1. NAME OF PROPERTY

Historic Name: **MENDOCINO WOODLANDS RECREATIONAL DEMONSTRATION AREA**

Other Name/Site Number: MENDOCINO WOODLANDS OUTDOOR CENTER

2. LOCATION

Street & Number: 11301 Little Lake Road Not for publication:___

City/Town: Mendocino Vicinity: X

State: CA County: Mendocino Code:045 Zip Code: 95460

3. CLASSIFICATION

Ownership of Property		Category of Property	
Private:	__	Building(s):	__
Public-Local:	__	District:	X
Public-State:	X	Site:	__
Public-Federal:	__	Structure:	__
		Object:	__

Number of Resources within Property

Contributing	Noncontributing
92	4 buildings
0	0 sites
88	9 structures
0	0 objects
180	13 Total

Number of Contributing Resources Previously Listed in the National Register: 0

Name of Related Multiple Property Listing: Historic Park Landscapes in National and State Parks, 1995

4. STATE/FEDERAL AGENCY CERTIFICATION

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this _X_ nomination ____ request for determination of eligibility meets the documentation standards for registering properties in the National Register of Historic Places and meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. In my opinion, the property ____ meets ____ does not meet the National Register Criteria.

_____

_____
Signature of Certifying Official Date

_____
State or Federal Agency and Bureau

In my opinion, the property ____ meets ____ does not meet the National Register criteria.

_____

_____
Signature of Commenting or Other Official Date

_____
State or Federal Agency and Bureau

5. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that this property is:

____ Entered in the National Register
____ Determined eligible for the National Register
____ Determined not eligible for the National Register
____ Removed from the National Register
____ Other (explain):
_____

_____

_____ Signature of Keeper
Date of Action

6. FUNCTION OR USE

Historic:	Landscape	Sub: Park
	Recreation & Culture	Sub: Outdoor Recreation
	Domestic	Sub: Single Dwelling
	Transportation	Sub: Road-related
Current:	Landscape	Sub: Park
	Recreation & Culture	Sub: Outdoor Recreation
	Domestic	Sub: Single Dwelling
	Transportation	Sub: Road-related

7. DESCRIPTION

ARCHITECTURAL CLASSIFICATION: Bungalow/Craftsman
Other: NPS Rustic

MATERIALS:
Foundation: Stone/Concrete
Walls: Stone/Log/Shingle
Roof: Shingle
Other:
Site Furnishings: Stone/Wood/Metal/Concrete
Pavements and Curbs: Packed Earth/Gravel/Asphalt/Stone/Concrete
Retaining Walls and Other Landscape Structures: Concrete/Stone/Packed Earth

Describe Present and Historic Physical Appearance.

Summary
The Mendocino Woodlands Recreational Demonstration Area is located in Mendocino County on the California coast about 180 miles north of San Francisco. The park is a 720-acre unit of the California state park system, surrounded on all sides except to the south (and a small section to the east) by the Jackson Demonstration State Forest. Nine other state parks are nearby along the scenic California coast. Mendocino RDA, also known as Mendocino Woodlands Outdoor Center, is managed through a concession agreement by a private nonprofit corporation, the Mendocino Woodlands Camp Association, in cooperation with the superintendent of the Russian River-Mendocino District, California Department of Parks and Recreation.

Mendocino Woodlands was one of 46 RDAs in the United States whose purpose was to retire submarginal agricultural and other lands and develop them for recreational use. Mendocino Woodlands was the only RDA in California, the only one in a Redwood forest, and one of only two group camp facilities built west of the Rockies (The other Western RDA, Silver Falls State Park in Oregon, has been significantly altered.) A number of New Deal agencies were involved in these projects, with the National Park Service providing overall technical supervision, and the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) and the Works Progress Administration (WPA) providing labor.

The setting of the 720-acre park is a second growth Coast Redwood forest about nine miles from the coast. The park was created in a wooded canyon, along the banks of the Little North Fork of Big River. The park features three group camps and an administrative area, all sited along the river. The elevation above sea level ranges from 80 to over 400 feet, and the slopes of the hillsides are up to 50 percent in places. The moist climate and soils produce a lush understory that includes Madrone, Rhododendron, ferns, and orchids.

Planning for the park began in 1934, when the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA) committed funds to acquire submarginal agricultural lands for various new purposes. The Mendocino site was immediately identified as an ideal location for a new RDA because of its inherent beauty, its location within reasonably proximity of major metropolitan areas, its limited usefulness for agriculture, and its availability for purchase. The park was constructed on the site of the abandoned logging town of Boyles (founded in 1912, and razed in May 1936). By the spring of 1936, a "general development plan" had been approved and construction was well underway. The number of WPA enrollees in the "transient camp" building the park seems to have varied from as many as 350 to as few as 90. Topographical and road surveying, fire suppression, and other activities were underway at "Boyle's camp," in addition to the construction of the group camps. In 1938, the first group camp, Camp I, opened at Mendocino Woodlands. Construction continued, however, on dozens of buildings. Water and sewage systems were under construction, as was a telephone system, swimming facilities, foot bridges, and "landscape naturalization" around the completed construction projects.

By 1943, all three group camps had been completed, and they remain today virtually unaltered. The entire park has continued to serve its original functions almost without interruption or alterations of any kind. Of 193 resources in the 720-acre NHL District described here, 181 are

contributing. No other RDA in the country has as great a degree of integrity as Mendocino Woodlands.

No California state park resources have yet been placed on the National Register of Historic Places for their historic significance as CCC-era park developments. Comprehensive surveys of CCC-era state parks in California have been made by the California Department of Parks and Recreation, however, which recognizes the important history they represent. California state parks include some of the most impressive state parks developed anywhere in the United States during the 1930s. Planning for California state parks had been greatly advanced in the late 1920s and early 1930s by Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., and former Park Service chief landscape architect Daniel R. Hull. A special relationship evolved between California state park authorities and the Park Service during the 1930s.

Mendocino Woodlands, the largest and most intact state park development undertaken by the Park Service in California during the 1930s, will be the first California CCC-era state park to be listed on the National Register for its significance in the history of park planning and design.

Description of Contributing Resources in the Historic District
The following description of contributing resources is divided into six categories:

Spatial Organization
Circulation
Topography
Vegetation
Structures
Buildings

Spatial organization refers to the composition and sequence of outdoor spaces within the district. Circulation refers to the means and patterns of movement through the district. Topography refers to the ways in which the landscape planning responds to the topographic features of the site, and also to modifications of that topography. Vegetation also refers both to the response to existing vegetation, and to the management of vegetation through pruning, removal, or addition of trees and shrubs. Structures include all the contributing structures in the district, including roads, trails, retaining walls, etc. Buildings are defined as structures intended to shelter a human activity. No archeological resources have been considered in this study.

HISTORIC DISTRICT OVERALL

Spatial Organization
The Mendocino Woodlands RDA exploited the recreational and scenic potential of a second growth Coast Redwood forest in a wooded canyon typical of this region, nine miles inland from the rocky coast of northern California. The area had been extensively logged before its development as a park, and some remnants of these activities, such as log ponds, roads, and trails were incorporated into the new park by Park Service planners.

The overall organization of the principal spaces at Mendocino Woodlands is characterized by the decentralized, dispersed, and relatively small scale of the recreational facilities. Three discrete developed areas were distributed along the river that runs through the center of the park, north to south, and which characterizes the park's topography. In addition, a small group of buildings near the park entrance serve as a contact and administration area. The three group camps stretch the length of the park along the Little North Fork. Although each camp is a well defined unit, only one quarter to one half a mile (as the crow flies) separate each of these developed areas. The forests and topography provide natural sound and visual barriers between camps.

The decentralized plan of the park allows each developed area seclusion from the others, while fully exploiting the full range of picturesque views and recreational opportunities typical of the region. The decentralized plan made it possible for each developed area be within its own zone of influence, away from the distractions and noise of other campers or park visitors. Park Service policy for how RDAs should be laid out specifically required the concentration of developed areas in discrete, independent units. This remains a primary characteristic of the spatial organization of the overall NHL District.

All the developed areas in the park were located after careful consideration of the existing topography, views, and vegetation. Early topographic, vegetative and other detailed surveys of existing conditions were essential in the planning process. The developed areas were each located to exploit the recreational or scenic opportunities specific to each location. Certain opportunities, such as pools for swimming and meadows for group activities, were considered necessary for any successful camp. The activities offered by the Mendocino Woodlands in particular included swimming, fishing, boating, bicycling, and hiking in woodlands, appreciating diverse wildlife and habitats.

Circulation

The overall circulation system of the Mendocino Woodlands exemplifies certain planning goals of Park Service landscape architects of the period. The necessity of automotive roads was well-established, for example, but roads were planned to be as unobtrusive as possible. Road alignments were therefore calculated to minimize necessary grading. They were also designed to maximize visual interest. A careful hierarchy of road types made a clear distinction between the main public road, which connected the park entrance to the headquarters and group camps, and secondary service roads. Foot trails, represented the further extension of this hierarchy of road and trail types, each with its own typical section and alignment specifications. Some sort of swimming facilities were available for each camp, as were other open areas for activities such as archery, volleyball and basketball.

The identifying differences in the physical dimensions and engineering specifications of different road and trail types are a prominent aspect of the circulation of the park overall. The fact that the park road ends as a cul-de-sac is also significant; this arrangement reduced the possibility that group camp roads would be frequented by day visitors to the park, and eliminated the possibility that outside traffic would pass through the park at any point. The fact that the park road remains unpaved is significant; although almost all RDAs originally had dirt roads, all of them except Mendocino have subsequently had some portion paved.

The main circulation structure in the park is the Park Road, a single dirt road which followed an abandoned railroad grade for much of its route. The road connects the park entrance to the farthest extreme of the park at Camp II, about three miles away. Included as part of the road is the cut off around Units 1 and 2 of Camp I (the "lower road") that forms half of a one-way loop in this section of the park.

Topography

The foothills just inland from this section of the coast are typically steep, irregular, and often thickly forested. Narrow, steep gulches drain streams that rise and fall considerably with the heavy rains characteristic of the climate. Soil erosion is an issue in the park, both during winter floods and the summer, when the thin forest soils dry and are easily raised into clouds of dust wherever vehicle or foot traffic concentrate.

The park is organized along a north-south, three-mile canyon that rises steeply on each side from about 80 feet to over 400 feet in elevation. The floor of the canyon (the floodplain of the Little North Fork) is relatively flat, and up to 1,000 feet wide. Two wide areas where feeder streams form alluvial plains were exploited as sites for a small lake, near Camp I, and a recreation area for Camp III. In general, topography helped determine the suitability of different locations within the park for development and helped determined the basic organization of roads and park facilities.

The three group camps are arranged in a relatively narrow canyon along a three mile section of the Little North Fork of Big River at its confluence with Big River. Earlier in the century, a logging railroad followed the Little North Fork and logs were stored in a man-made pond near the confluence of the rivers. The hillsides were soon heavily cut over. The Little North Fork was silted in and heavily clogged with jams from logging debris. Construction of the park involved extensive rehabilitation of the land and river, including clearing the stream of jams and replanting native trees and shrubs along its banks.

Most of the buildings in the park were placed on hillsides, out of the floodplain, which created a characteristic effect evident in many of the campers cabins: the floors are at ground level on one side (where the entrances were placed) but are considerably elevated, often on pier foundations, on the other. Variations on the effect created by siting cabins on steep slopes are found throughout the park.

Vegetation

Vegetation in the NHL District overall is characterized by second growth Coast Redwood, Douglas-fir, and some Western Hemlock, Tan Oak, Big Leaf Maple, and Madrone. Riparian Alder, Willow and California Laurel are slowly being crowded out by the Redwood succession community. Ground cover includes Salal, Huckleberry, Manzanita, Rhododendron, Wild Rose, as well as nine species of ferns, and five varieties of wild orchids.

After being heavily logged, the area was burned repeatedly in order to promote pasture growth. These efforts met little success, and the region has been regenerating since the 1920s. In the early 1930s, many of the Redwoods were 10 to 70 years old. The subsequent growth of the forest since the creation of the park often presents a considerable contrast to the original appearance of the vegetation during the period of significance. This reforestation of the park was not only anticipated, but was a principal consideration for park planners. Keeping certain

views open along roadsides was an important aspect of the planned management of the vegetation.

Afforestation, erosion control, insect control, and fire suppression were all practiced within the park forests during the period of significance. Native plants were transplanted by CCC crews in order to "naturalize" disturbed areas, particularly around new construction. Such landscape work reinforced the overall goals of the spatial composition of the site plan. Foundation and other plantings around buildings, for example, were not intended to obscure the facades of buildings, but to become part of their elevations and enhance their ability to define outdoor spaces.

Structures

The following structures of the NHL District relate to the district overall, and so are described here rather than as part of the description of a specific developed area. These include the automotive road system of the park and its associated structures, as well as other contributing structures that are not described as part of one of the three developed areas of the park.

Contributing Structures:

CS1-4. Structure: Fire Hose Housings (4)
Location: Administration Area Date: c 1935
Architect/Builder: NPS
Four Redwood firehose housings with pegs for holding the canvas hoses.

CS5. Structure: Gate
Location: Administration Area Date:c 1938
Architect/Builder: NPS
3' x 3' hand hewn Redwood gate to Caretaker's house with iron hinges and bolts.

CS6-8. Structure: Entrance Portals (3)
Location: Entrance Area & Camp II Date: c1935
Architect/Builder: NPS
Three sets of double gates each 6' high x 12' wide, hand hewn Redwood with iron hinges, set into 2' x 2' x 8' stone pillars.

CS9. Structure: Split Rail Fence
Location: Administration Area Date: 1937
Architect/Builder: NPS
Split rail Redwood fence 200' long, around entry area and gates.

CS10. Structure: Park Road
Location: Entrance to furthest camp Date: c.1935
Architect/Builder: NPS
This 4.5-mile road runs north/south from the park entrance to Camp II. The Park Road includes the one-way section called the "lower road," on the east side of Camp I. The road surface is packed earth and hard rock. A series of Redwood culverts directs runoff from the hillsides under the road towards the river. The road is shored with Redwood log retaining walls in areas where it abuts the river. These minor structures are contributing parts of the road structure.

CS11. Structure: Bridge
Location: Entrance Camp II Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: NPS
Constructed of massive beams and Redwood tree trunk supports, plank surface with a stacked log and stone foundation, spanning Thompson Creek 200 feet north of its confluence with Little North Fork.

Buildings
Of 96 buildings in the park, only 3 are noncontributing. The degree of integrity of the park's architecture is only matched by the integrity of the overall site plan. No other complement of RDA group camps buildings has greater integrity than that of Mendocino Woodlands.

All buildings are constructed of Old Growth Redwood, which was plentiful in the area in the 1930s. Smaller buildings feature board and batten and shake siding. Larger buildings are board and batten. All buildings have wood floors except the Camp III dining hall and the latrines and shower houses, which have concrete floors. Shake roofs were used throughout, but were replaced with brown composition shingles in the late 1960s. All the lodges and dining halls, as well as all the cabins in Camp I, have massive stone fireplaces each unique in its masonry design.

The following buildings are within the NHL District overall, but are not included in the descriptions of individual developed areas below.

Contributing Buildings:
CB1. Building: Caretakers House
Location: Administration Area Date: 1937
Architect/Builder: NPS
Two-bedroom, 1 bath, 1270 square feet, massive stone fireplace with burl mantle and chimney breast reaching to the high open beam ceiling. Exterior and interior walls and ceiling are all board and batten. There is a covered front porch with 12" diameter peeled logs supporting the roof, and an open back porch of stone masonry.

CB2. Building: Administrative Building/staff housing
Location: Administration Area Date: 1937
Architect/Builder: NPS
A rectangular building with one bedroom, a kitchen/living room, and bathroom (560 sq. ft). The foundation is concrete and there is a gabled roof, wood floor, and Redwood finished

interior. Front porch overhang is supported by 12" diameter peeled log pillars. There is a stone fireplace in the front room. The interior has an open, high beam ceiling.

CB3. Building: Shop/Fire Vehicle Building
Location: Administration Area Date: 1937
Architect/Builder: NPS
A rectangular double garage and shop (420 sq. ft.) with 12' peeled cedar log supports, gabled roof, unfinished interior, board and batten exterior siding, side-sliding hanging doors.

Noncontributing Buildings:
NCB1. Building: Lavatory Date: 1937
Location: Administration Area
Architect/Builder: NPS
Cold water lavatory (186 sq. ft.) board and batten siding. One exterior wall and interior walls of building altered in 1989 and the building now serves as housing.

NCB2. Building: Temporary Housing
Location: Administration Area Date: 1987

NCB3. Structure: Caretakers Carport
Location: Administration Area Date: 1940
Architect/Builder: NPS
Carport with 12" diameter peeled cedar logs supporting the roof, open on two sides.

CAMP I

Spatial Organization

Camp I is the southernmost of the three group camps at Mendocino Woodlands. Camp I is the camp nearest the park entrance and the main park administration area, which is also near the entrance. The camp is located on a slope with southern exposure, around a meadow and a small lake fed by an unnamed feeder stream and draining into the Little North Fork.

Certain observations about the spatial organization of this group camp illustrate the principles of ideal group camp design promulgated by the Park Service for RDAs all over the country. The cabins of Camp I are organized in three units of 15-16 cabins each, and spaced 30-60 feet apart. Each group includes two or three duplex (connected) cabins and its own lavatory/wash house. Each cabin accommodates four campers, for a total of about 60 campers per unit, and 180 campers for all of Camp I.

The three cabin clusters, or units, are grouped around one central group of buildings, consisting of the dining hall, nature center, two staff quarters, and the recreation lodge. Each cluster of cabins is spaced at least 500 feet from the next. The entire ensemble, covering about 50-60 acres, makes up the group camp. In the case of the Mendocino Woodlands, the narrow canyon made a linear arrangement necessary, while in other RDAs, the dining hall area often was more central to all the camp units.

Each unit within Camp I is located to provide privacy from each other unit. The cabins are sited to fully exploit scenic opportunities in the area. A large recreation field, and a secluded campfire circle were essential complements. Both these features are situated to exploit views.

There are, as a result of this spatial organization, hierarchies of spaces, from intimate to quite large, from the semi-private space around an individual cabin, to the more communal spaces of the camp. There is also a continuous spectrum in the degree of privacy offered by these spaces, from the individual cabin, to the cluster of cabins, to the main gathering points around the dining hall or around the campfire circle.

Circulation

Vehicular traffic in Camp I is limited to the Park Road which runs along the perimeters of Units 1 and 2, and past Unit 3. All the camp units were connected to the central dining hall and also to one another by a network of foot trails or the Park Road. This arrangement was again somewhat unusual, since normally the road would have been a cul-de-sac leading to the camp unit. The narrow site, however, meant that the camp units would be strung along the road. Originally the main road was used only for Camp I, with Camp II and Camp III reached by a secondary road that went along the easternmost edge of the canyon and crossed the Little North Fork in two places without benefit of bridges. In the late 1970s this road was closed to vehicles and renamed Marsh Creek Trail.

The network of lightly constructed trails that connect the units of the group camp is informal and somewhat ephemeral by nature; the trails, however, particularly those that are better established, are contributing features of the historic developed area. Vehicular circulation is limited to the perimeters of Camp I. Parking areas draw most of the traffic, and from that point, circulation is entirely by foot through the site.

Topography

Because the lower elevations of the park site are subject to flooding, the buildings of Camp I are all situated on steep hillsides surrounding the flood plain of the Little North Fork and an unnamed feeder stream. At a low point between Unit 2 and Unit 3 of Camp I, loggers had built a pool for floating logs. The pool was excavated further during the 1930s to create a small lake. The Park Road curves around the north half of the lake. A three-acre area near the lake was graded flat to provide a large open space for recreation.

Vegetation

Camp I vegetation is the most diverse in the NHL District and ranges from riparian woods and meadowlands along the Little North Fork to mixed second growth Redwood community on the hillsides, to marsh and pond habitat. The cabins are all located under Coast Redwood trees with areas of brush providing privacy from the Park Road. Five species of wild orchids can be found in Camp I. The entire natural succession of Redwoods, from sprouting stumps to tall trees forming a tight canopy is present.

Considerable screen and slope plantings were done around the lake, near buildings, and along the Park Road. The rhododendron and other native shrubbery still provide privacy barriers between the cabins and Park Road.

Structures

CS13.	Structure:	Big Tree Trail	
	Location:	Camp I, Unit I	Date: c1935
	Architect/Builder:	National Park Service	

The trail starts near the Park Road exit from the park, goes east, and crosses the Little North Fork on the remains of a trussed log bridge (CS16). It then crosses an old logging levee, and passes through a grove of large Redwoods before crossing onto private property.

CS14. Structure: Marsh Creek Trail
Location: Camp I Date: c1912
Architect/Builder: Early loggers
A former skid road, this trail was the bypass road leading to Camps II and III until it was closed in the 1970s. Now a trail, the flat route runs north and south along the eastern edge of the Little North Fork, crosses it twice, and rejoins Park Road just north of Camp I.

CS15. Structure: Observation Point Trail Date: 1937
Location: Camp I, north end of pond
Architect/Builder: National Park Service
Observation Point Trail connects with trails from Camp II and Camp III. It winds up to the ridge above the camps where the old fire lookout was located.

CS16. Structure: Trussed Log Bridge
Location: Camp I, Unit I Date: c1935
Architect/Builder: NPS
Crossing the Little North Fork about 100 yards before its confluence with Big River. The bridge consists of stacked log and stone footings. The 3' diameter Old Growth Redwood log span was adzed flat on the top and bottom.

CS17-36. Structure: Fire Hose Housings (20)
Location: Camp I Date: c1935
Architect/Builder: NPS
Twenty Redwood fire hose housings with pegs for holding the canvas fire hoses. 3' wide x 1' deep x 4' high, board sides with hand hewn shingle roofing.

CS 37. Structure: Lake
Location: Camp I, Central Area Date: c1936
Fed by a small, unnamed feeder stream that originally flowed through a meadow and joined the Little North Fork, the pond was first dug by the Mendocino Lumber Company in the early 1900s. It was heavily silted before excavation by the Park Service in 1936, and currently serves as the focal point for Units 2 and 3 of Camp I. The Nature Center is located on this small lake, which has again begun to silt in, providing a variety of habitats for the Environmental Education Program.

Noncontributing Structures:

NCS1. Structure: Camp Fire Circle Date: 1996
Location: Camp I
Architect/Builder: NPS (original structure)
Destroyed in flooding 1993, the original bowl excavated between the Park Road and flood plain was regraded and log seating was replaced with benches.

NCS2. Structure: Retaining Wall Date: 1986
Location: Camp I Recreation Hall
Architect/Builder: Unknown

NCS3. Structure: Phone Booth
Location: Camp I, Dining Hall Date: 1994
Architect/Builder: J. Drake/MWCA

Buildings

All the buildings of Camp I are Old Growth Redwood frame structures, sided in Redwood board and batten. Shake roofs were replaced by brown composition shingles in the late 1960s. Each Camp I cabin has a stone fireplace, a balcony, and a small stone porch. Each fireplace has a design unique to that cabin. All the cabins are sited on slopes overlooking either the pond or the nearby meadow. The cabins are angled to provide privacy from the paths and from one another. The buildings of Camp I all display great attention to detail, with ornate cutouts around the eaves and decorating the balconies.

Contributing Buildings:

CB4. Building: Cook's House
Location: Camp I, Central Area Date: c1938
Architect/Builder: NPS
A wood framed board and batten sided building with medium end gable (800 sq. ft). Foundation of poured concrete perimeter, concrete pier interior. Original metal casement windows and French doors on the south entrance. There are two stone porches, one with 12" diameter peeled cedar roof supports. Three bedrooms, 1 bath, living room, and laundry. Interior tongue and groove ceiling and walls. Bedrooms have open beam ceilings.

CB5. Building: Infirmary
Location: Camp I,Central Area Date: 1939
Architect/Builder: NPS
Three rooms plus a bathroom (656 sq. ft.), board and batten exterior and interior, tongue and groove pine flooring. Ceilings in two rooms are board and batten, while the third is open beam. Roof is a moderate end gable with a six-foot overhang extending over the wooden front porch.

CB6. Building: Dining & Kitchen
Location: Camp I,Central Area Date: 1937
Architect/Builder: NPS
The kitchen forms the center point for the two dining wings (2988 sq. ft.). There is a high, open beam truss ceiling in the kitchen, concrete workspace floor, and tongue and groove pine floor in the serving area as well as in the two dining wings. Each wing has its own massive

stone fireplace, and 16" diameter cedar logs support the timbered trussed beam ceilings. Interior walls are not finished. A large stone entry brings campers to the kitchen serving area, and wood slab steps with peeled pole railings lead to the French doors on either end of the dining wings. Original CCC furniture is still in use.

CB7. Building: Recreation Lodge
Location: Camp I, Central Area Date: 1938
Architect/Builder: NPS
Three stone porches provide entry to the building. Tongue and groove pine flooring, and an open ceiling with massive peeled cedar timber trusses. A large stone fireplace with a Redwood mantle and hood is situated at the north end, and the walls are lined with attached bench seating. There are two small rooms for storage and miscellaneous use.

CB8. Building: Nature Center
Location: Camp I, Central Area Date: c1920
Architect/Builder: Early logging crews
The only remaining building from the town of Boyles, the building was constructed of Redwood board with Redwood shingle exterior. One rectangular room 15' x 38'; foundation is concrete piers and Redwood skids with 10" square cross beams (620 sq. ft.). Interior is entirely finished in painted 3" Old Growth Redwood boards.

CB9-12. Building: Unit I Duplex Cabins #1 & 2, #4 & 5, #12 & 13, #15 & 16
Location: Camp I, Unit 1 Date: 1937
Architect/Builder: NPS
Duplex cabins, each side contains one cabin that sleeps four persons. Board and batten exterior; gabled roof features decorative double ended purlin extensions. Foundations are poured concrete at the entrance (uphill side) and concrete piers at the rear (657 sq. ft. typically). Unfinished interiors with open beam ceilings. Porches covered by eave extensions. Balconies with alpine motives, decorative balustrade. Massive stone fireplaces and closets form the wall that completely divides the two sides of cabins.

CB13-20 Building: Unit 1 Single Cabins #3, #6, #7, #8, #9, #10, #11, #14
Location: Camp I, Unit 1 Date: 1936
Architect/Builder: NPS
Single cabins, which sleep four campers. Board and batten exterior; gabled roof features decorative double ended purlin extensions. Foundations are poured concrete at the entrance (uphill side) and concrete piers at the rear (324 sq. ft. typically). Unfinished interiors with open beam ceilings. Porches covered by eave extensions, and balconies with decorative balustrades. Stone fireplaces extend to form small exterior stone entry porches.

CB21. Building: Comfort and Shower Station #1
Location: Camp I, Unit 1 Date: c1936
Architect/Builder: NPS
Divided into two sides for men and women. Concrete slab floor (1614 sq. ft.), board and batten exterior, unfinished interior with open beam ceiling. The gabled roof with decorative double ended purlin extensions provides five foot overhangs at the entrances supported by eight-inch peeled poles. The areas under the gables are open and screened to provide ventilation.

CB22-24 Building: Unit 2 Duplex Cabins #24 & 25, #26 & 27, #29 & #30
Location: Camp I, Unit 2 Date: 1936
Architect/Builder: NPS
See CB9 above.

CB25-33 Building: Unit 2 Single Cabins #17, #18, #19, #20, #21, #22, #23, #28, #31
Location: Camp I, Unit 2 Date: 1936
Architect/Builder: NPS
See CB13 above.

CB34. Building: Comfort and Shower Station #2
Location: Camp I, Unit 2 Date: c1936
Architect/Builder: NPS
See CB21 above.

CB35-37 Building: Unit 3 Duplex Cabins #32 & 33, #40 & 41, #43 & 44,
Location: Camp I, Unit 3 Date: 1936
Architect/Builder: NPS
See CB9 above.

CB38-46 Building: Unit 3 Single Cabins #34, #35, #36, #37, #38, #39, #42, #45, #46
Location: Camp I, Unit 3 Date: 1936
Architect/Builder: NPS
See CB13 above.

CB47. Building: Comfort and Shower Station #3
Location: Camp I, Unit 3 Date: c1936
Architect/Builder: NPS
See CB21 above.

Noncontributing Structures:

NCS3.	Structure:	Generator Shed	
	Location:	Camp I, Central Area	Date: c1950
	Architect/Builder:	Unknown	
NCS4.	Structure:	Storage Shed	
	Location:	Camp I, Central Area	Date: c1976
	Architect/Builder:	Unknown	

CAMP II

Spatial Organization

Camp II is located on Redwood flats, on the Little North Fork, one mile north of Camp III and three miles north of Camp I at the northern extreme of the NHL District. Camp II has four cabin units, each with six camper cabins, two counselor cabins, a wood tent frame that sleeps 4, and a cold water lavatory. The units are somewhat closer together in Camp II, and the dining hall and administration area are more central in the overall camp plan.

Circulation

Since there was more level ground for the planners to work with here, the main park road terminates at the back of the dining hall, as typically was desired in RDA plans. Also, a parking lot at the administration building on the way in handles most of the arriving traffic; from that point on, all circulation is pedestrian, via a somewhat informal and lightly constructed network of trails through the camp.

All of these features are typical of Park Service group camp design, and in fact Camp II represents a more typical example of the type than Camps I or III. All the lavatories and central shower facility in Camp II take advantage of the elevation of the hillsides to align the gravity flow domestic water and septic systems. Cabins are all located along the river in such a way as to take advantage of the river views. Three of the four units are accessible by footbridge only, adding to the sense of privacy.

Topography

Camp II is located along the Little North Fork, which curves and twists around each of the four clusters of cabins. The canyon narrows sharply (to about 150' across) at the northern end of Camp II. A large flat meadow near the old swimming pool and an open area in front of the dining hall provide space for team and recreational activities.

Vegetation

The Coast Redwood forest succession has been more successful around Camp II than in any other part of the NHL District. Early descriptions of the camp mention open, grassy areas, but much of the ground cover and understory have disappeared or changed in character considerably as the second growth Redwoods take advantage of the excellent conditions for their growth. As the area becomes a mature Redwood forest, it begins to take on typical characteristics of Old Growth areas: trees with tight, high canopies, and extensive fern and moss groundcovers below.

Structures

Contributing Structures:

CS38. Structure: Campfire Circle
Location: Camp II Date: c1935
Architect/Builder: NPS
Using the natural rise of the hillside for log seating to create an amphitheater-effect, the campfire circle overlooks the Little North Fork. It can only be reached by a trussed log footbridge.

CS39-45. Structure: Seven Tent Frames
Location: Camp II Date: c1937
Architect/Builder: NPS
Scattered evenly around Camp II, these tent frames, with removable canvas tents, are used for housing, crafts, and office space.

CS46-53. Structure: Eight Fire Hose Housings
Location: Camp II Date: c.1935
Architect/Builder: NPS
Located primarily around the central area of the unit and campfire circle, the cabin clusters are served by a water barrel/pail system.

CS54-57. Structure: Trails (4)
Location: Camp II Date: c1938-40
Architect/Builder: National Park Service
Creek Trail, Eagle's Roost Trail, Fern Loop Trail, and Old Jeep Trail, four interconnected trails, were all built for use by campers. The trails start in Camp II, pass into the state forest, and then some pass onto private land. The initial portions of the trails (within the NHL District) are contributing structures.

CS58. Structure: Observation Point Trail Date: 1938
Location: Camp II, near entry bridge
Architect/Builder: National Park Service
Observation Point Trail, interconnecting with trails of the same name from Camps I and III, winds up Thompson Gulch through the state forest to the ridge above the camps where the old fire lookout was located. The portion of the trail within the NHL District is a contributing structure.

CS59. Structure: Storage Shed
Location: Camp II Date: 1938
Architect/Builder: NPS
Two room shed with rough Old Growth Redwood floor, unfinished interior (320 sq. ft.), on pier foundations.

CS60. Building: Shed
Location: Camp II, Unit 1 Date: 1939
Architect/Builder: NPS
4' x 6' x 5' high storage shed with original hand split shake roof in place.

Noncontributing Structures:
NCS5-7. Structure: Trussed Log Foot Bridges (3)
Location: Camp II Date: 1938
Architect/Builder: NPS
These footbridges have been reconstructed, and although the 3' diameter Redwood log forming the span of each structure is original, the structures overall are considered noncontributing.

NCS8. Structure: Swimming Pool
Location: Camp II Date: 1938
Architect/Builder: NPS
Concrete pool with diving board and entry stairs, surrounded by a cement apron. Pool filled and emptied directly from and into the Little North Fork. The pool was filled with gravel in the early 1970s.

NCS9. Structure: Stone Bar-B-Que
Location: Camp II, Central Area
Architect/Builder: Unknown Date: Unknown
Small stone Bar-B-Que, built of rock.

Buildings
All buildings in Camp II are of Old Growth Redwood and feature hand split shake siding. Shake roofs were replaced in the late 1970s with brown composition shingles. The kitchen/dining hall serves as a recreation hall as well. There is one central hot water shower house, and each of the four units have cold water lavatories. Cabins in Camp II are of two types: the four-bed camper cabin and the two-bed counselor cabin. The upper halves of all the cabins are open and screened.

Contributing Buildings:
CB48. Building: Central Area Shower House
Location: Camp II Date: 1939
Architect/Builder: NPS
Consists of three bathrooms each with a toilet, sink and shower, one large shower room with an attached dressing area, and a laundry/maintenance area (696 sq. ft.). The foundation is poured concrete, and there is a small wooden porch with peeled log railing leading to the laundry area.

CB49. Building: Dining/Kitchen/Lodge
Location: Camp II, Central Area Date: 1939
Architect/Builder: NPS
A lodge, or recreation hall, intended for Camp II was never built, so the Dining Hall doubles as a recreation hall. There are five stone porches some with stone steps, and two massive stone fireplaces, one at either end. The interior walls are unfinished (2930 sq. ft.). Massive round peeled cedar posts support ceiling timbers and the exposed beam ceiling.

CB50. Building: Central Area Infirmary
Location: Camp II, Central Area Date: 1939
Architect/Builder: NPS
Two main rooms, and a lavatory and small kitchen with original cupboards decorated with scalloped edges (750 sq. ft.). Stone steps lead to a small wooden porch with peeled pole railings. French doors provide entry at one end, and a simple wooden step entry exists at the other.

CB51. Building: Office
Location: Camp II, Central Area Date: 1936
Architect/Builder: NPS
Three rooms with a stone fireplace at one end and a large stone porch with an exterior stone stairway. The entire foundation is of stone with the exception of a concrete sill along the rear (650 sq. ft.). A wide Redwood sill tops and overhangs the masonry foundation with the walls set back 6" on the sill, having a decorative effect.

CB52-57 Buildings: Unit 1 Cabins #1, #2, #4, #6, #7, #8
Location: Camp II, Unit 1 Date: c1938
Architect/Builder: NPS
Four-bed camper cabins framed of Old Growth Redwood with the lower half of the exterior covered with hand split shingles and the upper half screened (216 sq. ft.). Roofs are gabled, foundations of concrete piers. Interiors have tongue and groove Douglas Fir floor and open beam ceilings.

CB58-59. Building: Unit 1 Cabins #3, #5
Location: Camp II, Unit 1 Date: c1938
Architect/Builder: NPS
Two-bed counselor cabins differ from four-bed camper cabin in that they have a 6' x 12' covered porch (192 sq. ft. interior). Framed of Old Growth Redwood with the lower half of the exterior covered with hand split shingles and the upper half screened. Roofs are gabled, foundations of concrete piers. Interiors have tongue and groove Douglas Fir floors and open beam ceilings.

CB60. Building: Wash House & Lavatory
Location: Camp II, Unit 1 Date: 1939
Architect/Builder: NPS
Cold water wash house and lavatory divided into men's and women's sides. Contains four toilet stalls and a covered but open trough sink, concrete slab foundation (225 sq. ft).

CB61-66. Buildings: Unit 2 Cabins #9, #10, #12, #14, #15, #16
Location: Camp II, Unit 2 Date: c1938
Architect/Builder: NPS
See CB52 above.

CB67-68. Building: Unit 2 Cabins #11, #13
Location: Camp II, Unit 2 Date: c1938
Architect/Builder: NPS
See CB58 above.

CB69. Building: Unit 2 Wash House & Lavatory
Location: Camp II, Unit 2 Date: 1939
Architect/Builder: NPS
See CB60 above.

CB70-75 Buildings: Unit 3 Cabins #17, #18, #20, #21, #22, #23
Location: Camp II, Unit 3 Date: c1938
Architect/Builder: NPS
See CB52 above.

CB76-77. Building: Unit 3 Cabins #19, #24
Location: Camp II, Unit 3 Date: c1938
Architect/Builder: NPS
See CB58 above.

CB78. Building: Unit 3 Wash House & Lavatory
Location: Camp II, Unit 3 Date: 1939
Architect/Builder: NPS
See CB60 above.

CB79-84. Buildings: Unit 4 Cabins #25, #27, #28, #29, #30, #32,
Location: Camp II, Unit 4 Date: c1938
Architect/Builder: NPS
See CB52 above.

CB85-86. Building: Unit 4 Cabins #26, #31
Location: Camp II, Unit 4 Date: c1938
Architect/Builder: NPS
See CB58 above.

CB87. Building: Wash House & Lavatory
Location: Camp II, Unit 4 Date: 1939
Architect/Builder: NPS
See CB60 above.

CAMP III

Spatial Organization

Camp III was the last group camp constructed at the Woodlands. World War II had started, and funding was short. Designed as a camp for younger children, tent frames on Redwood blocks replaced cabins for campers. Camp III is located (out of order) half way between Camps I and II.

Camp III is divided into three separate units, with one central area containing the dining hall and kitchen, and one hot water shower house. The campfire circle is located across the Park Road next to the river. The tent frames of unit 3 of Camp III have been destroyed by falling trees over the years. The unit 3 wash house remains intact.

Circulation

The Park Road connecting Camps I and II runs along the east edge of Camp III separating the campfire circle from the rest of the camp. Each of the three units of the camp is on the side of a hill and each is reached by its own trail. The units are separated from each other by deep seasonal stream gullies, and are connected to one another by paths leading back to the central area. Parking is off the main road, and there is no vehicular traffic within the camp. A dirt service road leads to the springs and water storage system from the parking area north of Camp III.

Topography

Camp III was built in a natural opening created by the flood plain of several seasonal streams. The Little North Fork flows past on the east side of the Park Road at this point, and the flood plain naturally forms a flat, open area several acres in size. This area provides space for basketball, volleyball, races, archery and other sports.

Vegetation

Because it is on flood plain, and in fact is flooded seasonally, this is the most open of the three camps. The tent frames are all located on hillsides under regenerating Coast Redwood and Madrone trees. Native sedges have reclaimed the meadow north of the dining hall.

Structures

Contributing Structures:

CS61. Structure: Fence
Location: Camp III Date: 1940
Architect/Builder: NPS
Fourteen feet of massive fencing hand hewn of Old Growth Redwood, ranging from 6" to 12" in width, 6' to 6.5' in height, and 4" to 6" thick. Placed to provide noise abatement for the refrigeration unit and electric generator near the dining hall.

CS62. Structure: Fire Circle
Location: Camp III, Central Area Date: 1940

Architect/Builder: NPS
Located on the east side of the Park Road on Redwood flats just above the Little North Fork, there is a stage supported by 18' diameter logs and log seating.

CS63-66. Structure: Fire Hose Housings (4)
Location: Camp III, Central Area Date: 1939
Architect/Builder: NPS
Redwood fire hose housings with pegs for holding the canvas hoses. 3' wide, 1' deep, 4' high, board sides with hand hewn shingle roofing.

CS67-70. Structure: Tent Platforms (4)
Location: Camp III, Central Area Date: 1940
Architect/Builder: NPS
Platforms set on small Redwood blocks (168 sq. ft.).

CS71-78. Structure: Tent Platforms (8)
Location: Camp III, Unit 1 Date: 1940
Architect/Builder: NPS
See CS67 above.

CS79-83. Structure: Tent Platforms (5)
Location: Camp III, Unit 2 Date: 1940
Architect/Builder: NPS
See CS67 above.

CS84. Structure: Generator Shed
Location: Camp III, Central Area Date: 1940
Architect/Builder: NPS
Shed of Old Growth Redwood, 5' x 4' x 5', with hand split shake roof, open on one side.

CS85. Structure: Small Utility Cupboard
Location: Camp III, Shower House Date: 1940
Architect/Builder: NPS
Small structure of Old Growth Redwood, hand split shingle roof, shelved with double cupboard doors.

CS86. Structure: Nature History Trail
Location: Camp III Date: 1912
Architect/Builder: Unknown
This level, 0.5 mile trail leaves the Park Road in Camp III at its northern end, crosses the Little North Fork, curves south along the east side of the river, and rejoins the Park Road south of Camp III.

CS87. Structure: Observation Point Trailhead
Location: Camp III Date: 1938
Architect/Builder: NPS
The Observation Point Trail follows the Manley Gulch seasonal feeder stream north up the canyon before turning west and joining with the other branches of this trail coming from Camp I and Camp II.

CS88. Structure: Rock Crusher
Location: Rocky Gulch, Near Camp III
Architect/Builder: Early loggers Date: Ca. 1910
Located in a small gulch that has served as a quarry, this rock crusher is built into the hillside with huge, 3' x 3' Redwood beams. The steel structure was used to crush rock for the original railroad running through the NHL District, and later for the park roads.

Buildings
Contributing Buildings:
CB88. Building: Dining Hall and Kitchen
Location: Camp III, Central Area Date: 1940
Architect/Builder: NPS
Exterior is of Old Growth Redwood tapered clapboard. The interior is finished, has an exposed beam ceiling and a massive stone fire place at the north end, opposite the kitchen. A small stone porch leads to the French door main entry; there are two smaller entries also with small (3' x 4') stone porches.

CB89. Building: Warehouse
Location: Camp III, Central Area Date: 1937
Architect/Builder: NPS
This building (500 sq. ft.) was constructed of lumber salvaged from the town of Boyles. There is a loading dock along part of one side.

CB90. Building: Shower House & Lavatory
Location: Camp III Date: 1940
Architect/Builder: NPS
The only hot water bathing facility for this camp, it contains four small toilet rooms, each with a private shower, one large shower, a group dressing room and a laundry/maintenance room (700 sq. ft.). Concrete slab foundation, area under eaves and gable open and screened.

CB91-93. Building: Wash Houses with Lavatories (3)
Location: Camp III, Units 1, 2 and 3
Architect/Builder: NPS Date: 1940
Cold water wash house and lavatory divided into men's and women's sides. Contains three toilet stalls, a utility cupboard and a covered but open trough sink, concrete slab foundation (260 sq. ft.).

8. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Certifying official has considered the significance of this property in relation to other properties:
Nationally: X Statewide:_ Locally:_

Applicable National Register Criteria: A X B_ C_ D_

Criteria Considerations (Exceptions): A___ B___ C___ D___ E___ F___ G___

NHL Criteria: 1, 4

NHL Theme(s): II. Creating Social Institutions and Movements
4. Recreational Activities

III. Expressing Cultural Values
5. Architecture, Landscape Architecture, Urban Design

VII. Transforming the Environment
3. Protecting/Preserving the Environment

Areas of Significance: Landscape Architecture, Architecture, Conservation, Entertainment/Recreation, Politics-Government, Community Development and Planning

Period(s) of Significance: 1934-1947

Significant Dates: 1935, 1938, 1942

Significant Person(s): NA

Cultural Affiliation: NA

Architect/Builder: Hull, Daniel R.; Hoyt, Raymond E.; Floyd, Robert E.; Lundgren, C. G.; Cowell, A. E.

NHL Comparative Categories:
XVII: Landscape Architecture
XVI: Architecture, Y Rustic

State Significance of Property, and Justify Criteria, Criteria Considerations, and Areas and Periods of Significance Noted Above.

Summary
Mendocino Woodlands Recreational Demonstration Area, also known as the Mendocino Woodlands Outdoor Center (or simply Mendocino Woodlands), is one of the two best remaining examples of "recreational demonstration area" (RDA) planning and design in the country. The RDAs were a new kind of state park planned by the National Park Service during the New Deal to accommodate private non-profit organizations that operated summer camps for youths. No other RDA in the country (with the exception of the St. Croix RDA, in Minnesota, which is also being nominated as an NHL) better represents the historical legacy of this unique era of federal recreational planning.

Mendocino Woodlands RDA is also an extremely significant and well preserved state park of the period, and epitomizes the artistic quality and high aspirations held for state parks designed by the Park Service during the 1930s. Mendocino Woodlands represents the highest achievements of the collaboration of the Park Service, the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), the Works Progress Administration (WPA), and local park authorities during the New Deal. Mendocino was also one of the largest and most ambitious state park projects undertaken in California by the Park Service. No other RDA in the country (with the exception of St. Croix RDA, in Minnesota, which is also being nominated as an NHL) better represents the unique and unprecedented planning for group camps that resulted in the RDAs. These two RDAs (St. Croix and Mendocino) are the best preserved examples of RDA planning with the highest degree of artistic significance in the country.

Many of the most significant results of Park Service landscape architecture were initiated in 1933 as part of the New Deal. Among the many parks and park systems that make up the legacy of this period, certain examples are particularly significant because of their extensive complement of period development, the exceptional quality of their original design and planning, and their excellent historic integrity and physical condition. Among these showcase state parks of the New Deal, certain examples again stand out because of further distinctions. Certain parks, for example, were the prototypes for new kinds of parks, such as recreational demonstration areas (featuring organized group camps) and national recreation areas (featuring recreational development alongside reservoirs).

Mendocino Woodlands is exceptional to begin with, because of its fine and well preserved cabins, dining halls, and group camp buildings; the Mendocino RDA also is an outstanding example of RDA planning nationally, since it is a particularly complete and well preserved example of what RDA planners tried to achieve. The RDAs were initiated in 1934 as the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA) committed $25 million to the acquisition of "submarginal" farm land, some of which was to be developed for recreational uses by the Park Service. Of these "demonstrations," by far the most important was a new kind of state park (developed on federal land, then donated to the states) that specifically (although not exclusively) accommodated group camp organizations. Thirty-four of the new parks, which retained the generic designation "recreational demonstration areas," were developed specifically to meet the need for organized group camp sites.

Few parks built by the Park Service during the New Deal are as expressive of the ideals of the New Deal era as the RDAs. "City planning in miniature," the group camp facilities combined the social philosophy of a generation of urban social reformers with the refined state park planning and design procedures of Conrad Wirth's branch of planning at the Park Service. Mendocino Woodlands is one of the two finest examples of this unique chapter in American park history. The park is one of the finest RDAs in terms of artistic significance, and it is the best example of an RDA in the Far West. Mendocino Woodlands has also retained an extraordinary degree of integrity and is in excellent overall condition. Besides an extraordinary setting in a second growth Coast Redwood forest, the park also represents the most significant remaining result of work by WPA "transient camps" in the RDA program. These adult work camps worked extensively (like the CCC) building the state parks designed by the Park Service.

The Mendocino Woodlands RDA NHL District meets National Historic Landmark Criterion 1 for its association with the American park movement. The high artistic significance and great integrity of the park make it an outstanding example of Park Service/WPA/CCC collaboration. This collaboration was one of the most significant events in the history of American parks, and the results of this collaboration today continue to make up the core of many state park systems. The NHL District also meets National Historic Landmark Criterion 4 as an exceptionally valuable example of American landscape architecture, specifically as a significant example of the Park Service collaboration with the WPA and local park authorities in the 1930s.

The Mendocino RDA NHL District is significant under National Register Criterion A for its association with the American park movement. The NHL District is also significant under National Register Criterion C as an example of American landscape architecture, specifically as an extremely significant example of the Park Service collaboration with the WPA and local park authorities.

The period of significance extends from the beginning of planning and design for the park in 1934, to 1947 when jurisdiction over the park was transferred to the State of California. Other significant dates include 1935, when construction began at the park; 1938, when the first group camps opened; and 1942, when most New Deal programs ceased activities.

Historic Context

One of the first pieces of New Deal legislation passed by the new Congress in 1933 funded the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC). Within two months of Franklin D. Roosevelt's inauguration, the Department of Labor and the U.S. Army had mobilized an army of formerly unemployed youths to undertake soil, forest, and water conservation projects on public lands all over the country. And the CCC, over 300,000-strong by 1935, needed things to do, whether planners and supervisors had prepared plans for productive activities or not. The National Park Service and the USDA Forest Service, as the "technical agencies" in charge of planning and supervising most CCC projects, immediately hired as many landscape architects and foresters as they could find.

By 1933, chief landscape architect Thomas C. Vint and his atelier of Park Service designers and engineers were in a unique position to offer technical support for New Deal programs. Since 1927, the closely knit group of up to 16 professionals had been growing in number and refining its procedures. The Landscape Division's authority within the Park Service had been

steadily enhanced as Park Service Director Horace Albright and other officials came to recognize the usefulness and efficiency of the park "master planning" process. The compilation of master plans proved be a particularly significant activity in the early 1930s. Besides safeguarding parks from excessive or poorly coordinated road construction and other development, the master plans also detailed at a six-year program of prioritized construction activity.

Updated annually, by 1933 the master plans completed or underway represented a considerable reservoir of schematic and partially developed designs that could be quickly converted into construction projects if the opportunity arose. After Horace Albright's resignation as director of the Park Service in the summer of 1933, his successor, Arno B. Cammerer, remarked on what seemed his predecessor's most salient achievement since 1929: "Extension of the landscape architectural activities and development of the six-year master plans for all national parks received special attention from [Albright]. Had not this advance planning been done, the National Park Service would have been unable to take part so quickly and competently in the emergency conservation and public-works program."[1]

No program would have a greater impact on Park Service organization and operations than the CCC. Within days of his arrival at the White House, Roosevelt instructed his new secretary of the interior, Harold L. Ickes, to coordinate an advisory committee that would draft legislation to create the CCC. Ickes named Albright to represent the Department of the Interior; Albright in turn brought Thomas Vint, Frank Kittredge, and his chief forester, John D. Coffman, to Washington to help determine what the new army of youths could accomplish in the national parks.[2] The CCC legislation was introduced on March 21 and was signed into law 10 days later. The Department of Labor screened and selected recruits; the War Department transported, fed, clothed, and housed the volunteers, organizing them into camps of up to 200 men apiece. The Forest Service provided technical and planning assistance for the hundreds of erosion control, fire suppression, and afforestation projects planned for national and state forests all over the country.

For its part in the "emergency conservation work," the Park Service was asked to plan, design, and give other technical assistance for all the park and recreational developments undertaken by the CCC outside of national forests. This of course included the work contemplated for the national parks themselves, but it also entailed the planning and design of hundreds of state, county, and even large municipal parks in almost every state and territory. Over 70 percent of the CCC work subsequently supervised by the Park Service was done in the over 560 non-federal park areas the bureau helped plan and develop during the 1930s. To accomplish this,

---

[1]Department of the Interior, Annual Report of the Department of the Interior, 1933 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1933), 153. Beginning in 1933, National Park Service Annual Reports were reduced in length and integrated with reports from the other bureaus of the Department of the Interior.

[2]Horace M. Albright and Robert Cahn, The Birth of the National Park Service: The Founding Years, 1913-1933 (Salt Lake City: Howe Brothers, 1985), 289-290.

the Park Service cooperated and provided direct technical assistance to state park and other planning agencies in 47 states, 26 counties, and 69 cities.[3]

The implications of engaging in this national recreational planning transformed the Park Service. Until then, the bureau had remained relatively small, dedicated to the preservation and management of about two dozen parks almost all located in the 11 Western states. By the end of the summer of 1933, however, the Park Service had acquired responsibility for over 50 new historical parks and monuments (mostly transferred from the War Department), it operated 70 CCC camps in national parks, and it helped supervise 105 camps in non-federal (mostly state) parks in 35 states. By the end of the next summer, there were 102 national park CCC camps and 268 state park camps in 40 states.[4]

The Park Service quickly regionalized portions of its operations to meet the new requirements placed on it. Four "districts" were created by Albright in May 1933 to handle the huge administrative burden of cooperating with scores of state and local governments in the development of new parks. Dividing the country geographically from east to west, "district officers" set up their regional administrations in Washington, Indianapolis, Denver, and San Francisco. By 1935, as the number of CCC camps continued to grow, the number of districts (renamed "regions" that year) had expanded to eight. That year the Park Service, in cooperation with individual state park authorities, was responsible for planning, design, and construction in 475 state park CCC camps.[5] Other divisions of the Park Service (those not involved with state park activities) were not yet regionalized, but discussions were already underway regarding the desirability of unifying the national and state park CCC programs, a change which implied such a reorganization of the entire bureau.

Bureaucratic growth and regionalization were necessitated by a huge expansion of staff and responsibilities. Before the spring of 1933, the Park Service had about 700 permanent and 373 temporary employees. Of these, fewer than 150 worked in the Washington office or in the eastern and western field headquarters.[6] By 1935, over 13,000 people were employed with the Park Service, and at the peak of New Deal activities the number was closer to 14,000. This number was inflated by employees who maintained the public buildings of the nation's capital (one of the many responsibilities transferred to the Park Service in the 1933 reorganization); but even when this function was divested to another agency in 1940, permanent Park Service personnel still numbered over 7,300. The Park Service "branch of plans and design," as

---

[3]Conrad L. Wirth, The Civilian Conservation Corps Program of the United States Department of the Interior (Washington, DC: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1944), 27-29; Department of the Interior, National Park Service, The CCC and Its Contribution to a Nation-Wide State Park Recreational Program, pamphlet (Washington, DC: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, n.d. [ca. 1940]), 16.

[4]Department of the Interior, 1933 Annual Report, 155-158; idem, 1934 Annual Report, 168-169.

[5]Conrad L. Wirth, Parks, Politics, and the People (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980), 127, 130-131.

[6]Harlan D. Unrau and G. Frank Williss, Administrative History: Expansion of the National Park Service in the 1930s (Denver: Government Printing Office, 1983), 236-238. Unrau and Williss point out that there was some confusion over the exact number of Park Service employees in 1933, but they feel these figures best indicate pre-New Deal staffing levels.

Thomas Vint's division was now known, went from 16 design and engineering professionals in 1933, to 120 in 1935. In 1936 the total rose to 220, but that number still did not include professionals working in the national park CCC camps as supervisors and foremen, or the hundreds of professionals working in the Park Service's state park CCC program.[7] Annual appropriations for the Park Service rose steadily as well, from about $10 million in 1933 to over $25 million in 1939 (before returning to $10 million in 1941).[8]

The expansion and diversification of Park Service activities quickly gave the bureau what the historian Donald C. Swain calls "the earmarks of a New Deal agency."[9] But of course the Park Service was not an invention of the New Deal; to some degree, in fact, the reverse was true. The programs, plans, and technical expertise that the first two Park Service directors, Stephen Mather and Horace Albright, had assembled since 1917 had made the bureau a unique national authority on outdoor recreational planning by 1933. And planning for recreational uses of public lands assumed greater significance during the Roosevelt administration than it had ever before in the United States, and possibly ever has since.

The outdoor recreation movement had been flourishing since before World War I; the creation of the Park Service, as well as numerous state and local park commissions, was evidence of the growing influence of mostly middle class tourists, mostly in automobiles, getting "back to nature" in the early 20th century. The "astonishing increase in motor travel" to national parks described by Albright in 1917 had shaped the activities of the Park Service from its inception.[10] During the 1920s the popularity of outdoor recreation continued to broaden and expand, and the popularity of these activities greatly influenced the growth of the national park system. Just as significant, however, was the contemporary expansion of state park systems across the country.

In 1921, Mather helped organize a National Conference on Parks in Des Moines, bringing together dozens of prominent park advocates from all over the country. The Park Service director was motivated in part by the desire to protect the standards and integrity of the national park system, since by encouraging the creation of state parks he hoped to avoid substandard properties from being forced on the Park Service. But there were far more ambitious goals for state park planning being expressed by other park advocates at the national conference. The group officially proclaimed that outdoor recreation was a basic human need, and that the national parks were often too far from centers of population to meet that need consistently. More accessible municipal parks, for their part, were insufficient to provide the desired experience of "the great outdoors." A complete, nation-wide park system needed to include a full typology of parks, including what J. Horace McFarland described as "broad areas

---

[7]James F. Kieley, A Brief History of the National Park Service, unpublished report (Washington, DC: Department of the Interior, Main Interior Library, 1940), 23.

[8]More than half of all Park Service employees were being paid out of emergency appropriations, however, and not out of these annual budgets. Department of the Interior, 1940 Annual Report, 203; idem, 1941 Annual Report, 319.

[9]Donald C. Swain, "The National Park Service and the New Deal, 1933-1940," Pacific Historical Review 51, no. 3 (August 1972), 312-332.

[10]Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1917 Annual Report, 18, 22.

that will give opportunity to enjoy the great outdoors as well as to preserve and make available the characteristic scenery of any particular state." Speaking at the second National Conference on State Parks held in 1922 at the Bear Mountain Inn, McFarland declared, "No American family should have to travel a thousand miles or more to reach a great open space." What was needed was a fully developed, national system of parks, including national parks certainly, but also including far more numerous state and county scenic reservations, which if less spectacular than national parks, were far more accessible to urban populations.[11]

A growing number of park advocates in the early 1920s were calling for coordinated, national outdoor recreational planning that would assure that a full range of recreational opportunities--from neighborhood playgrounds to national parks--would be available. The rapidly organizing state park movement brought together many different park promoters who advocated the coordinated expansion of different park systems. In 1924, Calvin Coolidge recognized this trend by convening the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation, which assembled 28 national organizations and scores of local groups to discuss how, in Coolidge's words, "to expand and conserve throughout the country our recreational opportunities."[12] The conference resulted in the creation of a cooperative association of national, state, and local groups working together to coordinate "national policy" on recreational planning for all categories of public lands. But the creation of such policy remained far beyond the mandate of any federal bureau. Mather's encouragement of state park planning, like the formation of the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation, relied on the spirit of cooperation for effectiveness and on private charity for most funding. Individual planners, such as Benton MacKaye or Warren Manning, who advocated their own national recreational plans in the early 1920s, did so largely at their own expense. By 1933, no truly coordinated policy for national recreational planning yet existed. Individual state and federal land management agencies pursued park plans independently, without the benefits or drawbacks of a centralized planning authority.

By the late 1920s, however, certain states had produced individual state-wide recreation plans that later influenced the course of New Deal national planning. In several states, what had been scattered collections of scenic reservations and historic sites were being consolidated and enlarged as state park systems. Many of these park systems, such as the Forest Preserve Districts around Chicago or the Westchester County parks outside New York, included areas that served large crowds of urbanites looking for picnic groves, swimming pools, and hiking trails within day-tripping distance. It was not immediately clear in the spring of 1933, however, that New Deal programs (particularly the CCC) would emphasize recreational planning to the degree they eventually did. The CCC "tree army," for example, was at first expected to concentrate mainly on forestry and soil conservation activities. Most CCC camps were planned for national and state forests, where the Forest Service would oversee them. The CCC boys, in their late teens and early twenties, generally had few or no skills, and it was

---

[11]All of these different park types, according to McFarland, would ideally be connected by "interstate parkways." National Conference on State Parks, Proceedings of the Second National Conference on State Parks at Bear Mountain Inn, Palisades Interstate Park, New York, May 22-25, 1922 (Washington, DC: National Conference on State Parks, 1922), 3, 56-58.

[12]National Conference on Outdoor Recreation, Proceedings of the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation Held in the Auditorium of the New National Museum, Washington, DC (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1924), 2.

expected that they would be occupied mostly in constructing fire roads, fighting forest fires, reforesting cutover land, and stabilizing eroded slopes. At the Park Service, Albright at first placed his chief forester, John Coffman, in charge of national and state park CCC activities, anticipating that forestry projects would be the main work of the CCC program.[13]

Once the CCC camps were operational, however, it was soon evident that the recruits would be able to successfully undertake demanding construction and park development projects, in addition to their forestry activities. Trepidations regarding the quality of masonry and wood construction the young men would be capable of soon were assuaged, and the Park Service began to employ CCC labor in more ambitious park projects. There were a number of reasons why the CCC program was so successful. A number of "local experienced men," for example, were hired at each camp and provided vital guidance and training while laboring with the recruits. The construction projects, like the camps themselves, were also extremely well supervised. The silver lining of the Depression was soon revealed: the unemployed condition of thousands of professionals, scientists, and educators made them available and eager to participate in the CCC and other New Deal programs. Landscape architects, in particular, were hired to work in state and national park CCC camps, but many other unemployed professionals were hired as supervisors and foremen as well. In a CCC camp in Keosauqua, Iowa, landscape architect Kenneth F. Jones worked as a "landscape foreman," supervising work crews of about 20 boys apiece. Each crew, he reported, had a "working foreman" with professional training: a landscape architect, an architect, a civil engineer, an agricultural engineer, a forester, a forest pathologist, and an entomologist.[14] Higher up in the organization, a network of regional inspectors, including many well-known landscape architects and architects, relentlessly enforced uniform high standards for design and construction in national and state parks. Under these circumstances, difficult and complex construction could be successfully undertaken by the CCC. If the CCC program was originally intended to reclaim a generation of unemployed youths by employing them in forestry activities, the great potential of using their labor to build national, state, and local parks became clear within the first months of the program. The political rewards of building new parks for hundreds of local communities also obviously exceeded those of less functional forestry projects.[15] As Herbert Evison later observed, "From the moment it was realized that the CCC could legitimately be

---

[13]Several summaries of Park Service CCC activities have been published by the Park Service. See John C. Paige, The Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Park Service (Washington, DC: National Park Service, 1985); Harlan D. Unrau and Frank G. Williss, Administrative History: Expansion of the National Park Service in the 1930s (Denver: Government Printing Office, 1982); Linda Flint McClelland, Presenting Nature: The Historic Landscape Design of the National Park Service, 1916-1942 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1993), 195-268.

[14]Kenneth F. Jones, "Emergency Conservation Work," Landscape Architecture 24, no. 2 (January 1934), 29-30.

[15]Tweed, et al., Rustic Architecture, 88-89; Newton, Design on the Land, 576-585; Wirth, Parks, Politics, and the People, 114. Wirth tells of being personally instructed by Franklin Roosevelt in the fall of 1933 to undertake more ambitious state park development projects with CCC labor.

utilized to perform Emergency Conservation Work on State parks, the State park situation underwent, for good or evil, the most radical change in its seventy-year history."[16]

Another reason for the success of CCC camps in the case of national parks were the master plans that Thomas Vint and his colleagues had already developed for virtually every national park and monument by 1933. The plans outlined many useful and carefully designed improvements that were waiting to be implemented. In the fall of 1933, Vint relocated from San Francisco to Washington, and his title was changed from "chief landscape architect" to "chief architect."[17] By 1934, the landscape architecture division had been renamed the "branch of plans and design." In the rapidly growing San Francisco office, Vint's assistant William Carnes took over as head of the "western division" of the branch of plans and design; the "eastern division," which remained under Charles Peterson, moved to Washington as it also took on dozens of new staff.[18] As Vint's design division grew to many times its former size, the procedures and policies he had instituted remained in effect. Experienced Park Service landscape architects, such as Ernest Davidson, Merel Sager, John Wosky, Kenneth McCarter, Harry Langley, Herbert Krellenkamp, and Howard Baker were ready to supervise scores of fresh recruits, many of whom were well qualified but had no experience in park planning. In 1933, Vint assigned each of these veterans responsibility for a "district" (a cluster of national parks), assuring that in every area of the park system new design staff would be supervised by someone he had personally trained in San Francisco.[19]

Established master planning procedures continued to guide the park planners of Vint's branch of plans and design as the CCC and other New Deal Programs, especially the Public Works Administration (PWA) invested unprecedented labor and capital in the national park system. In state park design, as well, Park Service landscape architects adapted Vint's master planning process to guide state and local park developments. In this case, Park Service planners created state park master plans that mimicked the larger national park master plans in their basic format. There were differences in the state plans, of course, besides their scale. Scenic preservation remained a major goal for state parks as it was for national parks; but state park design, done in cooperation with local park authorities, naturally incorporated a wider and more varied range of recreational uses within a smaller area. If the basic procedures of national park master planning were easily adapted to state parks, different policies determined how much and what type of landscape development would be deemed appropriate in the state reservations. State park design was also administered separately within the Park Service. While chief forester John Coffman remained in overall charge of Park Service CCC programs,

---

[16]Herbert Evison, "Recent Progress in State Parks," in American Planning and Civic Annual, Harlean James, ed. (Washington, DC: American Civic and Planning Association, 1935), 164-166.

[17]In 1938, Vint's title changed again to "chief of planning." Thomas C. Vint, Personnel Information Sheet, United States Civil Service Commission, July 1, 1940. Thomas C. Vint Collection, Papers of Charles E. Peterson.

[18]Thomas C. Vint and J.R. Thrower, eds., Report on the Building Program from Allotments of the Public Works Administration, Eastern Division, 1933-1937, unpublished report (Washington, DC: National Park Service, n.d. [1937]), 1; Unrau and Williss, Expansion of the National Park Service in the 1930s, 249.

[19]Charles Peterson had of course been in charge of the "eastern division" since 1931. Russ Olsen, Administrative History: Organizational Structures of the National Park Service, 1917-1985 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1985), 51.

state park CCC "planning and cooperation" was supervised out of the "branch of lands" at the Park Service. Vint's new branch of plans and design remained primarily concerned with work related to federal properties; the branch of lands, located in a parallel position on the Park Service organizational chart, took responsibility for all state and local park planning. In 1934, the branch was renamed the "branch of recreational land planning," and in 1936 it became the "branch of recreation, land planning, and state cooperation," indicating the growth and development of its activities.[20] After 1934 it was usually referred to simply as the "branch of planning." The assistant director in charge of the branch was a young landscape architect named Conrad L. Wirth, who had joined the Washington office in 1931.

Wirth was the son of the famous Minneapolis park superintendent, Theodore Wirth, and through his father he had many contacts with prominent figures in the American park movement. He had graduated from Frank Waugh's landscape program at the University of Massachusetts, and later went into business with a partner in New Orleans. When the Gulf Coast real estate market collapsed in 1927, the landscape architect was thrown out of work. Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., subsequently arranged for him to be hired by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, where Wirth was in charge of investigating and reporting on potential additions to the Washington park system. Three years later, when the position of assistant director in charge of land planning opened up at the Washington office of the Park Service, Horace Albright asked Wirth to transfer and take over similar planning responsibilities for the national park system.[21]

Wirth's position as the chief land planner at the Park Service made him a logical choice to organize state park planning efforts in 1933. At that time, many states did not yet have state park systems or even a single state park. In order to capitalize on federal work relief programs (especially the CCC), the first requirement for many states was to draft a recreational land use plan to guide the acquisition of new parkland. Wirth's experience investigating and reporting on potential national park areas would serve him well while he assisted in planning the expansion of dozens of state park systems after 1933. Managing CCC state park planning nationwide was a daunting organizational task, and Wirth also proved to be a capable administrator. He quickly established official relationships with local governments that made it possible for the Park Service to "cooperate"--that is, provide extensive planning and design assistance--without ever suggesting that local authorities were being bypassed or overruled by a federal bureau. This was a massive and sometimes delicate bureaucratic feat, which Wirth performed with great aplomb and enthusiasm over the next eight years.

Herbert Evison, the executive secretary of the National Conference on State Parks, was enlisted to assist Wirth, and together they administered CCC state park planning through the regional administrations established in 1933. The "district officers" of this shadow park service included leading figures from the state park movement. Lawrence Merriam, the California forester, headed the Western district office in San Francisco. Paul V. Brown, an important figure in Indiana state parks, led a Midwestern district in Indianapolis. John M. Hoffman, who had been commissioner of Pennsylvania state parks, ran the Eastern district in

---

[20]Olsen, Organizational Structures of the National Park Service, 53.

[21]Wirth, Parks, Politics, and the People, 11-15, 32.

Washington. Perhaps most significantly for the subsequent history of Park Service design, Herbert Maier, the architect of the Yellowstone trailside museums, was hired as the regional officer for the Rocky Mountain district in Denver.[22] They were an impressive group, and with the resources of the Park Service and CCC behind them, they were prepared to implement what would have only recently seemed visionary state park plans.

Over the next several years the CCC was acclaimed as an unqualified success of the New Deal. New state parks all over the country were particularly convincing evidence of the value and permanence of the work being done by the CCC boys. The state parks were designed by scores of planners and landscape architects who, whether supervised by state park departments ("local park authorities") or directly by the Park Service regional offices, were paid through federal funds and met standards for their work imposed by Conrad Wirth and his associates.[23] Wirth insisted that the arrangement was "an extension of the understandings that were developed in 1921 when the National Conference on State Parks was organized," based on a purely voluntary "exchange of ideas"; but the desirability of CCC state park camps and funding gave the Park Service far greater leverage with local governments than Wirth acknowledged.

Local park authorities submitted applications for the assignment of CCC camps based on state recreational land use plans--usually part of an overall state plan--that identified desirable state park areas based on a statewide survey of land suitabilities and characteristics. The Park Service district offices reviewed the applications, supervised park planning, and assigned the camps. State park departments (where they already existed) hired professionals to prepare park plans, procured all supplies and materials, and generally were in direct control of their park projects. Of course they did all this with the federal money disbursed to them as part of the CCC program, and the Park Service oversaw and supervised every aspect of park planning and development. Wirth's state park CCC program hired regional inspectors (just as the national park CCC program did) who were usually professional designers or engineers of some standing. Very early in the state park program, when Wirth felt that "the planning and development operation was not up to standard" in many states, he reminded his inspectors (and indirectly state park officials) that failure to meet design and construction standards would result in the loss of CCC state park camps. It was an effective if indirect threat, and Wirth reported receiving excellent cooperation from both his regional inspectors and local park authorities once the point was made.[24]

As chief of state park planning and cooperation at the Park Service, Wirth instituted far-reaching policies in 1933 and 1934. At the 15th annual National Conference on State Parks, held at Skyland, Virginia in 1935, Wirth summarized his planning policies. He felt that state

---

[22]Wirth, Parks, Politics, and the People, 76-78.

[23]According to Herbert Evison, Wirth himself established "central design offices" within state park departments, staffed by landscape architects, engineers, and planners on his CCC payroll. Although they technically were state park employees, they answered directly to Park Service officials who paid them and oversaw their work. Herbert Evison, "Civilian Conservation Corps in the National Park Service," transcribed interview, University of California, Berkeley: Forestry, Parks and Conservation Oral History Collection, No. 14, 1963, p. 41.

[24]Wirth, Parks, Politics, and the People, 110-113.

parks (and for that matter all parks) should be considered in two categories: those set aside for "conservation," and those set aside "primarily for recreation." The two types, he added, might be joined or separated, and "one might even completely surround the other, forming a multiple-use area." But Wirth also warned his planners that they should "always bear in mind the distinction" between conservation and recreational areas, and "forever seek a means of separating these two types." Inappropriate or poorly sited recreational development would simply degrade conservation areas, he explained, something which too often occurred because of public and official pressure to develop recreational facilities. In either category, proposed state parks were also required to meet certain standards that would distinguish them from county or municipal parks. For the conservation category, proposed state reservations should contain "the outstanding natural scenic areas of the state." The plants, wildlife, and geologic features of the area also should "attract State-wide recognition." Areas suitable for recreational development, on the other hand, were often more difficult to select since they did not possess the obvious scenic features that qualified an area in the conservation category. To know where state recreational developments were needed, extensive statistical and demographic information needed to be compiled for surrounding populations. Selecting recreational areas also required imagination to "visualize how . . . barren land," which otherwise might be overlooked, "could be transformed to serve good recreational purposes" near cities and towns in need of such areas.[25]

If the task of national recreational planning was huge, tremendous resources had been made available. Herbert Evison estimated that in 1934, 700 landscape architects, architects, and engineers, working for various local park authorities but paid through CCC funds administered by the Park Service, were engaged in state park planning. This total did not include the 220 professionals employed by Vint's branch of plans and design by 1936, or those working as supervisors and foremen in national park CCC camps. Thomas Vint's assistant, William Carnes, later recalled that of the 1,000 or more design and engineering professionals directly or indirectly supervised by the Park Service during the mid-1930s, about 400 were landscape architects--a figure that suggests more members of the profession were working for the Park Service at the time than were not.[26] By 1934, five states that previously had no state parks had acquired between one and six, and 20 other states had acquired new parks and added to existing ones. By 1935, 600,000 acres of state parkland had been added to the national total. That summer, 90,000 CCC boys were at work building state parks in 475 camps. The CCC was either already developing or planned to develop one half of the total of 3.5 million acres of state parkland in the country.[27]

---

[25]Conrad L. Wirth, "Parks and Their Uses," in American Planning and Civic Annual, Harlean James, ed. (Washington, DC: American Civic and Planning Association, 1935), 156-161.

[26]William G. Carnes, "Landscape Architecture in the National Park Service," Landscape Architecture 41, no. 4 (July 1951), 145-150. Intense demand created what were sometimes called "instant landscape architects," and at least some of those counted as landscape architects by Carnes must have been originally trained as engineers or architects.

[27]The five states that previously had no state parks were Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Virginia, and South Carolina. Herbert Evison, "The Civilian Conservation Corps in State Parks," in American Civic Annual, Harlean James, ed. (Washington, DC: The American Civic and Planning Association, 1934), 181-185; Newton, Design on the Land, 580; Department of the Interior, 1934 Annual Report, 168-169.

For all the state parks developed by the CCC, the Park Service oversaw the production of detailed master plans, reviewed planning decisions, and inspected park construction. Conrad Wirth's Washington office was directly involved with design reviews, as were the regional office staff and regional inspectors. The state park master plans were miniature versions of national park master plans, and as such they graphically illustrated the degree to which Wirth was building on the landscape architectural practice developed by Thomas Vint. Like the national park plans, the state park master plans typically were composed of a series of maps and more detailed drawings which together showed the full extent and character of all development for a park. Certain areas, especially of larger state parks, were intended to remain undeveloped "conservation" areas, analogous to the "wilderness" zones of national park master plans. Roads, fire roads, and trails would be kept to a minimum, but would allow access to the most important scenic and other features of interest in the park. Developed areas in the park, drawn at more detailed scales, were divided between overnight campgrounds, day use areas, and other specialized uses.

Among significant differences between the state park and national park master plans was the relative proportion of developed areas in each. More activities were considered appropriate for state parks and they were planned for a smaller total area. Swimming, boating, and fishing were among the most popular outdoor recreations, and so the creation of at least one lake was often the centerpiece of state park plans, whereas dam construction would have been anathemized in a national park plan. If swimming pools, ball fields, and other recreational facilities figured prominently in state park plans, however, such recreational areas were often juxtaposed to significant tracts of woodland developed only with hiking and bridle trails. And as in national park plans, development was concentrated in limited areas, along a road corridor for example; the two types of parkland Wirth described were kept as separate as possible.

Within the first two years of the beginning of the CCC program, Wirth's state park organization within the Park Service influenced the operations of the Park Service as a whole, and the entire project of national recreational planning began to coalesce in the aggregate activities of the Park Service and the over 140 state, county, and municipal authorities with which it eventually cooperated. As the state park CCC program grew, it became desirable to combine all Park Service CCC planning rather than continue with parallel organizations to administer state park and national park CCC projects. Considering the size and scope of the state park operations, Director Cammerer decided in 1936 that Conrad Wirth should assume the administration of both state and national park CCC work, taking over chief forester John Coffman's responsibilities. All CCC planning (for national as well as state parks) would then be administered out of the CCC regional offices Wirth had set up.[28] One implication of this consolidation was to effectively regionalize most of the Park Service; 70 percent of the bureau's personnel--the proportion involved in CCC related work--were brought under the supervision of the regional offices by this action.[29] While Arno Cammerer was consolidating the Park Service CCC programs, he was also proposing a complete regionalization plan that would further consolidate Conrad Wirth's recreational planning division with the rest of the

---

[28]In January 1936, the number of CCC state park regions was reduced from eight back to four, in part because of a reduction in the number of CCC camps. Paige, The CCC and the National Park Service, 48-51.

[29]Wirth, Parks, Politics, and the People, 118-119; Unrau and Williss, Expansion of the National Park Service in the 1930s, 252.

Park Service. Four new Park Service regional offices were proposed to replace and absorb the CCC regional offices; all Park Service operations were to be brought together in a consolidated, but regionalized, administration.

The Park Service, at the center of so much New Deal activity, had rapidly assumed new and expanded responsibilities in direct response to the social and environmental policies of the Roosevelt administration. The New Deal had remade the Park Service into an instrument of "national planning"; the Park Service, in turn, articulated defining policies for that national plan. The integration of national and local recreational planning and the increased emphasis on the recreational uses of land in general were unique opportunities to realize the full potential of park planning in the United States.

The substantial role of Park Service officials in New Deal "national planning" had begun during the Hundred Days of 1933. When Secretary of the Interior Ickes assumed the administration of the PWA, he knew that the plans for public works prepared in advance by groups like the Park Service would only go so far. To guide massive public works spending efficiently, some form of national planning authority was needed to coordinate the projects proposed by federal, state, and local organizations. Ickes therefore organized the National Planning Board within the PWA. Chaired by Frederic A. Delano, then president of the American Civic Association, the new group found an energetic executive director in landscape architect Charles W. Eliot II, who transferred from the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. The national board, which changed its name several times over the next 10 years, immediately encouraged states to initiate coordinated state plans, including the plans for expanded state park systems that became the basis for state park CCC work. Although the National Planning Board could no more than suggest such cooperation from state governments, it was understood that future work relief spending might be influenced by such plans, and within one year 35 states had initiated state planning efforts. By 1936 every state (except Delaware) had at least begun a state plan.[30]

From its beginning, the National Planning Board relied on the Park Service as the best available source for information and advice on the recreational needs and trends of the nation. In 1934 the board, now renamed the National Resources Board, asked the Park Service to begin a comprehensive national study of "national and state parks and related recreational activities." To undertake the study, a "recreation board" was set up within the Park Service, headed by Herbert Evison and George M. Wright, chief of the wildlife division.[31] The report was presented that fall, but in the words of one of the planners, "It was evident, from our first considerations, that the requisite information was not available. The time allotted . . . was all too brief."[32] The only definitive conclusion in 1934 was that a more comprehensive national survey of recreational resources was indeed needed, and that year Secretary Ickes began

---

[30]Mel Scott, American City Planning Since 1890 (Berkeley: University of California, 1969), 300-310.

[31]Department of the Interior, 1934 Annual Report, 171, 183-184; National Resources Board, A Report on National Planning and Public Works in Relation to Natural Resources (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1934), 144-147.

[32]Ben H. Thompson, "The Park, Parkway, and Recreational Area Study," in American Planning and Civic Annual, Harlean James, ed. (Washington, DC: American Planning and Civic Association, 1937), 210-213.

pressing Congress for legislation that would allow the Park Service to undertake such a project. In June 1936, Congress passed the Park, Parkway and Recreational-Area Study Act, which effectively validated and extended the role the Park Service had already assumed as the nation's recreational planning agency. The law authorized the Park Service to undertake a truly comprehensive national survey of all types of recreational areas, and to use that information to assemble a plan that would coordinate the activities of federal land agencies and local park authorities to meet the future recreational needs of the country. The bill also contained provisions which allowed the Park Service to fund the planning activities of local park authorities, and which gave consent for two or more states to cooperate in completing regional surveys of recreational resources.[33]

The 1936 Park, Parkway and Recreational-Area Study Act marked the high point of the CCC's promise, and therefore of the Park Service's role as a national recreational planning authority.[34] Once the bill became law, Arno Cammerer appointed Conrad Wirth as chairman of a special Park Service "recreation committee," and Wirth also replaced Secretary Ickes as the Interior representative on the CCC advisory council. Wirth's renamed "branch of recreation, land planning, and state cooperation" compiled the ambitious plan, and CCC emergency conservation work appropriations paid for it.[35] The National Resources Board, now called the National Resources Committee, provided assistance and advice. In January 1937, the Park Service recreation committee distributed a procedural manual instructing state and local governments on what the national recreational survey was intended to be and how they could help assemble the needed information. The committee described the "problem of recreational land use" in the United States: although there had been stunning growth in state park systems since 1933, much of it had, "of necessity been based on inadequate planning," resulting sometimes in "unhealthy growth" and "ill-suited and unneeded development of available lands." Wirth suggested that each state conduct a comprehensive survey of "existing park, parkway, and recreational facilities," and of "potential areas . . . for acquisition and development." These surveys could then be compiled by the Park Service and become the basis of a "comprehensive report on a Nation-wide basis."[36]

States responded quickly to the call to organize recreational planning efforts. In 1938, 43 states arranged to participate in the study, and seven states completed tentative final reports. By 1941, when the Park Service published the completed study, 34 states had contributed finished surveys which were condensed and published as an index of national recreational resources. The final report, titled A Study of the Park and Recreation Problem of the United States, summarized the philosophy of New Deal recreational planning. As Secretary Ickes wrote in its forward, "The proper use of leisure time is a fundamental problem of modern society . . . . Outdoor recreation answers this need." The secretary described the fundamental

---

[33]Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Procedure for Park, Parkway and Recreational-Area Study (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1937).

[34]In his memoirs, Wirth claims that the 1936 act "plays a key role in the history of parks in the United States." Wirth, Parks, Politics, and the People, 166-172.

[35]Kieley, A Brief History of the National Park Service, 37.

[36]Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Procedure for Park, Parkway and Recreational-Area Study, 3-5.

goal of the Park Service planning activities: "To establish the basis for coordinated, correlated recreation land planning among all the agencies--Federal, state, and local--having responsibility for park and recreational developments."[37]

The physical results of unified, national recreational planning soon appeared. A plethora of new parks--and new kinds of parks--were planned and developed to meet outdoor recreational needs at every level. The national park system acquired some of its most extensive "wilderness" parks during the 1930s, including Everglades, Big Bend, Kings Canyon, and Olympic national parks. At the same time, the bureau created new categories of national parks that were unlike earlier scenic reservations. The typological expansion had already begun under Horace Albright with the creation of new historical parks at Yorktown, Virginia and Morristown, New Jersey; the 1933 transfer of national military, battlefield, and historic sites, monuments, and memorials accelerated the process. Conrad Wirth's planners, however, backed by the CCC, 47 state park departments, and other New Deal agencies and programs, introduced whole new categories of national and state parks. They were aided in these efforts by the federal acquisition of vast areas of land beginning in 1933. The Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA), for example, was authorized to provide funds to buy out farmers who were cultivating "submarginal land" at a loss to themselves as well as the environment. The land was to be put to other uses, and in some cases it was suitable for recreational purposes; thousands of acres were transferred to Wirth's branch of planning at the Park Service, which developed the areas as "demonstrations" of recreational planning and use. Most of these demonstration areas were later turned over to local park authorities; other remain today part of the national park system. The Bureau of Reclamation, building new dams in the West with New Deal funds, created hundreds of miles of new lakeshore, which the Park Service made plans to develop for boating, swimming, and other recreational uses. In the Appalachians, national parkway projects connecting the new Eastern mountain parks similarly opened up opportunities for outdoor recreational activities. By 1941, the Park Service had built or was planning at least four distinct new kinds of national parks, called recreational demonstration areas, national recreation areas, national parkways, and national seashores.[38]

But of all contributions made by professional landscape architects to the manifold social and economic experiments of the New Deal, no physical expressions more completely captured the aspirations, innovations, and characteristic spirit of the era to a greater degree than the hundreds of state and local parks built by the CCC and designed by the Park Service in cooperation with local park authorities. This field of park design--state park and recreational planning--was not so much expanded by the New Deal as created by it. To this day, many states owe the origins of their state park systems and the majority of facilities in them to the labor of CCC recruits and the landscape design and planning of Park Service professionals. National recreational planning at this scale consummated the long and mutually influential relationship between the Park Service and American landscape architecture. The state parks produced through this partnership remain today among the most potent symbols of New Deal idealism.

---

[37]Department of the Interior, National Park Service, A Study of the Park and Recreation Problem of the United States (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1941), v.

[38]Department of the Interior, National Park Service, A Study of the Park and Recreation Problem, 52; Mackintosh, Shaping the System, 58-59.

Among the hundreds of examples of many different kinds of state parks this partnership produced, however, none were more charged with the social ideals of New Dealers than the "recreational demonstration areas." This was in part because these demonstration projects, developed on federal land acquired mostly through FERA programs, not only represented the ideals of scenic preservationists and landscape architects, they also embodied the aspirations of "group camp" advocates, who for decades had sought to make summer camps and other organized camps an integral aspect of the larger state park movement.

The movement to promote group camping, or "youth camping," had been growing since before World War I. The camping movement also drew on an older tradition of bible camps and summer camps organized by various religious groups in the decades after the Civil War. National organizations, especially the Young Men's Christian Association, had become important advocates for group camps since that time. By the 1880s, organized camps for both boys and girls had been established by private groups in New York and in several New England states. But in the early 20th century, many of the Progressive reformers who had advocated playgrounds for children in crowded cities also were soon organizing "fresh air" camps to bring the same children out of the city altogether at least for a few weeks. When the Boy Scouts of America was founded in 1910, the organization (like its British predecessor) made group camping a fundamental experience for young scouts; the Campfire Girls (1910) and the Girl Scouts (1912) also made summer camps essential parts of their programs.

By 1924, L. H. Weir, the field secretary of the Playground and Recreation Association of America, reported at the annual meeting of the National Conference of State Parks that "organized groups or massed camps for boys and girls and for adults have increased very rapidly within the past ten years." Weir estimated that up to a million campers--mostly children--were taking part in 5,000 to 6,000 organized camps being operated nationwide that summer. Most of these camps were conducted on property owned or leased by the camping organizations themselves; but Weir foresaw the day when this inherent limitation on the size and number of group camps might be overcome. "There is no question that large State Park and Forest reservations are destined to play an important part," he predicted, "in providing opportunities for that splendid form of outdoor life represented by the organized camp."[39]

But state park advocates and group camp organizers, at least up to this point, were not always the same people. The state park movement had mostly emphasized the preservation of historic sites and scenic areas outside of cities. Group camp organizations had concentrated on social issues in the cities, and especially on improving the lives of urban children. Much as municipal park departments embraced the playground movement in the first decade of the century, however, state park officials had begun to welcome camping organizations into state parks by the 1920s, even if concerns were expressed over the intensive use such arrangements would entail. The great precedent for the state park as a site for group camping was Palisades Interstate Park (in New York and New Jersey), where by 1924 the park's superintendent, Major William A. Welch, provided sites for no fewer than 81 "fresh air" organizations from the New York City region.

---

[39]L. H. Weir, "Group Camping," A State Park Anthology, Herbert Evison, ed. (Washington, DC: National Conference on State Parks, 1930), 165.

Major Welch began this wholesale embrace of group camp organizations in 1913, and the Palisades quickly became the national center and exemplar for park development of this type. Among Major Welch's early admirers were Stephen Mather and Horace Albright, both of whom were very familiar with Bear Mountain and the other units of the Palisades park system. The group camp movement expanded rapidly during the 1920s, as "recreational specialists" and social workers brought their increasingly professional attentions to the cause. Many aspects of the operation and design of group camps were worked out at this time and have remained fundamentally unchanged since then. By the mid-1920s, the peculiarly American institution of the summer camp had taken shape. No less an authority on education than Charles W. Eliot, who died in 1926, suggested that the "organized summer camp is the most significant contribution to education that America has given the world."[40]

But the group camp phenomenon, if it remained limited mostly to private or leased property, would never achieve the dimensions it could as an integral part of the larger state park movement. Many state park systems were also expanding rapidly in the 1920s, and Palisades Interstate Park offered a tantalizing example of how state parks could accommodate group camps on a far larger scale than would otherwise be possible. Besides Major Welch's success in accommodating such camps, however, there had been few major collaborations between state park managers and group camp organizations.

After 1933, however, the expansions of state park systems underway all over the country were recognized by many officials within the New Deal--and by Conrad Wirth in particular--as an unprecedented opportunity to provide sites for private non-profit groups to expand their organized camping operations. The development of new kinds of parks specifically suited for these activities, however, did not get underway until February 1934, when FERA made $25 million available for the acquisition of submarginal agricultural lands. Other New Deal programs, including the CCC, were not empowered to acquire land for new parks. But the FERA "Land Program," begun in 1934 and directed in part by the secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, was intended to identify and acquire submarginal agricultural lands and, hopefully, to put the lands to more beneficial uses. Farmers and their families, trapped on farms that could not turn a profit, were to be relocated as part of the program. Soil erosion and other destructive effects of inappropriate land uses were to be abated; "land use planning," based on soil, climate, and other conditions, was to be implemented.

If in some cases crop land was converted into range or planted with forests, in other cases recreational land uses were recognized as appropriate. Here the Park Service planners, specifically Conrad Wirth's branch of planning, were asked to take responsibility for identifying and developing new federal "recreational demonstration areas" (RDAs), which would demonstrate various types of new park development, and hopefully encourage states to undertake similar efforts. In April 1935, the FERA Land Program was reorganized and folded into Rexford G. Tugwell's Resettlement Administration, which assumed control over the money for land acquisitions, including the land for new RDAs. By November 1936, however, Wirth's planners (who chafed under this arrangement) assumed complete control of the acquisition and development of RDA projects. By 1941, the Park Service had acquired nearly

---

[40]Eliot, the father of landscape architect Charles Eliot, was quoted in Department of the Interior, National Park Service, "The National Park Service in the Field of Organized Camping," 1937 Yearbook: Park and Recreation Progress (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1938), 38.

400,000 acres in 24 states for RDAs, most of which were developed by the CCC. Harvard landscape architecture professor Norman T. Newton, who was himself a regional CCC inspector at this time, later suggested that the RDAs were "perhaps the most remarkable collateral product of CCC days."[41]

The generic term "recreational demonstration project" at first referred to a number of different types of demonstrations the Park Service established with the help of the FERA funds for acquiring land. Pieces of land as small as 20 acres were acquired for highway "wayside" parks, while in other cases tracts of land up to 20,000 acres were acquired as extensions to existing state and national parks. But the type of demonstration project that quickly caught the imagination of the New Dealers (and which became known specifically as the "recreational demonstration area") was the large park of 5,000 to 20,000 acres devoted specifically--but not exclusively--to the accommodation of group camp organizations. These projects were not, according to the Park Service in 1936, "national parks, state parks, county parks, metropolitan parks, or forests of any technical classification. They are newcomers to the recreation field--part of a recreational awakening." The RDAs were not intended to compete with or replace existing park systems, in other words, they were "vitally needed adjuncts to these parks, providing facilities for low-cost recreation in the form of organized camps--a special service to the cities' lower-income groups."[42]

One of the first of these new parks to be completed opened in the summer of 1937, south of Washington, DC, in Virginia. Known as Chopawamsic, the area has been retained as a federal property today known as Prince William Forest Park (in part perhaps because it is surrounded on three sides by the Quantico U.S. Marine Reservation). The Park Service and Resettlement Administration planners who collaborated on the project reported that more than 100 families had been living in the 15,000-acre project area around the Town of Joplin. The farmland, however, was exhausted, local businesses were dying, and many of the families in question "had suffered extreme poverty" and were on various forms of relief. Some of the families were relocated to new farms, some remained, others left the area on their own after being bought out. The land was then developed with artificial lakes, and three large, well separated sites for group camp operations: a boys' camp, a girls' camp, and an area for "family groups." The planners insisted that "a program of dual value is thus being perfected. . . . The people of the cities are to have, without cost, a share of the good earth and the health and happiness that goes with it; and poverty stricken farmers are to have a new chance."[43]

Perhaps no other type of New Deal project more fully exemplified the ambitious social goals of many planners within the Park Service, the Department of Agriculture, and other federal agencies. Chopawamsic was soon joined by dozens of other RDAs all over the country, many of which began receiving campers in 1938 and 1939. It was soon apparent, however, that not

---

[41]Paige, The CCC and the National Park Service, 117-118; Norman T. Newton, Design on the Land (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1971), 588.

[42]Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Recreational Demonstration Projects as Illustrated by Chopawamsic, Virginia (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1936), 2.

[43]Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Recreational Demonstration Projects as Illustrated by Chopawamsic, 6.

all the social goals for the RDAs were compatible. At the Park Service, for example, the criteria for locating new parks was based primarily on the topographic, demographic, and scenic qualities of proposed areas. As a result, the "dual value" that had been pressed as a goal in 1935 and 1936 (mostly during the year and a half the RDA program was under Tugwell's authority) was rarely achieved. "Submarginal" agricultural land with appropriately impoverished inhabitants simply could not be counted on to meet Park Service requirements for new state parks. Adequate group camps sites required low-lying areas, for example, with substantial streams running through them that could be impounded to create lakes for swimming and boating. But such sites often included the most fertile and productive land in a given region; the exhausted soils of subsistence farms were more often located on higher slopes, away from the rich bottomlands. The higher elevations of a site might be acquired, but they would be of limited use for recreation without the lakes that could be created below.[44]

Scenic preservation also remained a concern for Park Service landscape architects, who were naturally interested in at least considering the visual interest of different areas when determining the locations of new RDAs. The criteria of professional park planners in selecting and developing new projects simply did not coincide with the goals of agricultural reformers, such as Tugwell. The conflicts made the collaboration between the Park Service and the Resettlement Administration untenable. In 1936, when the Park Service assumed complete control over the RDA projects, it also secured the power to make land acquisitions based on the desirability of the land for recreational purposes, not just on the pretext of its "submarginal" usefulness for agriculture.

If Conrad Wirth found that the purposes of park development and those of agricultural reform frequently crossed, a more harmonious relationship soon developed between the Park Service and the professional educators and social workers who had advocated organized group camping over the previous 20 years. In this case, the goals of group camps and those of state parks could be successfully combined in the design of a new kind of state park that would accommodate camping organizations in some areas, and day use visitors in others. Recreational specialists, like L. H. Weir, had described in detail how state parks could accommodate group camps already by the mid-1920s. In order "to function effectively as centers for organized camping," Weir wrote in 1924, the new parks should provide "a source of pure water for domestic purposes, . . . an area of such size to permit the orderly layout of the camp, . . . water for swimming, boating, canoeing, etc. . . . [and] a site that is not too far from the home communities of the campers." Again drawing on the Palisades as the best example of such a park, Weir also described the specific types of buildings that ideal group camps would require, including the dining hall, the recreation building, sleeping tents or cabins, latrines, and wash houses.[45]

For Weir and other social reformers, the ultimate goal of organized camps was to give children the experience of "outdoor life" that (it was felt) was essential to build physical health, moral character, and social skills. The layout and design of the camps therefore expressed, at least to some degree, ideal social relationships. "The planning of camp-sites is city planning in

---

[44]Newton, Design on the Land, 589.

[45]L. H. Weir, "Group Camping," 166-169.

miniature," as Weir put it. The size of camping groups, the relationship of buildings to one another, and the overall layout of the camps were all the subject of careful consideration based on their perceived effects on the physical and emotional health of the children that would inhabit--and perhaps be shaped by--their experience in these ideal cities.

It is interesting to note, therefore, that many group camp advocates were not sure at first that Park Service landscape architects would be able to contribute in constructive ways to the design of the RDAs. Julian H. Salomon, a camp advocate who became a "recreational specialist" at the Park Service in 1933, recalled in 1936 that "I never realized that a landscape architect could ever contribute anything to a camp until I went down to Washington and sat next to Lou Croft [Park Service landscape architect Louis P. Croft] . . . I have learned a great deal from him." In fact, Salomon (who went on to become a leading expert on group camp management and design for decades) and other recreational specialists hired by the Park Service participated in a remarkable period of collaboration with Conrad Wirth's planners between 1933 and 1936. During that time, dozens of state parks designed specifically to accommodate organized camping associations were designed for sites all over the country.

In May 1936, the planners held their first significant national conference on the subject of organized group camps and state parks. The conference was held at the Girl Scouts training center, Camp Edith Macy, in Briarcliff Manor, New York. The location was a recognition of influence not only of the Girl Scouts, but of the other national organizations (many of which were headquartered in nearby New York) that had led the group camp movement since before World War I. At the conference, Salomon gave a detailed description of Park Service policies for "camp layout and structures" as they were being implemented at Chopawamsic and dozens of other sites. The policies Salomon described were the fruitful hybrid of state park design as practiced by Conrad Wirth, and group camp philosophy as described by L. H. Weir and others.

Salomon began by noting that up until 1933, state parks had not in fact provided as many opportunities for group camps as they might have. This was understandable, since without careful planning, the activities of day use visitors potentially would detract from the successful operation of camps, which needed privacy and some isolation. Salomon continued by reporting that according to the surveys and other research that he and the branch of planning had done, camp operators preferred camps of about 80 to 100 campers apiece. In making typical plans for camps of that size, the Park Service had also decided on a "unit type layout," which permitted the children of a large camp to be divided into smaller groups, based on age and interests, and which also allowed closer contact between children and camp counselors.

The "camp units" Salomon described recalled the contemporary city planning ideal of the "neighborhood unit," advanced by the architect Clarence S. Stein and others. But in the case of the organized camp, the unit was to consist of 16 to 32 campers; the camp itself would therefore be comprised of three to four units. The distance between units might vary, according to Salomon, but the general rule was to allow about 600 feet, so that they would be "out of sight and hearing of each other." Privacy, in other words, was "the first requirement of a unit site just as it [was] the first factor to be considered in selecting a camp site." Salomon went on to describe the required dimensions and other features of campers' cabins and other buildings. Counselors' cabins were to be located near the center of each unit. A "unit lodge," which was "the living room, recreation hall, and all purpose shelter" of the unit, was also a

"most important building." A small outdoor kitchen could be attached to the exterior of the unit lodge. Each unit also had its own wash house and latrine.

The camp itself was arranged, at a larger scale, along the lines of the individual units. The camp administration building, Solomon advised, "should be the first one to be reached in approaching the camp," with a nearby parking area that would handle most vehicular traffic arriving at the camp. Although functionally the center of operations for the camp, the building did not need to be at its physical center; it should however be roughly equidistant from the three or four units that made up the camp, and within walking distance from each. Nearby the administration building, the dining hall and kitchen complex also served the entire camp. An infirmary, staff quarters, a recreation hall, and a craft shop also were part of the central administrative group, around which the units of the camp were evenly clustered.[46]

The plans Solomon described were the result of intensive collaboration between landscape architects and recreational planners. The two groups had been brought together on an unprecedented scale within Conrad Wirth's branch of planning. Wirth attended the conference at Camp Edith Macy, where he was received warmly and given great credit for the recent advances in both state park design and organized camping. Wirth himself (typically) deflected the credit back to his audience. The RDAs, he insisted, represented "an accumulation of study and effort of people who were never in the Park Service." His planners and administrators had "analyzed those [efforts] and picked out what we thought were the best."[47] In his later memoirs, however, Wirth clearly regards the organized camps of the RDAs among his most significant contributions to the New Deal state park effort. Without the Park Service planners and programs, the camping organizations never would have been able to exploit the opportunities of the New Deal as effectively. Wirth credits in particular Matthew C. Huppuch, his deputy, who supervised the RDA program. The other chief RDA planners in Washington included Peter DeGelleke, Charles H. Gerner, Julian Salomon, and Fay Welch.[48]

The power and funds to acquire large tracts of land (a power that neither the CCC nor the PWA programs possessed) made the RDA program the locus of some of the most important planning decisions made by the Park Service during the New Deal. By 1937 Wirth was overseeing the construction and operation of 32 RDAs devoted specifically (if not exclusively) to organized group camping. All of these were intended to be given to state park departments as they were completed and states agreed to take them on. The lands acquired through the RDA program also were used to create Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, Hopewell Village National Historic Site, and the Kings Mountain National Military Park; they also extended areas of the Blue Ridge Parkway, Acadia National Park, and state parks all over the country.

---

[46]Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Proceedings of Conference on Camp Planning Held at Camp Edith Macy, Briarcliff Manor, New York, May 20-23, 1936 (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1936), 70-86.

[47]Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Proceedings of Conference on Camp Planning Held at Camp Edith Macy, 96.

[48]Wirth, Parks, Politics, and the People, 189.

There were a total of 46 projects described as RDAs in 1937, but nine of these were in fact simply additions to the national park system--either new parks or additions to existing ones. Two more of the RDAs were demonstrations of highway "wayside" parks, a popular idea that never achieved substantial success, although state and federal highway designers later incorporated "rest areas" into limited access highway design. Five large state parks were expanded through the RDA program, including Pine Mountain, in Georgia, and Lake Guernsey, in Wyoming. The remaining 31 RDAs were completely new RDA projects, intended to become state parks eventually.

Of the total of 46 RDA state park projects, 34 had planned group camp facilities, and the term RDA eventually was used specifically to describe these 34 group camp/state park developments. As Conrad Wirth recalls in his memoirs, "the RDAs were the main purpose of the larger [RDA] program," meaning that it was the large state parks with organized camping facilities that received the most attention from Wirth and the RDA program. By 1941, over 200,000 acres had been acquired to build the 34 group camp/state parks; beginning in 1942, all but two were given to their respective state park departments. (In addition to Chopawamsic, a portion of the Catoctin Mountain RDA was retained in the federal system; a portion of the park had been developed as the presidential retreat FDR called "Shangri-La" and which Eisenhower renamed Camp David.) The RDAs were all intended to be located within 50-100 miles of major metropolitan populations. Wirth also wanted the RDAs to be at least 10,000 acres, because in addition to their role as sites for organized camps, he wanted them to be large enough to function as state parks for the general public as well. Ten thousand acres generally meant enough land for both purposes, with the opportunity ideally to develop substantial lakes for both groups of users.[49]

Today, the RDAs developed by the Park Service, working with CCC or WPA labor, have survived with various degrees of integrity. Almost all have remained state parks, although many have retained only a portion of their original buildings, and others no longer serve the group camp organizations that had been the original impetus for the parks. The RDAs that remain intact, functioning, and in good condition, however, have a startling power to recall the social idealism of the New Deal.

Of the 34 RDA sites with group camps, however, two are outstanding for the artistic significance of their original design and planning, combined with extraordinary integrity and excellent condition. These two RDAs also continue to serve their original functions--as organized camps and public day use areas--and have done so virtually without interruption since the late 1930s. The first, St. Croix State Park in Minnesota, was the largest of all the RDAs and one of the most beautiful in terms of its setting. It was built by the CCC and the WPA. The other, Mendocino Woodlands, was one of only two RDAs developed for the West Coast. It too has an extraordinary setting, but it also is the most significant remaining example of the WPA "transient camps," the adult work camps that worked extensively (like the CCC) in the RDA program. Both are being nominated as NHLs as part of this study because of their significance as the finest remaining results of the RDA program.

---

[49]Wirth, Parks, Politics, and the People, 176-192.

Unlike many states, California already had a vigorous and storied history of state park development in 1933. Yosemite Valley, by virtue of the federal Yosemite Grant of 1864, became the nation's first state park. In the early 20th century, extensive logging of Coast Redwoods precipitated a response by scenic preservationists anxious to save some of the old growth stands. The Sempirvirens Club was organized in 1900, and after a concerted public relations campaign succeeded in having the California Legislature pass a 1901 bill authorizing a California Redwood Park Commission. Over the next 10 years, the commission acquired thousands of acres of old growth Coast Redwoods, including the California Redwood State Park in 1902. In 1918, another private group in California, the Save-the-Redwoods League, was organized and successfully lobbied for more Coast Redwood reservations to the north.[50] One of the those most active in the Save-the-Redwoods League was Stephen Tyng Mather, who in 1917 had become the first director of the National Park Service.

By 1924, California already had 13,000 acres of parks in just five of its reservations, most of which, like the California State Redwood Park and the Humboldt State Redwood Park were created to preserve Coast Redwood groves. Other states, including New York, Iowa, and Wisconsin had drawn up important state park plans during the 1920s, as well; but no state park plan of the period proved more significant than the State Park Survey of California completed by Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., in 1929. In 1927, the California State Legislature established a state park commission and authorized it to undertake a comprehensive survey to determine the "ultimate development of a comprehensive, state park system" as a means of "conserving and utilizing the scenic and recreational resources of the state."[51] The commission immediately hired Olmsted, already well known in the state for his advocacy of national and state parks and as the planner of Palos Verdes Estates (1923), the town where he also built a home for his family in 1927. Olmsted, in turn, consulted with several California landscape architects over the next two years, including Daniel R. Hull, who had only recently left his position as chief landscape architect with the Park Service, who was now in private practice in Los Angeles. The state park plan became a procedural blueprint for scientific and comprehensive state park planning, as well as the basis for the development of California's exceptional state park system.[52]

When the Park Service arrived in California in 1933, it found a large state park system and a well established State Park Commission. The Park Service's efforts in California were much more of a collaboration than they were in many states. Many of the most important figures of the Park Service were themselves native Californians, including Stephen Mather (who died in 1930), Horace Albright, Thomas Vint, and many others. In 1933, the former chief engineer of the Park Service, Frank Kittredge, was appointed to be the "District IV" (Western district) director for the CCC regions being established under Conrad Wirth. The former chief landscape architect of the Park Service, Daniel Hull, returned to the Park Service as a regional

---

[50]Joseph H. Engbeck, Jr., State Parks of California from 1864 to the Present (Portland, Oregon: Graphic Arts Center Publishing Co., 1980), 29-33, 41-43.

[51]Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., Report of State Park Survey of California (Sacramento: California State Printing Office, 1929), 3.

[52]Olmsted, State Park Survey, 9, 39-53; Engbeck, State Parks of California, 47-56; Newton, Design on the Land, 572-575.

inspector in 1933, and then became the chief planner for the California State Park Commission in 1934. Later, Lawrence C. Merriam, an important figure in California state forestry and parks, was appointed director of the new Park Service "Region VIII," which included California and the Pacific Northwest. Kittredge continued as his associate director, and remained especially involved in planning and design issues.

In no other state were state park and national park officials so closely associated. In addition, the size and geographical diversity of California and its many scenic attractions, combined with a vigorous desire in the state to develop outdoor recreational opportunities as much as possible, soon made the California state park system one of the largest and best developed in the country. The CCC was to have an enormous impact in California, as elsewhere; but interestingly, the WPA was to play an even greater role providing labor for the expansion of roads, trails, observation towers, swimming areas, and many other facilities in state parks. The WPA, through individual construction projects and through the "transient camps" of up to 400 laborers apiece, played a proportionally larger role in developing state parks in California than in most other states.

This was certainly the case for the largest of the new parks developed in California during the New Deal: Mendocino Woodlands RDA. The Mendocino Woodlands project was built almost entirely by WPA workers, drawn from local relief and unemployment roles. The CCC, in this case, played only support roles, undertaking trail construction and other projects, leaving the construction to the more experienced laborers and craftsmen recruited through the WPA. The Mendocino Woodlands RDA project was originally authorized to cover 6,120 acres of cutover, burned over, and clear cut Redwood forests near the rocky coast of Mendocino County. Over $1,000,000 of construction was also authorized, in addition to "CCC projects of miscellaneous nature." The work was performed by a 400-man WPA camp located within the park site, and by CCC boys drawn mostly from the camp established at nearby Russian Gulch State Park.[53]

According to a Resettlement Administration press release dated December 1935, options on the Mendocino Woodlands park site had already been obtained, and "heads of families taken from relief roles in the vicinity" would be put to work soon. According to the Park Service, the area was perfectly suited for RDA development, "because of scenic beauty, its location within five miles of the coast and on the first slope of the Coast range, and because of its accessibility to a large metropolitan area." The small farms and apple orchards in the area were to be "taken down by the development crews and the land restored to its natural state." In other areas, the Redwood forest would be allowed to continue to regenerate, "restoring it to its natural forest state."[54]

---

[53]T. F. Arvola, "Prospectus, Mendocino Woodlands," 1947, State Park Archives, Department of Parks and Recreation, State of California, PO Box 942896, Sacramento, CA 94296-0001. The Department of Parks and Recreation retains miscellaneous textual records regarding the history of Mendocino Woodlands and other state parks. The agency's map file also conserves extensive original drawings from the period, including several editions of drawings for the Park Service master plan for Mendocino Woodlands, dated 1935-1937.

[54]Resettlement Administration, Division of Information, Press Release, December 16, 1935. Entry 47, RDA Program Files, 1934-1937, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

The woodlands around the Town of Mendocino featured precipitous slopes, small rivers, scattered clearings, and rapidly regenerating Redwood and pine groves. These picturesque forests already had begun to attract the campers, hikers, and sightseers who were traveling up and down the scenic coastline. The potential for stimulating tourist businesses in what were otherwise extremely depressed rural areas had already led to the creation of numerous state parks along the coast, as well as proposals for connecting scenic highways.

As the master plan for the Mendocino Woodlands project began to take shape in the fall of 1935, one of the first observations made by Conrad Wirth and Matthew Huppuch in Washington was that the surrounding state parks made the Mendocino project slightly different from other RDAs (such as the St. Croix RDA). In a letter to Joseph W. Crouch, the Park Service regional projects manager for Region VIII, Wirth and Huppuch commented on the first draft of the master plan. "Since our major objective in the development of a Recreational Demonstration Project is to provide organized camping," they wrote, "the greater portion of the area, if not the entire area, should be devoted to organized camping." The numerous state parks around the RDA, they noted, "could accommodate all the public use facilities such as: picnic grounds, overnight cabins, etc."[55]

This observation, together with many specific revisions on even very detailed points of design, were reiterated in later correspondence. Wirth was particularly concerned with what were becoming standard design policies. The road system needed to be simplified, for example, and no through roads should be planned. The camps should accommodate no more than 100-150 campers, divided into at least three units. Each unit should be 600 feet from the next, and all should be clustered around central dining, recreation, and administrative facilities. Each group camp, in turn needed to be completely separated from the others for the maximum amount of privacy. All the basic points developed at the RDA division of Wirth's branch of planning were systematically reinforced through the planning review process. Variations were of course allowed, but only after they had been well justified. And not only the overall plan was reviewed; every aspect of the site plans and architectural designs received the same extraordinary attention from both the San Francisco and the Washington offices of the Park Service.

By the spring of 1936, a "general development plan" approved by Wirth and the Resettlement Administration approved funds to accelerate work at the site and initiate the major construction. In a long memorandum to his counterparts at the Resettlement Administration, Wirth described the project--and also expressed his impatience with the need to justify his work to a bureau within the Department of Agriculture. Point by point, however, he justified every aspect of the plan, including unit costs, the lay out of the camps, the number of proposed new lakes (one), and even the fate of purchased motor vehicles once the project was complete.[56] Wirth's irritation with these bureaucratic arrangements was evident; in November 1936, however, the Park Service assumed complete control and jurisdiction over all aspects of the RDA program.

---

[55]Conrad Wirth to Joseph Crouch, November 20, 1935, Entry 47, RDA Program Files, 1934-1937, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[56]Conrad Wirth, "Mendocino Woodlands General Development Plan," memorandum, April 1936, Entry 47, RDA Program Files, 1934-1937, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

Whatever the review process, however, the Mendocino Woodlands master plan was primarily the work of Robert E. Floyd, the park landscape architect, Raymond E. Hoyt, a Region VIII recreational planner, and A. E. Cowell, a regional engineer. The park architect, C. G. Lundgren designed the great majority of the cabins, dining halls, and other buildings in the park.[57] Daniel R. Hull, the former Park Service landscape architect, should also be credited as the regional inspector, and then the state park official, with direct responsibility for the work at Mendocino. William H. Gibbs was the project superintendent on the construction site.

By the winter of 1936, the project was well underway. The number of WPA enrollees in the "transient camp" building the park seems to have varied from as many as 350 to as few as 90. By the end of the year, however, the sites for the first group camps had been cleared, the logging town of Boyles had been demolished (and salvaged), and the Park Road was serviceable for trucks. The work was followed closely by the Mendocino Beacon, understandably since the project certainly must have been the largest single employer in the region at the time. The paper reported that topographical and road surveying, fire suppression, and other activities were underway at "Boyle's camp," in addition to the construction of the group camps. The administration building and the Camp I Dining Hall were among the first buildings to be completed. A contract for 95,000 board feet of lumber was awarded to the Union Lumber Company, which was undoubtedly a boon to that local company, and illustrated the larger importance of New Deal spending to local economies.[58]

In 1938, the first group camp, Camp I, opened at Mendocino Woodlands. Construction continued, however, on dozens of buildings. Water and sewage systems were under construction, as was a telephone system, swimming facilities, foot bridges, and "landscape naturalization" around the completed construction projects. Listed by regional associate director Frank Kittredge as "priority number one," the Mendocino project continued to employ large numbers of WPA workers, as well as occasional crews from state park CCC camps, although the latter were "a long haul from the site of major development" at Mendocino.[59]

By 1943, all three group camps had been completed, and park managers estimated that "average camper-days of use per year" had been 10,500. In 1942, the Park Service was authorized to turn over all of the RDAs to the states, which had been an intention of the RDA program from its inception in 1934. Not all states, however, were eager to take on responsibility for the new parks. In 1947, the Mendocino Woodlands was finally transferred to the State of California, not to the State Park Commission, but to the State Division of Forestry, where it was incorporated into the Jackson State Forest. The Division of Forestry, unable to assume the management of group camps, turned the group camps themselves over to the Mendocino Woodlands Camp Association, a private non-profit group created in 1948. This association has managed the property ever since for the benefit of the many camping

---

[57]These attributions are based on the signatures on planning and working drawings conserved at the Department of Parks and Recreation office in Sacramento, and on correspondence in the National Archives, RG 79, Entry 47. Floyd and Lundgren, in particular, were directly responsible for design and construction drawings.

[58]Mendocino Beacon, February 15, 1936; March 7, 1936; April 11, 1936.

[59]Frank Kittredge, memorandum to the director of the National Park Service, October 21, 1937, Entry 47, RDA Program Files, 1934-1937, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

organizations and other groups that have come to rely on the site for their activities. The group camp facilities finally were transferred to the Department of Parks and Recreation in 1976, and a 720-acre state park, the heart of the original Mendocino RDA, has officially existed since that time. (The boundaries of the park were determined in the 1976 legislation.)

The significance of the Mendocino Woodlands RDA NHL District has several levels. The RDA program itself was one of the most characteristic and idealistic programs of the entire New Deal; the parks that are its legacy are a unique record of that period of American history. Mendocino Woodlands is one of two outstanding remaining examples. As a California state park, as well, Mendocino Woodlands is a remarkable record of the cooperation between the Park Service, the California State Park Commission, the CCC, and the WPA. No other state park in California, or even in the Western region, better embodies this legacy with as high a degree of integrity.

9. MAJOR BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

Clar, C. Raymond. California Government and Forestry from Spanish Days Until the Creation of the Department of Natural Resources in 1927. Sacramento: Division of Forestry, Department of Natural Resources, 1959.

Cutler, Phoebe. The Public Landscape of the New Deal. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

Dewitt, John B. California Redwood Parks and Preserves. San Francisco: Save-the-Redwoods League, 1985.

Emergency Conservation Work, Office of the Director. Annual Reports of the Director of Emergency Conservation for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1936-1940. 5 vols. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Engbeck, Joseph H., Jr. State Parks of California: 1864 to the Present. Portland, Oregon: Graphic Arts Center Publishing Co., 1980.

Evison, Herbert. "The Civilian Conservation Corps in State Parks." In American Planning and Civic Annual, Harlean James, ed. Washington, DC: American Planning and Civic Association, 1934.

Evison, Herbert, ed. A State Park Anthology. Washington, DC: National Conference on State Parks, 1930.

Good, Albert H. Park and Recreation Structures. 3 vols. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1938; reprint, Boulder: Graybooks, 1990.

Harrison, Laura Soulliere. Architecture in the Parks: National Historic Landmark Theme Study. Washington, DC: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1986.

McClelland, Linda Flint. Presenting Nature: The Historic Landscape Design of the National Park Service, 1916 to 1942. Washington, DC: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1994.

Olmsted, Frederick Law, Jr. Report of State Park Survey of California. Sacremento: California State Park Commission, 1929.

Paige, John C. The Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Park Service, 1933-1942; An Administrative History. Washington, DC: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1985.

Roland, Carol. CCC Resources in the State Park System; An Inventory. Sacramento: California Department of Parks and Recreation, 1991.

Salmond, John A. The Civilian Conservation Corps, 1933-1942: A New Deal Case Study. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1967.

Torrey, Raymond H. State Parks and Recreational Uses of State Forests in the United States. Washington, DC: National Conference on State Parks, 1926.

Tweed, William C., Laura E. Soulliere, and Henry G. Law. National Park Service Rustic Architecture: 1916-1942. Unpublished report. Washington, DC: Department of the Interior, Main Interior Library, 1977.

Unrau, Harlan D., and Frank G. Williss. Administrative History: Expansion of the National Park Service in the 1930s. Denver: Government Printing Office, 1982.

U.S. Department of the Interior. National Park Service. An Invitation to New Play Areas. Pamphlet. Washington, DC: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, n.d.

Wirth, Conrad L. The CCC and Its Contribution to a Nation-Wide State Park Recreational Program. Washington, DC: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, n.d. [ca. 1940].

_____. Parks, Politics, and the People. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980.

Previous documentation on file (NPS):

___ Preliminary Determination of Individual Listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested.
___ Previously Listed in the National Register.
___ Previously Determined Eligible by the National Register.
___ Designated a National Historic Landmark.
___ Recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey: #_____
___ Recorded by Historic American Engineering Record: #_____

Primary Location of Additional Data:

___ State Historic Preservation Office
_X_ Other State Agency
___ Federal Agency
___ Local Government
___ University
___ Other (Specify Repository):

10. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

Acreage of Property: 720 acres

UTM References:

	Zone	Easting	Northing		Zone	Easting	Northing
A	10	441360	4354800	**B**	10	441360	4354400
C	10	440340	4354400	**D**	10	440340	4354000
E	10	439940	4354000	**F**	10	439880	4351620
G	10	438700	4351620	**H**	10	438730	4352000
I	10	439110	4352020	**J**	10	439120	4352800
K	10	439520	4352820	**L**	10	439560	4354820

Verbal Boundary Description:

The boundary of the Mendocino Woodlands Recreation Demonstration Area is defined by the park's current statutory boundary shown on the accompanying USGS map.

Boundary Justification:

The boundary encompasses the historic developed areas associated with the Mendocino Woodlands Recreational Demonstration Area.

11. FORM PREPARED BY

Name/Title: Ronnie James, Ethan Carr

Org.: National Park Service

Street/#: 800 North Capitol Street

City/Town: Washington

State: DC

ZIP: 20002

Telephone: 202-343-8148

Date: January 6, 1997