

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

RECEIVED

MAY 12 1993

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
MULTIPLE PROPERTY DOCUMENTATION FORM

NATIONAL REGISTER

This form is for use in documenting multiple property groups related to one or several historic contexts. See instructions in "Guidelines for Completing National Register Forms" (National Register Bulletin 16). Complete each item by marking "x" in the appropriate box or by entering the requested information. For additional space use continuation sheets (Form 10-900A). Type all entries.

A. Name of Multiple Property Listing

DEPRESSION-ERA USDA FOREST SERVICE ADMINISTRATIVE COMPLEXES IN ARIZONA

B. Associated Historic Contexts

USDA Forest Service Response to the Depression, Circa 1929-1942

The Development of the USDA Forest Service as a Land Management Agency, Circa 1929-
Early 1940s

USDA Forest Service Architecture During the Depression-Era

C. Geographical Data

The geographical area encompasses the six Arizona National Forests within the Southwestern Region (R-3), USDA Forest Service including the Apache-Sitgreaves, Coconino, Coronado, Kaibab, Prescott and Tonto National Forests (Figure 1).

D. Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this documentation form meets the National Register documentation standards and sets forth requirements for the listing of related properties consistent with the National Register criteria. This submission meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60 and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Planning and Evaluation.

William D. McPherson
Signature of certifying official
USDA Forest Service

5/7/93
Date

I, hereby, certify that this multiple property documentation form has been approved by the National Register as a basis for evaluating related properties for listing in the National Register.

Antoinette G. Rose
Signature of the Keeper of the National Register

5/10/93
Date

Summary

The historic contexts for this nomination cover three broad areas including: (1) the USDA Forest Service response to the Depression, circa 1929-1942, (2) the development of the USDA Forest Service as a land management agency during the 1930s and 1940s, and (3) USDA Forest Service architecture during the Depression-era.

USDA Forest Service properties in Arizona built in the Depression-era represent the expansion of Forest Service administration from custodial superintendence to extensive resource management, and reflect the role of the USDA Forest Service in the Depression. Individual resources may be significant for local associations, as well. Properties may also be significant as distinctive types or methods of construction, or because they embody a distinctive style of architecture developed by the Forest Service during the Depression-era.

USDA Forest Service Response to the Depression, circa 1929-1942

The Great Depression was a turning point in American history. Affecting all sectors of the American population, the Depression had a profound impact on the Nation's economic, social, and political realms. Unemployment and dislocation became commonplace. Unemployment for the period from 1930 to 1940 never dropped below 8 million people except during 1937 (Galbraith 1979:168). This unemployment fell with disproportionate severity on young workers just entering the labor force. Untrained, unskilled, and unable to obtain necessary experience, they could not find work in a nonexistent job market (Throop: 1984).

At the same time, the Nation faced the consequences of decades of exploitation and mismanagement of its natural resources. Land use ethics that accommodated economic self-interest had resulted in exhausted soils, denuded forests, and overgrazed grasslands. This brought on increasing erosion by wind and water, which threatened remaining resources (Throop: 1984).

Soon after the 1929 stock market crash, the federal government took initial steps to stem the downward spiral of the economy and concomitant rising unemployment. The Hoover administration attempted to provide relief through loan programs, expansion of public works, and drastic economies in the federal government. However, Hoover's political philosophy precluded direct federal relief to the masses of unemployed. Despite Hoover's efforts, the economy worsened. Unhappy with the Hoover leadership vacuum, the American public elected charismatic Franklin Delano Roosevelt to the Presidency in 1932.

Immediately upon taking office in 1933, President Roosevelt addressed the national crisis by giving Congress bills for "The Relief of Unemployment through the Performance of Useful Public Work and for Other Purposes," popularly referred to as the New Deal. It authorized the President to create organizations which would use the unemployed to complete public works projects such as reforestation, prevention of soil erosion, flood control and facilities construction. These projects were intended to provide leadership and vocational training opportunities for the

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
CONTINUATION SHEET

Section number E Page 2

unemployed. The best known of these programs was the Emergency Conservation Work (ECW) Act, which set up the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC). Implementation of the Bill's requirements fell under the jurisdiction of the Departments of Labor, War, Agriculture, and Interior. Hiring fell under the purview of the Department of Labor. The War Department built the camps and supervised the enrollees. The Departments of Agriculture and Interior developed, implemented, and administered projects.

Plans for the summer of 1933 called for 28 camps to house 4,800 men on National Forests in Arizona. Only 15 camps actually opened, including two each on the Sitgreaves and Tonto, three each on the Crook (now in the Apache-Sitgreaves, Tonto and Coronado) and Prescott, and five on the Coconino. Camp locations changed through the years, but Region 3 (Arizona and New Mexico) averaged 20 camps each year until 1942, when the CCC was disbanded. In addition to main camps, which housed 200 men each, the CCC established numerous smaller side or "fly" camps of from 3 to 65 men close to their work projects (Otis et al. 1986: 29).

Although the CCC was the largest and best known of the Depression-era work relief programs, there were others. The Works Progress Administration (WPA) provided local laborers for projects, and the National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA) provided funding for facilities.

The Forest Service completed a wide range of projects in Arizona during the Depression with the CCC and other work relief programs. Many projects involved natural resource conservation work; others included construction of recreational and administrative facilities. The work relief program played a major role in helping to restore grazing lands in Arizona. Enrollees assisted in building fences, installing cattle guards, constructing water developments, and placing thousands of erosion control features on overgrazed allotments. The CCC also carried out an active firefighting program. In addition to suppressing wildfires, enrollees built truck trails, telephone lines, and lookout houses and towers. Timber protection included programs directed against twig blight, and reforestation efforts. Reforestation efforts were spearheaded by CCC enrollees who built the Fort Valley Nursery on the Coconino NF (Otis et. al. 1986:32). The Forest Service built many new recreation facilities with CCC labor. They built trails and roads for recreational, forestry, and fire needs. Administrative structures and buildings built throughout the state are the most tangible evidence of the work relief programs on Forest lands in Arizona today.

|X| See Continuation Sheet

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
CONTINUATION SHEET

Section number E Page 3

Retired Forest Service administrator Charles A. Connaughton characterized the contributions of work relief programs to the Forest Service as follows: "The first real big impact internally within the Forest Service came with the advent of CCC and some of the emergency work programs. This completely modified and changed the normal way of doing business. . . . The Depression made possible needed work by making funds available. CCC had both a social value and a resource physical value. The results are being enjoyed to this day" (Mauder 1976: 16, 18).

The Development of the USDA Forest Service as a Land Management Agency, Circa 1929 to the Early 1940s

The construction of Forest Service administrative facilities by the CCC and others occurred during a most important transition in the agency's development: moving from custodial superintendence to extensive resource management.

Federal control of our Nation's forests began with the 1891 General Land Law Revision Act (26 Stat. 1103), which empowered Presidents to set aside forest reserves. President Benjamin Harrison created the first in Arizona, the Grand Canyon Forest Reserve, in 1893. Presidents Cleveland, McKinley, and Roosevelt set aside additional reserves during the next two decades. Active management of the nation's forests did not begin until passage of the Organic Administration Act on June 4, 1897 (30 Stat. 34-36). This established standards for protection and use of the vast resources within reserves under the direction of the General Land Office (GLO) in the Department of the Interior. In 1905 authority for the Forest Reserves was transferred from the GLO to the Bureau of Forestry in the Department of Agriculture. In that same year, the name was changed to the United States Forest Service. Forest Reserves became National Forests in 1907 (Baker, et al. 1988: 39-40).

The establishment of the Forest Service as a conservation organization and steward of national timber resources culminated the efforts of many individuals. Franklin Hough's 1873 paper entitled "On the Duty of Governments in the Preservation of Forests" spurred the establishment of the Bureau of Forestry. Bernhard Fernow served as the Bureau's first director through the 1880s and 1890s. Gifford Pinchot molded the Forest Service into its present form after he took the helm in 1898 (Steen 1976).

X See Continuation Sheet

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
CONTINUATION SHEET

Section number E Page 4

The Forest Service's conservation mandate emphasized watershed protection, elimination of destructive logging techniques, regeneration of cut-over timber, careful slash disposal, and fire protection. The Southwestern Region (Arizona and New Mexico), also emphasized grazing regulation. The first Forest Service manual, dubbed the Use Book, published in 1905, summed up the agency's mission as follows: "Forest reserves are for the purpose of preserving a perpetual supply of timber for home industries, preventing destruction of the forest cover which regulates the flow of streams, and protecting local residents from unfair competition in the use of forest and range" (Use Book 1905: 7).

During the early years of the Forest Service, rangers trained in forestry administered vast areas of land. Duties were primarily protective in nature and included examination of mining and homestead entries, fire prevention, grazing regulation, timber surveys, and game protection. The small number of timber sales also needed to be administered. Will Mace, remembering his experiences as a new ranger on the Kaibab National Forest in 1910 said, "With much of this work it was not merely a case of supervising the job but we all laid aside our riding gear to take up whatever tools were necessary to complete jobs when the meager appropriations proved inadequate" (letter to Gifford Pinchot: 2/9/40). It is not surprising that field officers often had a hand in building their own administrative station, which usually consisted of a simple log or board-and-batten cabin, sometimes with a barn.

Management of National Forests in the decades of the 'teens and twenties could be characterized as custodial superintendence. Underpaid and overwhelmed with work, personnel lacked the means to actively manage their forest resources (Throop 1984). However, as America's population became more mobile and as the country became more industrialized, pressures on forest resources increased beyond the capability of the understaffed foresters to manage them. At the same time, the distribution of Forest Service facilities became woefully inadequate to serve the staff and their increasing industry and public contacts. This was most apparent in the distribution of administrative and recreational facilities.

In 1920, Congress requested a report from the Forest Service on the condition of timber on lands under their control. Called the Capper Report after Senator Arthur Capper of Kansas, who sponsored the request, the study demonstrated that timber depletion was causing record high prices. The Forest Service reevaluated their conservation efforts and began cooperative programs for fire protection and reforestation (Steen 1976). This created additional administrative duties that resulted in increased hiring.

|X| See Continuation Sheet

United States Department of the Interior
National Park ServiceNATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
CONTINUATION SHEETSection number E Page 5

In 1932, a more comprehensive study referred to as the Copeland Report reevaluated the condition of forests and their resources. The massive report, officially titled A National Plan for American Forestry, evaluated every aspect of forestry, including timber, water, range, recreation, wildlife, research, state aid, and fire protection. The concept of multiple use management as it is known today appeared for the first time in this report (Steen 1976: 202). This "New Deal blueprint for forestry" emphasized more intensive management of all the forests' resources, and marked the shift in policy from custodial superintendence to active resource management for the Forest Service. To accomplish its redefined objectives, the Forest Service would need more personnel and additional facilities to house them and their equipment. The Copeland Report was submitted to Congress in the spring of 1933, coinciding with the establishment of the New Deal programs. These programs, especially the CCC, provided the means for the Forest Service to implement the report's recommendations, and build the infrastructure to continue them for decades to come (Throop 1984).

In Arizona, the numerous facilities built on National Forests in the Depression-era reflect the agency's expanded role. New administrative facilities included staff and crew residences, offices, storage buildings, barns, garages, gas, oil, and powder houses, warehouses, and fire lookout towers. Administrative sites like Ranger Stations and Guard Houses were often arranged in compounds with easy public access and room for expansion. A distinctive architectural style identified these new facilities with the Forest Service.

Other national trends profoundly affected the development of National Forests at the same time. The automobile brought recreationists to America's forests in record numbers. Recognizing this new use, the Forest Service organized the Division of Recreation in 1935 (Steen 1976: 209). The CCC helped build new campgrounds and other recreational facilities, and the roads to access them.

By the time that the CCC and other New Deal programs were disbanded in 1942 at the start of World War II, National Forests had changed dramatically. Conservation efforts brought renewed resources, and new facilities made resource management more efficient. The Forest Service began an era of active resource management, made possible by the planning and efforts made in the previous decade.

See Continuation Sheet

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
CONTINUATION SHEET

Section number E Page 6

Depression-Era USDA Forest Service Architecture

During the early years of the Forest Service, rangers lived in isolated structures which they often built themselves. If lumber could be obtained at a nearby sawmill, these buildings were usually of frame construction with board-and-batten siding. Otherwise, builders utilized log, stone, or adobe for walls. Building designs reflected prevailing local styles, the individual builders' skills, and the availability of materials. One former ranger remembered 1910 living conditions: "There were hardly any shacks for the rangers to live in or anything else. There were no roads and few trails. . . . It was rough" (Mauder 1977: 7). A rule that no facility could cost more than \$800 kept these buildings simple. An inspection of 210 ranger stations in 1920 revealed only 46 with running water (Steen 1976:170). The resultant collection of buildings could best be categorized by the stylistic traditions of folk architecture referred to as Pre-Railroad and National (McAlester and McAlester, 1984).

As the role of the Forest Service became more complex through the 1920s, the need for additional facilities increased. Plans for the needed structures were being developed just prior to the onset of the Depression. Once the Depression took its grip on the country planning accelerated to meet the needs of the emergency relief efforts. The concept of "standard plans" developed out of this demand for quantity design production in a short time frame. These plans provided "off the shelf" designs that could be used throughout the Forest Service with little delay.

The standardization of structure plans brought a sense of order to the random assortment of buildings that had previously characterized the Forest Service. The first plans developed by the Forest Service targeted the essential structures within administrative complexes known as ranger stations. These primary structures included dwellings, offices, and barns (or barn/garages). Designs soon followed for the numerous types of secondary structures within ranger stations, such as oil houses, hen houses, and latrines.

Direction for the development of these plans came from the Washington Office but the actual designs were created at the Regional Office. The Region 3 architects selected the Bungalow architectural style as the design basis for the initial set of standard plans. This style was derived from the Prairie and Craftsman architectural styles. Popularized by magazines and architectural pattern books, the one story Bungalow house became the most popular and fashionable smaller house style in the country between about 1905 and 1930. Ironically, the Forest Service developed the standard plan for Bungalows during the style's waning years of popularity. By 1940, the Bungalow was out of style.

|X| See Continuation Sheet

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
CONTINUATION SHEET

Section number E Page 7

The plans that were first developed called for balloon type wood framing that could be finished with either horizontal or vertical board siding. The reasons behind the selection of this style for the first standard plans in Region 3 are not known, but the style fit in well with the wood frame folk structures already common throughout the region. In addition, these plans emphasized the use of readily available materials and relatively simple construction techniques that could be easily learned by the men in the public works programs.

The architects recognized, however, that the Region contained divisions that varied widely in environmental type (from desert to alpine) in which board siding might not be the best design choice. Therefore, additional standard plans were developed based on the same series of floor plans but with different elevations that were selected to reflect the different environmental types. Thus, Bungalow type structures were designed with either frame construction with board siding or stone masonry construction with false half timbered gables. The stone masonry structures were designed for the timber country while frame construction with board siding were planned for grassland areas.

This concept extended to development of non-Bungalow types for the desert areas of the Region. While sharing the floor plans of the Bungalow types the elevations of these desert oriented plans owed nothing to the Prairie or Craftsman influences. Instead, the stylistic basis for these plans were Spanish Eclectic and Pueblo Revival (McAlester and McAlester, 1984).

In actuality the division of the region by environmental types for architectural development was only partially successful on the Arizona National Forests. While the stone masonry bungalow type and the two desert types (Pueblo and Spanish) had been constructed only in those areas for which they were designed such was not the case for the frame bungalow type. The simplicity of construction technique and the inexpensive materials combined to take the design out of the grassland context it was meant for and placed it in every environmental type that had been identified.

Although the Forests primarily chose to construct facilities according to the standard plans available from the Regional Office, unique designs continued to be developed and built. A distinction did exist, however, between the types of buildings being constructed to standard plans and those done to unique plans. Primary structures in ranger stations accounted for the vast majority of the standard plan buildings. In contrast, unique plans appeared in secondary structures at ranger stations and in all buildings at guard stations.

|X| See Continuation Sheet

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
CONTINUATION SHEET

Section number E Page 8

The reason behind this difference lies in Forest Service administrative structure. The ranger station was (and is) the basic administrative unit of the Forest Service. From there, the day to day management of the Forests took place. Consequently, the facilities at a ranger station became the contact point between the majority of the public and the Forest Service. Guard stations, on the other hand, developed as isolated work centers intended to facilitate the management activities of Forest Service personnel and not as public contact points. When apportioning dollars and labor for construction the highly visible primary structures at the ranger stations were given the best the Forest Service had to offer: the standard plans, which offered both the highest construction standards and the benefit of organizational identity and recognition. Guard stations, being isolated (which raised the cost of bringing materials to the site) and much less visible to the public, neither warranted the expense of standard plan construction nor benefited from their identity and recognition.

The only stipulation the Regional Office put on the use of unique plans was that they needed to be submitted for design review. This review ensured that plans met Regional safety and design standards.

By the late 1930s the need for quantity design production had lessened, permitting the Forest Service Division of Engineering to review the direction it had taken during the previous years. This review resulted in the rejection of the concept of standard plans. In the 1937 publication Improvement Handbook, the 1938 publication Acceptable Plans: Forest Service Administrative Buildings and the 1940 pamphlet Architectural Trend of Future Forest Service Buildings, the Division of Engineering spelled out the reasons behind its new position. The standard plan concept did not fit individual situations and therefore needed constant revision. This made the plans unresponsive to local conditions resulting in instances of poor site location and bad coordination among the various components of administrative complexes.

To replace the standard plans the concept of "acceptable plans" was introduced. Acceptable plans were assembled so that a group of plans would be available for use that embodied then current principles of scientific and economic planning and which satisfied the needs of the time. The plans would be used as guides (not as formal plans) for similar future structures. The main difference between standard and acceptable plans was that while standard plans required that the building site be modified for the plan, acceptable plans required that the building plans be modified for the site.

|X| See Continuation Sheet

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
CONTINUATION SHEET

Section number E Page 9

The design philosophy behind the acceptable plan concept represented Forest Service movement toward the Rustic idiom in use by the Park Service. Forest Service design philosophy began to emphasize visual harmony with environmental and cultural surroundings more than it had ever done before. Development of the administrative complex as a functional unit rather than as a collection of buildings was also stressed, indicating the increasing influence of landscape architects.

A construction hiatus brought about by the end of the Depression-era and the beginning of the World War Two truncated the development of the acceptable plan concept and terminated this period of Forest Service architectural development. By the end of the war, Bungalow and Rustic architectural styles had faded from popularity and Functionalism was in vogue. As a result, the Depression-era administrative site complexes of the Arizona National Forests present a remarkably intact view into the first attempt by the Forest Service to define its own distinctive architectural design style and philosophy.

F. Associated Property Types

I. Name of Property Type Administrative Complexes

II. Description

These properties represent Forest Service administration at the Forest and field levels of organization. They include ranger stations and guard stations. Specific structures include offices, residences, crew quarters, garages, barns, gas and oil houses, sheds, and a variety of other service and support buildings.

The properties encompassed in the nomination include only administrative complexes of two or more buildings. The buildings have collective value and serve an administrative function. They also clearly illustrate the comprehensive qualities of Depression-era Forest Service architectural design and planning.

Many of the Forest Service administrative complexes from the Depression-era were constructed with primary structures that conformed to standard plans. They are generally described as follows:

BUNGALOW TYPE: These structures all have generally low pitched gable roofs sheathed in asphalt shingles. Although cross gables are most common, straight gables (end/side gable) are occasionally found. Barns are side gabled with two roof planes. The rafter ends on all the buildings are exposed under wide eaves. Decorative knee braces and purlins often delineate the eave line. Windows are primarily double hung 6/1 or 4/1 wood sash. The construction style varies from frame construction with vertical or horizontal board siding to stone construction with false half timbering on gable ends. Exterior chimneys are prominent. The bungalow type was the most popular of the standard plans on the Arizona National Forests. A total of 56 primary structures of the bungalow type had been built by the end of the Depression era. Only 5 of these were constructed of stone. At present, 33 of these structures (4 stone construction) remain on lands of the Arizona National Forests. Of these 33 buildings, 31 are included in this set of properties.

SPANISH TYPE: These buildings are flat roofed with parapeted walls. Dwellings and offices may have narrow tile covered shed roofs above entryways or porches. Eaves usually have little or no overhang. Windows are rectangular casements with 4 to 6 lights. Arched window treatments are found only in office plans; windows are recessed into an arched wall area. Office entry doors are set behind an arched porch entry. No arched treatment is found in barns. Decorative tile vents are found above primary facade windows in dwellings and offices. These also occur in barns but are widely spaced and not related to window or door location. Construction materials are limited to hollow tile covered with a stucco veneer. Only one administrative complex on the Arizona National Forests had been built using this set of standard plans. Of the three primary buildings constructed, two still remain and are on Forest Service lands. Both these are contributing elements in this set of properties.

PUEBLO TYPE: These buildings are also flat roofed with parapeted walls. Parapets are stepped in a regular pattern. Standard plans indicate that vigas should project at front and rear of structure, however, no examples in Arizona were built with this treatment. Windows are double hung 6/1 or 6/6 wood sash. Wooden lintels are

|X̄| See Continuation Sheet

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
CONTINUATION SHEET

Section number F Page 2

installed over windows and entries but not exposed. Decorative tile vents are located above primary facade windows. These occur in barns but are spaced far apart and are not related to window or door location. Construction materials are limited to adobe with stucco veneer. Fireplaces and porch supports are built of brick. Construction of this type only took place in the desert areas of the Arizona National Forests. Of the six primary structures built from this set of standard plans five are extant and on Forest Service lands. Only two of these retain sufficient integrity to be included as elements among the present properties.

In addition to the structures constructed following standard plans, several facilities had been constructed using unique plans. Included among these structures considered as being built to unique plans are one-of-a-kind buildings and buildings that may have been built to standard plans but for which no plans could be found. Of the 90 unique plan structures built during the Depression-era 31 can be classified as primary structures (21 residences; 8 barns; and 2 offices). Of these, only 3 residences and 5 barns are still extant and on Forest Service lands. The building type most widely constructed using unique plans was residences (cabins) at guard stations. Three of the 19 cabins built still exist in Federal ownership and area included as elements in this nomination. These buildings can best be categorized by reference to the folk styles termed Pre-Railroad and National by McAlester and McAlester (1984). These styles, as expressed in Forest Service constructions, can be defined as follows:

PRE-RAILROAD: Construction is of logs that are saddle notched to interlock. The roof is normal/steep pitched with wood shingles. It is front or side gabled with exposed rafter ends. The majority of doors are constructed of vertical one by twelve inch planks.

NATIONAL: The roofing is low/normal pitched with asphalt shingle. The gable ends are oriented to the side and have enclosed eaves. The windows are double hung sash with six over one lights. The gable ends have a set of four triangular decorative vents. Construction is frame with horizontal board siding.

The final phase of Forest Service architectural development during the Depression-era, the acceptable plans, found expression in eight administrative complexes with a total of 20 structures. At present, 6 acceptable plan primary structures in three administrative complexes still exist on Forest Service lands. All these are included as property elements in this nomination.

It is interesting to note that the three of the Forest Service administrative complexes in Arizona, considered in this nomination, constructed during this period of acceptable plans, have more in common with pre-Depression and Depression-era unique plans than with the standard plans. None fall within the Bungalow, Spanish,

|X| See Continuation Sheet

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
CONTINUATION SHEET

Section number F Page 3

or Pueblo design styles popular in the standard plans. Rather, they reflect influences of earlier, more vernacular forms of design, forms that had most recently been seen in the non-standard facilities constructed during the earlier part of the Depression. Two of the complexes have buildings strongly influenced by the Pre-Railroad and National folk styles. The final complex, Moqui Ranger Station on the Kaibab National Forest, deserves special mention as the only set of buildings on the Arizona National Forests constructed to acceptable plans that directly reflect the influences of Rustic Architecture. This style, originally promulgated by the National Park Service, emphasized the use of little-modified natural materials. As expressed in Forest Service constructions, it can be defined as follows:

RUSTIC: Rusticated sandstone masonry with battered walls and piers. Gable roofs with cedar shakes. Gable ends are wood planks with exposed log purlins. Windows are for the most part double hung sash with four over one lights. Doors are panel with the upper panel containing a six light window.

III. Significance

USDA Forest Service administrative sites in Arizona built during the Depression-era are significant under Criterion A [36 CFR 60.6(a)] for their association with the history of the development of the US Forest Service and the Federal response to the Depression in Arizona between the years 1929-1942. They represent the expansion of Forest Service administration from custodial superintendence to extensive resource management, and reflect the role of the USDA Forest Service in Depression-era public work relief programs. Administrative sites built to standard plans are also significant under Criterion C [36 CFR 60.6(c)] because they embody a distinctive style of architecture developed by the Forest Service during the Depression-era.

During the Depression-era, construction took place on 45 administrative complexes in the National Forests in Arizona. These complexes contained a total of about 188 primary and secondary structures. The National Forests in Arizona today contain 28 of these original complexes. These 28 once had a total of 126 buildings but attrition over the years has reduced this number to 83. Of the remaining 28 complexes, 19 have retained sufficient integrity to have been included in this nomination.

IV. Registration Requirements

Integrity is a key component of the evaluation. It is a measure of the historic identity of a property, and the degree to which it retains those qualities for which it is significant. There are seven aspects of integrity: location, design, setting, workmanship, materials, association, and feeling. An individual property need not (indeed, probably will not) possess all of these aspects of integrity.

|X| See Continuation Sheet

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
CONTINUATION SHEET

Section number F Page 4

Administrative complexes eligible under Criterion A for association with the Depression and the Forest Service should appear essentially as they did in the historic period of significance -- the crew who built it should be able to recognize it today. Its design, setting, feeling, and association should remain essentially unchanged. If it is further eligible under Criterion C for its distinctive architectural design qualities, it should retain those elements which distinguish it -- such as multi-light windows, battered piers, exterior masonry chimney, knee brackets, and form. Its design, workmanship, materials, and possibly setting should also be retained. Evaluation methodology is further discussed in Section G.

G. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods

Discuss the methods used in developing the multiple property listing.

The multiple property listing for Depression Era USDA Forest Service Administrative Sites in Arizona was based on a listing of all administrative facilities built during the period of significance (1929-1942) on the National Forests in Arizona. The initial subset of this universe was all such properties still extant and continuing in USDA Forest Service ownership. These were identified through archival research involving Regional Office, Forest Supervisor, and Ranger District historic files and maps. Once identified, Forest Service Cultural Resource personnel photographed and produced site and structure plans for each of the properties included within this initial subset.

The focus of the property evaluation was on the integrity of the administrative complex. An administrative complex property was seen as consisting of three elements: primary structures (dwellings, offices, and barns [barn/garages; garages]), secondary structures (sheds, oilhouses, latrines, etc.), and setting. The most consistent aspect of these administrative complexes was the use of the three primary structures. These structures serve to define and identify the properties. Therefore, for the property to be considered as having integrity it had to have at least two intact primary structures.

The numbers and types of secondary structures within any given complex was much more variable. Since these structures serve only to complement the primaries, they do not, in and of themselves, represent the residential and administrative nature of the properties. Presence of secondary structures provide a greater value to the complex and may increase its probability for inclusion. Secondary structures were not considered necessary in determining the integrity of a property. Therefore properties containing no secondary structures but having all of their primaries may have been considered to have integrity within the context of the nomination. Reverse cases (all secondaries and no primaries) were not be considered.

Additionally, each structural loss (especially of the primaries) increased the need for the surviving structures to retain more of their original configurations. If all primaries and secondaries remained at the complex and the complex retained its setting then a greater amount of modification can be tolerated. In cases where construction of a particular design occurred in only a single instance much more modification to the complex can be accepted. The exact amount of allowable modification in each case was based on whether or not it impaired recognition of distinctive architectural styles, building function, or overall property character.

Setting was the least important of the three elements considered. The more the original setting is retained the greater the probability for inclusion. Most detrimental to the integrity of the setting was the intrusion of later buildings and/or structures within the property boundary that dominated or obscured the visual preception of the complex as it appeared when built. Later buildings and/or structures beyond the property boundary detracted from the setting if they formed the predominate background of the complex. Large scale changes in landscaping and/or natural vegetation was also seen as diminishing the property setting.

The assessment of integrity of all administrative complexes and their individual structures follows National Register standards. The degree to which allowances can be made for alterations and deterioration is assessed through the comparative use of current survey description and photographs and historic documentation and photographs.

H. Major Bibliographical References

- Baker, Robert D.; Robert S. Maxwell; Victor H. Treat; and Henry C. Dethloff
1988 Timeless Heritage: A History of the Forest Service in the Southwest. USDA Forest Service.
- Garraty, John A.
1986 The Great Depression: An Inquiry into the Causes, Course and Consequences of the Worldwide Depression of the Nineteen-Thirties, as seen by Contemporaries and in the Light of History. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers, San Diego, New York, London.
- Hendrickson, Kenneth E., Jr.
1980 The Civilian Conservation Corps in the Southwestern States. In The Depression in the Southwest edited by Donald W. Whisenhunt, Kennikat Press, National University Publications, Port Washington, N.Y./London.
- Letter: Will Mace to Gifford Pinchot dated February 9, 1940. On file at Kaibab National Forest, Williams, Arizona.
- McAlester, Virginia and Lee McAlester
1984 A Field guide to American Homes. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York.
- Mauder, Elwood R.
1976 Forty-Three Years in the Field with the U.S. Forest Service: An Interview with Charles A. Connaughton. Forest History Society, Santa Cruz, Ca.
1977 Memoirs of a Pioneering Forester in the West: An Interview with Robie M. Evans. Forest History Society, Santa Cruz, Ca.
- Otis, Alison T., William D. Honey, Thomas C. Hogg, and Kimberly K. Lakin
1986 The Civilian Conservation Corps: 1933-1942. USDA Forest Service.
- Steen, Harold K.
1976 The U.S. Forest Service: A History. University of Washington Press, Seattle and London.
- Steer, Peter L.
1987 National Forest Fire Lookouts in the Southwestern Region, USDA Forest Service. National Register of Historic Places Thematic Nomination, on file at USFS Southwestern Region office, Albuquerque, NM.
- Throop, E. Gail
1979 Utterly Visionary and Chimerical: A Federal Response to the Depression, An examination of Civilian Conservation Corps Construction on National Forest System Lands in the Pacific Northwest. Thesis completed at Portland State University, Portland, Oregon.
1984 USDA Forest Service Administrative Buildings in the State of Oregon and Washington built by the Civilian Conservation Corps. National Register Nomination completed for Region 6 of the USDA Forest Service.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES
CONTINUATION SHEET

Section number H Page 2

Tweed, William C.

1980 Recreation Site Planning and Improvements in National Forests: 1891-1942.
USDA, Forest Service. Government Printing Office, Washington D. C.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service

1937 Improvement Handbook. Division of Engineering, Government Printing Office,
Washington D.C.

1938 Acceptable Plans, Forest Service Administrative Buildings. Division of
Engineering, Government Printing Office, Washington D.C.

1940 Architectural Trend of Future Forest Service Buildings. Division of
Engineering, Government Printing Office, Washington D.C.

1905 Use Book

Whisenhunt, Donald W. (editor)

1980 The Depression in the Southwest. Kennikat Press, National University
Publications, Port Washington, N.Y./London.

Primary location of additional documentation:

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | State historic preservation office | <input type="checkbox"/> | Local government |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Other State agency | <input type="checkbox"/> | University |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Federal agency | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other |

Specify respository: Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest, Supervisor's Office
Coconino National Forest, Supervisor's Office
Coronado National Forest, Supervisor's Office
Kaibab National Forest, Supervisor's Office
Prescott National Forest, Supervisor's Office
Tonto National Forest, Supervisor's Office

I. Form Prepared By

name/title Michael Sullivan, Assistant Forest Archeologist
organization Tonto National Forest, USDA Forest Service date August 24, 1989
street/number 2324 E. McDowell Road phone (602) 225-5233
city or town Phoenix state Arizona zip code 85010

name/title Teri A. Cleeland, Assistant Forest Archeologist
organization Kaibab National Forest, USDA Forest Service date August 24, 1989
street/number 800 S. Sixth St. phone (602) 635-2681, ext. 277
city or town Williams state Arizona zip code 86046

name/title J. Michael Bremer, Archeologist
organization Coconino National Forest, USDA Forest Service date August 24, 1989
street/number 2323 E. Greenlaw Lane phone (602) 527-7431
city or town Flagstaff state Arizona zip code 86004