the Budget Bill Section 4-4.01(s), 2000 Virginia Acts of Assembly, Chapter 1073: To guarantee that the historical and/or architectural integrity of any stateowned properties listed on the Virginia Landmarks Register and the knowledge to be gained from archaeological sites will not be adversely affected because of inappropriate changes, the heads of those agencies in charge of such properties are directed to submit all plans for significant alterations, remodeling, redecoration, restoration or repairs that may basically alter the appearance of the structure, landscaping, or demolition to the Department of Historic Resources. Such plans shall be reviewed within thirty days and the comments of that department shall be submitted to the Governor through the Department of General Services for use in making a final determination.

Local

As a state agency, The University of Virginia is exempt from compliance with local codes and ordinances.

Monticello:

Because Monticello is privately owned, federal and state preservation laws do not apply (except when federal or state funds or permits are involved). However, the Thomas Jefferson Foundation has a strong working relationship with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources.

#### Comment

2nd paragraph 1st sentence: change to "The Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, on behalf of the Commonwealth..." "2nd sentence: Virginia Department of Historic Resources "3rd sentence: scratch "Within the University, the property is controlled by the BOV "4th

sentence: scratch "by the curator and architect for the academical village" and "and the school of architecture".Add "and" New State code§ 2.2-2402.B reference:  
<http://leg1.state.va.us/cgi-bin/legp504.exe?000+cod+2.2-2402>

**4.2.2 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?**

The legal framework for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity of the World Heritage property provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection

**4.2.3 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?**

The property had **no buffer zone at the time of inscription** on the World Heritage List

**4.2.4 - Is the legal framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) adequate in the area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone for maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Integrity and / or Authenticity of the property?**

The legal framework for the area surrounding the World Heritage property and the buffer zone provides **an adequate or better basis** for effective management and protection of the property, contributing to the maintenance of its Outstanding Universal Value including conditions of Authenticity and / or Integrity

**4.2.5 - Can the legislative framework (i.e. legislation and / or regulation) be enforced?**

There is **excellent** capacity / resources to enforce legislation and / or regulation in the World Heritage property

**4.2.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to protective measures**

Both Monticello and UVA, along with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources, closely monitor all threats to the sites and can coordinate responses if it appears the legislative framework and/or regulations are not being followed or enforced. All three organizations also have a thorough understanding of the legislative framework along with any applicable regulations and resources are available to hire/engage lawyers if needed.

**4.3. Management System / Management Plan**

**4.3.1 - Management System**

Monticello has a detailed 213-page management plan, with rolling three-year financial projections. In addition, a Historic Structures Report was completed in 1987. The University of Virginia completed a Historic Structures report in 1987, but does not yet have a formal management plan.

University of Virginia:

A Historic Preservation Master Plan will be commissioned in September 2003.

The Master Plan will define and guide a University preservation stewardship ethic which will extend beyond the boundary of the Academical Village, as development pressures result in new construction adjacent to and around

existing historic properties. As a first step toward the completion of a Historic Preservation Master Plan, the University has conducted a grant-funded research project to document the evolution of the built and natural environment of the University Grounds from 1817 through the present. Over the past six summers, an interdisciplinary team of graduate students from the School of Architecture has worked under the direction of a University Landscape Architect to trace the development of land use, roads, topography, water, and vegetation in addition to buildings, using primary source material from the University's Special Collections Library. The project, which will be completed in the summer of 2003, has produced a narrative history that identifies historic periods and themes that will form the basis of the Historic Preservation Master Plan Site History work.

The Historic Preservation Master Plan will provide an important collection of foundation analysis and documentation in support of the University of Virginia's historic preservation values and priorities. The University will use the analysis and documentation of the Historic Preservation Master Plan as a crucial piece of overall strategic master planning, continuing to develop a model preservation program across the entire site that is founded on the principle that the historic buildings will be intensively used, will grow, and will evolve.

**Comment**

UVA developed a Historic Preservation Framework instead of a Historic Preservation Master Plan. The Framework was written in 2007 and currently guides the decision making process for preservation activities in the Academical Village. A cultural landscape report is also being prepared for the Academical Village (2013) and individual HSRs have been completed for all Pavilions but 2 and 2 of the hotels as well as the Rotunda. Edit: remove "The Historic Preservation Master Plan will be..."

**4.3.2 - Management Documents**

**Comment**

Monticello - 213 page Management Plan, yearly work plans  
University of Virginia - 2007 Historic Preservation Framework Plan  
([http://www.virginia.edu/architectoffice/pdf/UVA\\_HPFP\\_2007\\_WEB.pdf](http://www.virginia.edu/architectoffice/pdf/UVA_HPFP_2007_WEB.pdf))

**4.3.3 - How well do the various levels of administration (i.e. national / federal; regional / provincial / state; local / municipal etc.) coordinate in the management of the World Heritage Property ?**

There is **excellent coordination** between all bodies / levels involved in the management of the property

**4.3.4 - Is the management system / plan adequate to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value ?**

The management system / plan is **fully adequate** to maintain the property's Outstanding Universal Value

**4.3.5 - Is the management system being implemented?**

The management system is being **fully** implemented and monitored

**4.3.6 - Is there an annual work / action plan and is it being implemented?**

An annual work / action plan exists and **many activities** are being implemented

**4.3.7 - Please rate the cooperation / relationship with World Heritage property managers / coordinators / staff of the following**

Local communities / residents	Fair
Local / Municipal authorities	Good
Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Landowners	Fair
Visitors	Good
Researchers	Good
Tourism industry	Good
Industry	Not applicable

**4.3.8 - If present, do local communities resident in or near the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?**

Local communities have **some input** into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management

**4.3.9 - If present, do indigenous peoples resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone have input in management decisions that maintain the Outstanding Universal Value?**

**No indigenous peoples** are resident in or regularly using the World Heritage property and / or buffer zone

**4.3.10 - Is there cooperation with industry (i.e. forestry, mining, agriculture, etc.) regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone?**

There is contact but only **some cooperation** with industry regarding the management of the World Heritage property, buffer zone and / or area surrounding the World Heritage property and buffer zone

**4.3.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training**

The University Architect at UVA sits on Albemarle County's Planning Commission and helps to ensure the preservation of both the Academical Village and Monticello. Both sites also develop yearly work plans and Monticello is consulting with Professors from UVA's Dept. of Environmental Studies and Virginia Polytechnic Institute's Department of Forest Resources to potentially develop a forestry management plan.

**4.3.12 - Please report any significant changes in the legal status and / or contractual / traditional protective measures and management arrangements for the World Heritage property since inscription or the last Periodic report**

The Thomas Jefferson Foundation has placed 566 hectares of the approximately 1011.7 hectares (768.9 of which are included in the WHS boundary) it owns in conservation and historic preservation easements to perpetually protect the land from development. No change to the legal status of UVA.

**4.4. Financial and Human Resources**

**4.4.1 - Costs related to conservation, based on the average of last five years (relative percentage of the funding sources)**

Multilateral funding (GEF, World Bank, etc)	
International donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	
Governmental (National / Federal)	
Governmental (Regional / Provincial / State)	
Governmental (Local / Municipal)	
In country donations (NGO's, foundations, etc)	100%
Individual visitor charges (e.g. entry, parking, camping fees, etc.)	
Commercial operator payments (e.g. filming permit, concessions, etc.)	
Other grants	

**4.4.2 - International Assistance received from the World Heritage Fund (USD)**

**Comment**

No international assistance from the World Heritage Fund is received at either Monticello or UVA's Academical Village

**4.4.3 - Is the current budget sufficient to manage the World Heritage property effectively?**

The available budget is **sufficient** but further funding would enable more effective management to international best practice standard

**4.4.4 - Are the existing sources of funding secure and likely to remain so?**

The existing sources of funding **are secure** in the medium-term and planning is underway to secure funding in the long-term

**4.4.5 - Does the World Heritage property provide economic benefits to local communities (e.g. income, employment)?**

There is a **major flow** of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the World Heritage property

**4.4.6 - Are available resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure sufficient to meet management needs?**

There are **adequate** equipment and facilities

**4.4.7 - Are resources such as equipment, facilities and infrastructure adequately maintained?**

Equipment and facilities are **well maintained**

**4.4.8 - Comments, conclusion, and / or recommendations related to finance and infrastructure**

The buildings at UVA that are contained in the World Heritage site are maintained and conserved with funds drawn from an endowment. However, UVA also receives occasionally monies from the State of Virginia to partially fund repairs to the Academical Village. Similarly, the maintenance of the Monticello buildings listed on the World Heritage site nomination is also funded through an endowment with additional fundraising being undertaken as needed.

**4.4.9 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)**

Full-time	90%
Part-time	10%

**4.4.10 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)**

Permanent	100%
Seasonal	

**4.4.11 - Distribution of employees involved in managing the World Heritage property (% of total)**

Paid	99%
Volunteer	1%

**4.4.12 - Are available human resources adequate to manage the World Heritage property?**

Human resources are **adequate** for management needs

**4.4.13 - Considering the management needs of the World Heritage property, please rate the availability of professionals in the following disciplines**

Research and monitoring	Good
Promotion	Good
Community outreach	Fair
Interpretation	Good
Education	Good
Visitor management	Good
Conservation	Good
Administration	Good
Risk preparedness	Good
Tourism	Good
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Good

**4.4.14 - Please rate the availability of training opportunities for the management of the World Heritage property in the following disciplines**

Research and monitoring	High
Promotion	Medium
Community outreach	Medium
Interpretation	High
Education	High
Visitor management	Medium
Conservation	High
Administration	High
Risk preparedness	Medium
Tourism	High
Enforcement (custodians, police)	Medium

**4.4.15 - Do the management and conservation programmes at the World Heritage property help develop local expertise?**

A capacity development plan or programme is **in place and fully implemented**; all technical skills are being transferred to those managing the property locally, who are assuming leadership in management

**4.4.16 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to human resources, expertise and training**

Both UVA and the Thomas Jefferson Foundation maintain in house craftsmen, architectural conservators, landscape specialists, architectural historians, and historic architecture construction specialists to oversee the preservation and maintenance of the historic buildings and landscapes. A broad range of communications, human resources, administrative, development, security, and academic staff positions are also employed by the sites. Student interns are also common at both sites.

**4.5. Scientific Studies and Research Projects**

**4.5.1 - Is there adequate knowledge (scientific or traditional) about the values of the World Heritage property to support planning, management and decision-making to ensure that Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?**

Knowledge about the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient**

**4.5.2 - Is there a planned programme of research at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?**

There is a **comprehensive, integrated programme of research**, which is relevant to management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

**4.5.3 - Are results from research programmes disseminated?**

Research results are **shared widely** with the local, national and international audiences

**4.5.4 - Please provide details (i.e. authors, title, and web link) of papers published about the World Heritage property since the last Periodic Report**

UVA HSRs:

<http://www.virginia.edu/architectoffice/historicpreservation.html>  
 . Selected Recent Monticello related Books: "A rich spot of earth": Thomas Jefferson's revolutionary garden at Monticello; From Shadwell to Monticello: the material culture of slavery, 1760-1774; Thomas Jefferson, architect: the interactive portfolio. For additional resources see:<http://tjportal.worldcat.org/>

**4.5.5 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to scientific studies and research projects**

Both UVA and the Thomas Jefferson Foundation actively promote scholarship relating to the sites. UVA's Architectural and Art History Department, Office of the Architect, and Art History Department and the Thomas Jefferson Foundation's International Center for Jefferson Studies, Curatorial, and Restoration Departments regularly produce and sponsor research related to the sites.



#### 4.6. Education, Information and Awareness Building

##### 4.6.1 - At how many locations is the World Heritage emblem displayed at the property?

In **one location and easily visible** to visitors

##### 4.6.2 - Please rate the awareness and understanding of the existence and justification for inscription of the World Heritage property amongst the following groups

Local communities / residents	Poor
Local / Municipal authorities within or adjacent to the property	Average
Local Indigenous peoples	Not applicable
Local landowners	Poor
Visitors	Average
Tourism industry	Excellent
Local businesses and industries	Poor

##### 4.6.3 - Is there a planned education and awareness programme linked to the values and management of the World Heritage property?

There is a **planned and effective** education and awareness programme that contributes to the protection of the World Heritage property

##### 4.6.4 - What role, if any, has designation as a World Heritage property played with respect to education, information and awareness building activities?

World Heritage status has influenced education, information and awareness building activities, **but it could be improved**

##### 4.6.5 - How well is the information on Outstanding Universal Value of the property presented and interpreted?

There is **excellent presentation and interpretation** of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property

##### 4.6.6 - Please rate the adequacy for education, information and awareness building of the following visitor facilities and services at the World Heritage property

Visitor centre	Excellent
Site museum	Excellent
Information booths	Excellent
Guided tours	Excellent
Trails / routes	Excellent
Information materials	Excellent
Transportation facilities	Excellent
Other	Not needed

##### 4.6.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to education, information and awareness building

UVA and the Thomas Jefferson Foundation maintain websites (<http://www.virginia.edu/academicalvillage> and <http://www.monticello.org>) that educate and raise awareness of the history and development of the sites. Both sites also organize tours, with Monticello hosting over 400,000 visitors every year. Both sites also proudly advertise that they are World Heritage Sites.

#### 4.7. Visitor Management

##### 4.7.1 - Please provide the trend in annual visitation for the last five years

Last year	Decreasing
Two years ago	Static
Three years ago	Minor Increase
Four years ago	Minor Increase
Five years ago	Decreasing

##### 4.7.2 - What information sources are used to collect trend data on visitor statistics?

Entry tickets and registries
Tourism industry
Visitor surveys

##### 4.7.3 - Visitor management documents

###### Comment

The Thomas Jefferson Foundation does not have a formal visitor management document but it does have a fully staffed visitor operations and services department that manages and coordinates visitation at the site. Staff includes administrators, educational guides, and visitor services specialists. UVA has a written policy for the use of the Rotunda:  
<https://policy.itc.virginia.edu/policy/policydisplay?id=PRM-007>

##### 4.7.4 - Is there an appropriate visitor use management plan (e.g. specific plan) for the World Heritage property which ensures that its Outstanding Universal Value is maintained?

Visitor use of the World Heritage property is **effectively managed** and does not impact its Outstanding Universal Value

##### 4.7.5 - Does the tourism industry contribute to improving visitor experiences and maintaining the values of the World Heritage property?

There is **limited co-operation** between those responsible for the World Heritage property and the tourism industry to present the Outstanding Universal Value and increase appreciation

##### 4.7.6 - If fees (i.e. entry charges, permits) are collected, do they contribute to the management of the World Heritage property?

The fee is collected and makes a **substantial contribution** to the management of the World Heritage property

##### 4.7.7 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to visitor use of the World Heritage property

Fees are mainly collected at Monticello where they account for about 1/3 of the site's operating expenses. A small amount of money is also collected at UVA for tours of the Rotunda, but they do not substantially contribute to the Academical Village's operating expenses.

#### 4.8. Monitoring

##### 4.8.1 - Is there a monitoring programme at the property which is directed towards management needs and / or

**improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value?**

There is a **comprehensive, integrated programme** of monitoring, which is relevant to management needs and / or improving understanding of Outstanding Universal Value

**4.8.2 - Are key indicators for measuring the state of conservation used to monitor how the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is maintained?**

Information on the values of the World Heritage property is **sufficient** for defining and monitoring key indicators for measuring its state of conservation

**4.8.3 - Please rate the level of involvement in monitoring of the following groups**

World Heritage managers / coordinators and staff	Excellent
Local / Municipal authorities	Not applicable
Local communities	Not applicable
Researchers	Average
NGOs	Not applicable
Industry	Not applicable
Local indigenous peoples	Not applicable

**4.8.4 - Has the State Party implemented relevant recommendations arising from the World Heritage Committee?**

**No relevant** Committee recommendations to implement

**4.8.5 - Please provide comments relevant to the implementation of recommendations from the World Heritage Committee**

**4.8.6 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to monitoring**

Both sites employ nationally recognized, on-site staff members who constantly monitor the sites' key indicators of Outstanding Universal Value (UVA - Architect of the University's Historic Preservation Group; Monticello - Restoration Department)

**4.9. Identification of Priority Management Needs**

**4.9.1 - Please select the top 6 managements needs for the property (if more than 6 are listed below)**

Please refer to question 5.2

## **5. Summary and Conclusions**

### **5.1. Summary - Factors affecting the Property**

#### **5.1.1 - Summary - Factors affecting the Property**

No factor is both current and negative.

### **5.2. Summary - Management Needs**

#### **5.2.2 - Summary - Management Needs**

Answers provided have not outlined any serious management need.

### 5.3. Conclusions on the State of Conservation of the Property

#### 5.3.1 - Current state of Authenticity

The authenticity of the World Heritage property has been **preserved**

#### 5.3.2 - Current state of Integrity

The integrity of the World Heritage property is **intact**

#### 5.3.3 - Current state of the World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value

The World Heritage property's Outstanding Universal Value has been **maintained**.

#### 5.3.4 - Current state of the property's other values

Other important cultural and / or natural values and the state of conservation of the World Heritage property are **predominantly intact**

### 5.4. Additional comments on the State of Conservation of the Property

#### 5.4.1 - Comments

Both Monticello and UVA's Academical Village remain in an excellent state of preservation and on-site staff work daily at each site to ensure that the sites' Outstanding Universal Values are maintained and that visitors and students are made aware of the both sites international cultural importance.

### 6. World Heritage Status and Conclusions on Periodic Reporting Exercise

#### 6.1 - Please rate the impacts of World Heritage status of the property in relation to the following areas

Conservation	Positive
Research and monitoring	Positive
Management effectiveness	Positive
Quality of life for local communities and indigenous peoples	Positive
Recognition	Very positive
Education	Very positive
Infrastructure development	Positive
Funding for the property	Very positive
International cooperation	Very positive
Political support for conservation	Very positive
Legal / Policy framework	Positive
Lobbying	Very positive
Institutional coordination	Positive
Security	No impact
Other (please specify)	Not applicable

#### 6.2 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to World Heritage status

Both Monticello and UVA take great pride in being listed as a World Heritage Site and both are dedicated to taking part in the international community of World Heritage Sites.

#### 6.3 - Entities involved in the preparation of this Section of the Periodic Report

Governmental institution responsible for the property
Site Manager/Coordinator/World Heritage property staff

#### 6.4 - Was the Periodic Reporting questionnaire easy to use and clearly understandable?

yes

#### 6.5 - Please provide suggestions for improvement of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire

This format works well for us!

#### 6.6 - Please rate the level of support for completing the Periodic Report questionnaire from the following entities

UNESCO	Good
State Party Representative	Very good
Advisory Body	Poor

#### 6.7 - How accessible was the information required to complete the Periodic Report?

Most of the required information was accessible

#### 6.8 - The Periodic Reporting process has improved the understanding of the following

The World Heritage Convention
The concept of Outstanding Universal Value

#### 6.9 - Please rate the follow-up to conclusions and recommendations from previous Periodic Reporting exercise by the following entities

UNESCO	Satisfactory
State Party	Satisfactory
Site Managers	Not Applicable
Advisory Bodies	Not Applicable

#### 6.10 - Summary of actions that will require formal consideration by the World Heritage Committee

- **Geographic Information Table**  
Reason for update: UVA - 11.3312 hectares (property), 0 hectare buffer zone, 11.3312 hectares total Monticello - 768.9027 hectares (property), 0 hectare buffer zone, 768.9027 hectares total For both sites the total hectares is: 780.2147

#### 6.11 - Comments, conclusions and / or recommendations related to the Assessment of the Periodic Reporting exercise

Because this report was for a site that included two separate groups of resources managed by two separated entities, the lengths of the fields were often too small and so they restricted a fuller explanation of the threats to each site and their differing management practices.