NPS Form 10-900
(January 1992)

OMB No. 10024-0018

United States Department of Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations for individual properties and districts. See instructions in *How to Complete the National Register of Historic Places Registration Form* (National Register Bulletin 16A). Complete each item by marking "x" in the appropriate box or by entering the information requested. If an item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, architectural classification, materials, and areas of significance, enter only categories and subcategories from the instructions. Place additional entries and narrative items on continuation sheets (NPS Form 10-900A). Use a typewriter, word processor, or computer, to complete all items.

1. Name of Property

historic name Anvil Lake Campground Shelter

other names/site number FS Site No. 09-06-02-260

2. Location

street & number Anvil Lake Road & STH 70 N/A not for publication

city or town Eagle River N/A vicinity

state Wisconsin code WI county Vilas code 125 zip code 54521

3. State/Federal Agency Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act, 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 X meets ___ does not meet the National Register criteria. I recommend that this property be considered significant ___ nationally ___ statewide X locally. (___ See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

Evan J. DeBloois 4-1-96
Signature of certifying official/Title Date

Federal Preservation Officer Forest Service
State or Federal agency and bureau

In my opinion, the property X meets __ does not meet the National Register criteria.
(__ See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

3/21/96
Signature of certifying official/Title Date

State Historic Preservation Officer-WI
State or Federal agency and bureau

Anvil Lake Campground Shelter — Vilas County, Wisconsin
Name of Property — County and State

4. National Park Service Certification

I hereby certify that the property is:
- ✓ entered in the National Register.
  - __ See continuation sheet.
- __ determined eligible for the National Register.
  - __ See continuation sheet.
- __ determined not eligible for the National Register.
  - __ See continuation sheet.
- __ removed from the National Register.
- __ other, (explain:) _____

Signature of the Keeper — Date of Action: 5/21/96

5. Classification

Ownership of Property (check as many boxes as apply)
- __ private
- __ public-local
- __ public-state
- x public-federal

Category of Property (Check only one box)
- x building(s)
- __ district
- __ site
- __ structure
- __ object

Number of Resources within Property (Do not include listed resources within the count)

Contributing	Noncontributing	
1		buildings
		sites
		structures
		objects
1	0	Total

Name of related multiple property listing (Enter "N/A" if property is not part of a multiple property listing.)

N/A

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register

none

6. Function or Use

Historic Functions (Enter categories from instructions)

RECREATION & CULTURE/outdoor recreation

Current Functions (Enter categories from instructions)

RECREATION & CULTURE/outdoor recreation

7. Description

Architectural Classification (Enter categories from instructions)

LATE 19TH AND EARLY 20TH CENTURY AMERICAN MOVEMENTS

Materials (Enter categories from instructions)

foundation CONCRETE
walls Log
roof ASPHALT
other Iron
STONE

Narrative Description

(Describe the historic and current condition of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

7. Description

Anvil Lake Campground Shelter sits on a small, level terrace along of a hillside above the southeast shore of Anvil Lake, one of many small lakes dotting Oneida and Vilas counties. It is located just west of a surfaced parking lot and campground placed above it along the ridge. Anvil Lake Road leads from the lot to STH 70 about 1000 feet to the southwest and continues south around Lake Anvil. The lake occurs ten miles east of Eagle River in Vilas County, in the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 24, township 40 north, range 11 east. The picnic shelter which includes bathhouse facilities faces northwest toward the lake. A mixed hardwood and conifer forest surrounds the shelter and covers the hillside down to the sandy beach below. Steps composed of railroad ties and lined with a wood post and board fence climb the hill between the beach and the shelter. The fence also encloses the shelter and its immediate grounds to the front and sides. A barrier composed of boards and secured with posts and rubble stone walls and steps along each end act as a retaining wall along the rear of the hillside. The property includes the shelter counted as one individually eligible building and its setting, the surrounding clearing, the wooded hillside, the steps between the shelter and the lake, and the beach. Erected in 1936 (Civilian Conservation Corps 1933-43 [records of camp F-2, boxes 236-37, 1934-36]; Vilas County News-Review 1936 [1/30: 6/4; 10/1: 5/3; 12/17: 5/1].), the picnic shelter/bathhouse displays architectural elements associated with the Rustic Style.

Enclosing a single level, the rectangular building measures 33 feet northeast-southwest and 21 feet northwest-southeast. The building includes the picnic shelter in the southwest three-fourths and the bathhouse in the northeast quarter. The horizontal log building with U-shaped, saddle notching stands on a concrete foundation. Sheathing and asphalt shingle cover the gently sloped, gable roof. The bark was removed from the rounded logs which were then roughly smoothed and stained brown. The ends of the logs of the walls are not cut flush at the corners. The logs are tightly fit together and are not chinked. The walls include a centrally located opening on both the front and rear elevations of the bathhouse portion. The sides of these openings slant inward near the eaves. Squarish window openings pierce both the front and rear walls adjacent to the side elevations. A massive, rubble stone, exposed end chimney rises along the center of the southwest elevation and through the roof. Rafters and purlins are exposed. Three, vertical board doors enter into the two end rooms and the center storage area of bathhouse along the northeast side elevation. Wrought iron strap hinges and latches secure the doors.

The interior walls and ceiling of the shelter and bathhouse are unfinished and the floor is concrete. Exposed timbers support the roof in each of the two sections. The interior of the picnic shelter includes a rubble stone fireplace with a roughly shaped wood mantle centered on the southwest wall. A sign board finished with timber surrounds occupies the center of the opposite wall. A half-timber bench resting on log supports is placed along the southwest corner. The bathhouse portion of the shelter includes two small changing rooms at either end of the northeast elevation and a center storage room.

Elements of the Anvil Lake Campground Shelter common to the Rustic Style include the roughly finished log and stone materials, overlapping corners with saddle notching, the massive chimney, broad roof, wide eaves, exposed purlins, rafters and roof supports, roughly fashioned doors, broad interior stone fireplace, log bench and sign board, and use of wrought iron hardware (Draeger 1986 [1993]).

The building has undergone little alteration. Recently placed vertical boards repair deteriorated portions of the doors along the northeast side elevation. Asphalt shingles now replace the original wood shingle roofing. Two window openings on the front and rear elevations that originally opened into the bathhouse are now closed. Vents were added to the front and rear of the roof. The log bench may represent replication of the original bench or benches. The setting has also undergone some modification. The post and rail fence along the steps and adjacent to the shelter, the board retaining wall, and steps composed of railroad ties (probably once logs or stone) represent alteration to the setting. Overall, the Anvil Lake Campground Shelter and its immediately adjacent setting retain high physical integrity. The shelter itself has undergone minor alterations, and the forested surroundings and vista over the lake remain. Changed elements of the setting which blend well with their surroundings represent areas which commonly undergo rapid deterioration.

8. Statement of Significance

Applicable National Register Criteria
(Mark "x" in one or more boxes for the criteria qualifying the property for the National Register listing.)

_x_ A Property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

___ B Property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

_x_ C Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.

___ D Property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Criteria Considerations
(Mark "x" in all the boxes that apply.)

___ A owned by a religious institution or used for religious purposes.

___ B removed from its original location.

___ C a birthplace or grave.

___ D a cemetery.

___ E a reconstructed building, object, or structure.

___ F a commemorative property.

___ G less than 50 years of age achieved significance within the past 50 years.

Areas of Significance
(Enter categories from instructions)
POLITICS/GOVERNMENT
ARCHITECTURE

Period of Significance
1936 (1)

Significant Dates
1936 (1)

Significant Person
(Complete if Criterion B is marked above)
N/A

Cultural Affiliation
N/A

Architect/Builder
unknown

Narrative Statement of Significance
(Explain the significance of the property on one or more continuation sheets.)

9. Major Bibliographic References

Bibliography
(Cite the books, articles, and other sources used in preparing this form on one or more continuation sheets.)

8. Significance

Statement of Significance

The Anvil Lake Campground Shelter is locally significant under National Register criterion A in the area of government and under criterion C in the area of architecture. The Anvil Lake shelter was one of the early products of a new federal policy implemented in 1935 to increase recreational usage within the national forests. In response to the natural, financial, and social crisis of the Depression Era, the federal government implemented several national work programs, including the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), to gainfully engage and train the unemployed, financially assist their families, and add useful public works to communities. Playing a significant role in these recovery programs of the 1933-1942 period was the USDA's National Forest Service. The Forest Service, which was founded in 1905, possessed the technical expertise to oversee new conservation programs and it also administrated many of the lands on which this conservation work was first implemented. One of the new issues that these programs had to deal with was the degree to which the national forest lands should be utilized for recreational purposes. The Forest Service finally developed an administrative policy regarding recreation in the national forests in its Copeland Report but did not create its Division of Recreation and Lands to oversee this new function until 1935, after which it began to design relatively complex recreational facilities. The CCC provided the labor force that allowed the Forest Service to not only pursue appropriate conservation measures within the forest, but also to build these recreational facilities. The Anvil Lake shelter is a fine, representative example of the projects constructed by these programs.

The Anvil Lake Campground Shelter is also a fine example of the Rustic Style of Architecture common to parks and forests of the early and mid-1930s. Its Rustic Style features include the use of roughly shaped materials, low, broad lines, exposed structural members, and the absence of added decorative elaboration. The site of the shelter retains much of the original setting developed by the CCC including the beach and (with some changes) the immediate landscaping along the terrace and the hillside between the beach and the shelter. The building acquired significance in 1936, the year of its construction (Civilian Conservation Corps 1933-43 [Records of Camp F-2, boxes 236-37, 1934-36]; Vilas County News-Review 1936 [1/30: 6/4; 10/1: 5/3; 12/17: 5/1]). The significance date is represented by the year of its construction. The shelter is significant at the local level as a fine, largely intact, and representative example of the several Depression Era park shelters that were constructed within the Nicolet National Forest.

Historical Background

Anvil Lake is one of many small lakes which surround the city of Eagle River and characterize the forested lands in Vilas and Oneida counties. Logging operations began cutting the white pine along the streams and lakes adjacent to Eagle River

in ca. 1858. They became extensive between 1885 and 1900. During this period, the industry drew an influx of population to work in the camps in the area of Eagle River and the mills to the south in Rhinelander. Although sawmills were initially established in the Eagle River area, the length of time required to move timber to market led these companies to relocate their mills to the south. As railroads extended their tracks into the area in the late nineteenth century, its population expanded. Settlement stabilized sufficiently in the early 1890s to establish Vilas County, previously part of Oneida and Forest counties, and place its county seat at Eagle River. The county attained its current boundaries in 1905. Logging operations cut most of the timber in the area by 1910. The logging of hardwoods revived the industry during the second and third decades of the twentieth century. Established in 1919, the Thunder Lumber Company purchased the mill and lands of Robbin's Rhinelander Lumber Company and rebuilt and extended the logging railroad along the east side of Anvil Lake. This company cut most of the timber from the Anvil Lake area by ca. 1940 (Anvil Lake Property Owners' Association n.d.: 6, 34, 37; Becker 1952: 43; Dunn 1978: 70-71).

When logging declined after the turn of the century, reuse of the cutover lands for agriculture appeared to be one viable economic alternative. Farmers maintained small dairy herds and raised such crops as potatoes, oats, hay, and garden vegetables. However, because of its poor thin forest soils and the short growing season, Vilas County proved to be a marginal farming region. The region was already economically depressed as a result of the poor farm economy of the early 1920s and a period of harsh weather in the early 1930s. This led to the abandonment of many farms across northern Wisconsin including the area adjacent to Anvil Lake and Eagle River. Initially established in the area in 1885 along Catfish Lake and growing more rapidly as railroad connections moved closer in the 1890s, the tourist industry began to grow in the 1920s. It catered primarily to Chicago's elite. The industry stabilized around Eagles River in the 1930s and began to expand in the early 1940s. Attempting to revitalize the economy through its work projects, the National Forest Service recognized this economic attraction and established campgrounds, picnic areas, beach facilities, hiking trails, ski trails, and similar recreational facilities in Nicolet National Forest during the 1930s and early 1940s (Anvil Lake Property Owners' Association n.d.: 24, 31, 34, 37-38, 40; Brown 1986; Dunn 1978: 70).

Private individuals purchased lands along Lake Anvil just after the turn of the century. A mercantilist, banker, and a Wisconsin Secretary of State, Dr. John Froehlich purchased the first tract along the south side of Anvil Lake in sections 13, 23 and 24 of the Town of Lincoln or township 40 north and range 11 east in 1898. These lands served as his summer vacation home at the turn of the century and remained within his family. William Froehlich indirectly sold some of these lands including the ones occupied by the Anvil Lake Campground with its picnic shelter to the National Forest Service to create the Nicolet National Forest in the early 1930s. The Forest Service acquired the land for the Anvil Lake Campground directly from S.D. Austin on December 12, 1934 (USDA Forest Service 1934-81 [land records, case no. 88 1934]). Adjacent land owners established an association in 1927 to improve the area's public service, particularly the roads. They subsequently cooperated with the National Forest Service who began purchasing large tracts of land in the area by the end of the

1920s. This involvement may have attracted several of the 1930s CCC camps to the Eagle River vicinity. These joint improvements included the building of a fire tower at the north end of Lake Anvil, road improvements, and the stocking of the lake (Anvil Lake Property Owners' Association n.d.20-23; Anonymous n.d. [map]).

Area of Significance: Government

The Anvil Lake Campground Shelter is a fine representative example of a resource type that is among the significant legacies of the National Forest Service's program to preserve, maintain, and manage the resources of the nations's national forests between 1933 and 1942. Several of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal programs benefitted both the conservation of lands within the national forests and their recreational development. These programs were largely implemented by the Civilian Conservation Corp under the direction of the Forest Service and the work at the Anvil Lake site performed by the CCC under the direction of the Forest Service is typical of the types of projects that were accomplished by these programs in the Nicolet National Forest and in other national forests.

The contemplation and enjoyment of nature had become a pastime for the wealthy in the United States by the 1870s. Nature was viewed as the necessary balance to the problems of life in large, congested cities. It offered fresh air, healthful activities, and a source of spiritual revival. Initially developed in the Adirondack Mountains of New York in the 1870s, resorts catered to the increasing demand for outdoor recreation. The Yosemite, Yellowstone, Grand Canyon, and other areas in the West developed from this same impetus. The Rustic Style of architecture emerged to house this resort movement (Schmitt 1969: xix-xxv; Steiner 1970 [1933]: 34-61; Reiger 1975: 50-73; Dulles 1965 [1940]: 321-26; Tweed et al. 1977: 27-48). Thus, the style, concern for the conservation of natural resources, and use of those resources in recreation were interrelated movements emerging in the late nineteenth century, maturing in the early decades of the twentieth century, and sustained and advanced by the Depression Era programs of the New Deal.

The Development of the American Conservation Movement and the Creation of the National Forest Service

Both the National Forest Service and the Civilian Conservation Corps had their origins in the American conservation movement. This movement can trace its own beginnings to the Romantic movement in literature by the early and mid-nineteenth century writers. Ralph Waldo Emerson and Henry David Thoreau eulogized nature and questioned the supposed benefits of civilization. However, George Perkins Marsh's 1864 Man and Nature Or, Physical Geography as Modified by Human Action advanced a much more specific and scientific discussion of the exploitation of natural resources. Particularly concerned with the ecology of forests and the consequences of deforestation, Marsh argued even by this early date that human activities can harm the environment. His book became an international classic within ten years. It tremendously influenced the formation of a favorable public

climate toward the role of the Federal government in forest conservation during last quarter of the century (West 1992: 1-2; Nash 1967: 44-66, 84-95; 1990: 13-18; Huth 1957: 30-57; Davies 1983 (2); Clepper 1971: 14-15).

In 1867, Increase Lapham prepared an equally significant report on the condition of Wisconsin forests. Commissioned by a special conservation commission created by the Legislature, his Report on the Disastrous Effect of the Destruction of Forest Trees Now Going on so Rapidly in the State of Wisconsin clearly stated the potential for serious environmental and economic consequences if lumbering continued uncontrolled by the state (Carstensen 1958: 6-9). The report brought no change in Wisconsin during the nineteenth century. Among the consequences which Lapham had found in his study was the increased potential for disastrous forest fires. The Peshtigo fire in northeastern Wisconsin in October, 1871, was one of the most destructive fires in American history (West 1992: 3).

Forest fires such as the one at Peshtigo led many public leaders to call for governmental action concerning American Forest lands. In 1873, Franklin B. Hough, a scientist and physician, spoke at the 1873 meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science on the duty of governments to preserve forests. In 1876, the United States Congress directed Hough, the head of the new Division of Forestry in the Department of Agriculture, to prepare a study on the conditions of American forests. The findings of Hough's study confirmed the growing concerns over the rapid depletion of forests and heightened pressure for Federal control of forests (Huth 1957: 174; Clepper 1971: 17-19; Williams 1989: 277-78, 376-77, 400, 449-50).

In 1886, a permanent Division of Forestry was established in the Department of Agriculture under the direction of Bernhard E. Fernow. A Prussian professional forester, Fernow had been active in American forestry since his arrival in the United States in 1876. Fernow and his colleagues in the American Forestry Association worked within government for the protection of the forests. This work culminated in a central piece of legislation in the history of American conservation, the Forest Reserve Act of 1891 (West 1992: 27-29; Williams 1989: 409-12; Davies 1983: (1): 234; Robbins 1985: 7; Clepper 1971: 23-28). Congress passed the act as a rider to a bill revising land laws. It gave the President authority to create forest reserves from public lands. Within weeks, President Benjamin Harrison set aside the first forest reserve composed of almost 1,240,000 acres of public land known as the Yellowstone Forest Reserve and later as the Shoshone and Teton National Forests in Wyoming. By the end of his term, President Harrison had ordered the withdrawal of 13 million acres of forest reserves. In addition, President Grover Cleveland added over 20 million acres before the close of his term of office in 1897.

Because the Forest Reserve Act failed to define the purpose of the reserves, it frequently barred potential users from their resources. The rapid growth of the forest reserves between 1891 and 1897 and the mounting concern of western landowners for their lack of management led to an appropriations bill amendment, the Forest Management Act. It defined the purpose of the 1891 act as watershed protection and the provision of a source of timber for the nation. Also known as the Organic Act, this act thus authorized logging on the reserves. However,

this act omitted other potential uses of the reserves such as forage, recreation, and wildlife management. It gave Congressional authority for the organization and management of Federal forest reserves to the General Land Office in the Department of the Interior. The Forestry Division in the Department of Agriculture provided the technical expertise for its operation. The 1897 Organic Act served as the basis for forest management by the Federal government until the passage of the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960. Only then did the government actually sanction the additional uses of the forest reserves (Williams 1989: 414-16; Steen 1976: 103-45; West 1992: 30-32, 51; Clepper 1971 102-34; Davies 1983 (1): 222; Robbins 1988: 8; Smith 1930: 20-22).

The General Land Office administered the forest reserves by grouping them into eleven districts and appointing a superintendent for each district, a supervisor for each reserve, and rangers for work within the reserves. When Gifford Pinchot was appointed head of the Division of Forestry in 1898, he developed more efficient management policies for the reserves in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture. Pinchot was a fellow conservationist and close friend of Vice-President Theodore Roosevelt. After Roosevelt became president following the assassination of President McKinley in September, 1901, Pinchot and Roosevelt worked closely together on conservation policies. Pinchot soon recognized that the national reserves possessed many uses each of which required management to fill both current and future needs.

By the beginning of 1902, Roosevelt was considering the transfer of the forest reserves from the General Land Offices to Pinchot's Bureau of Forestry in the Department of Agriculture. In that year, the Department of the Interior issued an administrative manual which reflected Pinchot's theories on forest management. In effect, Pinchot was directly heading the Division of Forestry in Agriculture, and indirectly controlling the operations of the Forestry Division in Interior. By early 1905, Congress approved the transfer of the forest reserves from Interior to Agriculture, and on July 1, 1905, the Bureau of Forestry became the United States Forest Service. The new agency gained responsibility for the administration of 63 million acres in sixty forest reserves, all located in the western United States. In 1907, the forest reserves were renamed national forests. But, legislation ended the presidential authority to create national forests and forbade the creation or enlargement of forests in six western states without Congressional approval. However, Congress continued to expand the national forests. Between 1905 and 1907, Roosevelt and Congress added over 130 million acres to the 1905 transfer acreage of 63 million acres. At the 1908 Conservation Conference of Governors, Roosevelt stressed the need to manage natural resources including soil, water, forests, and minerals, and at this early date he advised the creation of a national resources plan (Nash 1968: 59; West 1992: 30-32, 37-39; Steen 1976: 69-103; Smith 1930: 27-34; Elliott 1977: 35; Pinkett 1970; Otis 5, 40-45; Wirth 1980: 17,43).

The national forests had been created from lands located entirely in the western states and held in the public domain. To protect forested watersheds and meet the recreational needs of large urban populations, influential political groups in eastern states pressed the federal government to create forests in the eastern states. Federal acquisition of the eastern forest lands was possible only

through purchase. However, since the federal land policy had been one of disposal rather than acquisition, the Constitution failed to provide the government explicit authority for land purchase. Passed in March, 1911, the Weeks Act authorized the federal purchase of lands at the headwaters of navigable streams. The specified location of land purchase recognized the importance of forests in flood protection. Popular support grew from a desire for government involvement in forest fire protection. The first instance of federal funding of non-federal programs, the law also provided matching funds to create state forestry agencies who became involved in fire control programs. National forests had been created in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, and Oklahoma from lands remaining in the public domain. The Weeks Act permitted additions to these forests and the creation of new national forests through purchase (Steen 1976: 122-31; Robbins 1985: 50-84; West 1992: 41-43).

As head of the Forest Service, Gifford Pinchot had established a decentralized structure for the agency so that personnel in each forest possessed the authority to manage it. Pinchot's Use Book provided the rules and regulations to guide actions and decisions in the field. It clearly stated the function of the reserves including the preservation of a continual supply of timber for industries, the maintenance of a forest cover which naturally regulated the flow of streams, and the protection of the interest of local communities adjacent to the forest reserves. To ensure effective operation of this decentralization organization, Pinchot divided the country into forest districts whose headquarters oversaw inspection and review of individual forest management. The districts were subdivided into national forests, each headed by a forest supervisor, and forests were divided into districts headed by district rangers. The districts which became regions in 1930 played a central role in the supervision of Civilian Conservation Corps activities (Pinkett 1970: 67; Steen 1976: 76-81; Smith 1930: 75; West 1992: 39).

Because of Pinchot's conflicts with Richard A. Ballinger, an official in the Department of the Interior, President Taft removed him from his position in January, 1910. Pinchot's successor, Henry S. Graves, then dealt with these concerns which primarily involved the administration of recreational activities in the national forests. Recreational use rose as the government increased accessibility to and through the national forests. The recreation uses of public lands had increased rapidly after 1910. Both professional organizations and the public directed the Federal government to create a parks bureau to deal specifically with recreation on Federal lands. The government responded to this demand for recreational oversight of public lands by the creation of the National Park Service in 1916. Its functions potentially competed with those of the National Forest Service (Steen 1976: 113-22; West 1992: 51-54; Williams 1989: 456-58).

To facilitate the administration of the national forests, the Forest Service planned a comprehensive system of roads and trails in its forests beginning in 1909. In fiscal year 1912, Congress authorized the use of forest receipts to fund road and trail construction. This source of funding for such construction became permanent in 1913. This transportation system was an essential part of forest development because it permitted access to the forests for the fighting

of forest-fires. In 1916, the Forest Service received an additional ten million dollars for roads and trails for the development of resources on which the communities within the forest depended. By 1921, the Federal High Act provided additional funding for highway construction through forests as part of a 39,000 mile forest road and Federal highway network. Such a network not only permitted improved protection of the forests but gave visitors access to the forests (Steen 1976: 154-55; Smith 1930: 52-58).

The Clarke-McNary Act of 1924 continued the growth and improved management of the national forests through the 1920s. The act permitted the purchase of forest lands which were within watersheds of navigable streams rather than just at the headwaters as specified under the Weeks Law of 1911. The Clarke-McNary Act also authorized appropriations for cooperative programs with state agencies for fire control, farm forestry extension, and production and distribution of forest planting stock. This act thus emphasized cooperation rather than coercion of private interests in the forests (Smith 1930: 63, 90; Steen 1976: 185-95; Davies 1983: 86; West 1992: 54). By the 1920s, Forest Service policies not only recognized multiple uses of the forests but also varied treatment depending on the available resources and environment. Congressional acts in 1924 and 1925 permitted donations of land to the national forests as a third means of expanding the forests in addition to reserving lands from the public domain and government purchase.

The Creation of the Nicolet National Forest in the Cutover Lands

In 1929, the National Forest Service established the North Central National Forest District and placed its regional headquarters in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. This new district oversaw national forests in the Great Lakes area of the country. The forests in Minnesota then included the Superior National Forest established in 1909 and the Chippewa National Forest created in 1928 from the former Minnesota National Forest formed in 1908. National forests in Michigan included the Michigan and Marquette National Forests created in 1909 and the Huron National Forest established in 1928. In 1930, the forest districts were renamed regions. The former North Central National Forest District became Region Nine of the United States Forest Service. The region grew with the creation of new national forests in the early 1930s including the Hiawatha and Ottawa national forests in Michigan established in 1931 and the Nicolet and Chequamegon national forests of Wisconsin created in 1933.

On March 2, 1933, presidential proclamation created the Nicolet National forest from cutover timber lands purchased in northeastern Wisconsin (Elliott 1977 [1989]: 35; USDA 1949: 373). The origins of the Nicolet are found in the history of the lumber industry in Wisconsin. Because of the extensive pine forests across the northern part of the state, Wisconsin became a leading lumber-producing state in the second half of the nineteenth century. The state lead the nation in this industry between 1900 and 1904. However, production fell steadily, and by 1920 Wisconsin ranked tenth in the nation (Lusignan 1986 (5): 14-15). Harvesting patterns, fires, and the absence of reforestation policies contributed to production decline and increase in cutover lands in the state.

The Wisconsin lumber industry harvested pine in the second half of the nineteenth century. After the pine stocks became depleted, the industry began to harvest hemlock and cedar as well as hardwoods such as basswood, elm, and ash. Fire protection was virtually non-existent as the lumber companies left behind slash after cutting over the forest land. By 1923, fires and uncontrolled cutting left less then two million acres of usable timber from the almost thirty million acres of forests which had covered the state in the mid-nineteenth century (Wisconsin Committee on Land Use and Forestry 1932: 17-18; Becker 1952).

Logging in the area of the Nicolet National Forest began in the 1850s along waterways to facilitate movement of the logs. The building of such railroads into the area in the 1880s allowed logging operations to penetrate beyond the timber-depleted waterways and stimulated the growth of permanent communities. In this period, the north-south running Milwaukee, Lakeshore, and Western railroad served Vilas County. It connected to the south with the Minneapolis, St. Paul and Sault St. Marie built east-west across northern Wisconsin in conjunction with the Canadian Pacific. It primarily carried lumber, pulpwood, and minerals. Lumbering of pine reached its peak by 1899 when the cutting of hardwoods increased. By the 1920s, the disposal of slash in some areas through controlled burning had established the growth of pioneer species such as aspen, white birch, jack pine. Without use for such woods at the time, the area continued its economic decline (Walker 1959: 2; Becker 1952; Lusignan 1986 (5): 15; Fay 1986 (6): 1, 6; (7): 1; Elliott 1977 [1989]: 35).

Attempts to farm the cutover lands failed because the land and the climate were not suitable for crops. The inability of farmers to support themselves in the area increased the number of tax delinquent properties. In 1927, nearly twenty-five percent of the land in the northern seventeen Wisconsin counties had become tax delinquent. In that year, Wisconsin voters approved an amendment to the tax clause of the state constitution, the Forest Tax Law, which permitted a taxation method for forest property different from that of non-forest property. It distinguished between land as capital and timber as income. This unique tax structure alleviated some of the problems in the area, but did not stop the rise in tax delinquency. This tax delinquent property effectively created a new public domain administered by the counties (Brown 1986 (4): 3; Sylvester 1992: 34-36; West 1992: 3; Wisconsin Committee on Land Use and Forestry 1932: 84-95). The Depression accelerated the reversion of land to the counties, even as counties, towns, cities, and school boards were establishing forests of their own (Becker 1952).

The purchase of forest lands by the Federal government under the Weeks Law of 1911 and the Clarke-McNary Act of 1924 provided one solution to the management of the cutover lands. Both the Weeks Act and Clarke-McNary Act permitted the purchase of forest lands by the Federal government if the forests lay at the headwaters or within the watersheds of navigable streams. The presence of the Eastern Continental Divide within the Nicolet National Forest clearly qualified the forest for purchase. The first purchase within the Nicolet National Forest was the Oneida Purchase Unit acquired by the federal government from the Thunder Lake Lumber Company of Rhinelander in December, 1928. This unit consisted of 151,680 acres in Oneida, Forest, and Vilas counties. In March, 1932, the Forest

Service acquired 68,000 additional acres in the Oneida Unit and gained 204,800 acres of the Oconto Unit in Forest, Vilas, Oconto, and Langlade counties. The National Forest Service established its headquarters in Rhinelander in March, 1933. In March, 1934, the National Forest was extended into Florence, Forest, Oconto, and Vilas counties (Elliott 1977 [1989]: 35, 37).

The Work of the Civilian Conservation Corps in the Nicolet

The creation of the Nicolet National Forest coincided with the 1933 publication of the Copeland Report on American forestry and the creation of the Emergency Conservation Works program by Franklin Roosevelt in March, 1933.

On March 13, 1933, the Forest Service issued its National Plan for American Forestry in the Copeland Report (USDA 1933). This report resulted from discussions in the U.S. Senate recommending the use of reforestation as a source of work for unemployed Americans. The final report added fire protection; flood control; soil erosion; forest research; wildlife, timber and range management; and recreation to the Forest Service's Depression Era agenda. However, the report clearly stated that the protection of these resources depended on federal-state control of forestry on private lands. Congress rejected the report on this basis. Its historical significance lies in its linkage between resource conservation and work relief. In this capacity, it served as the basis for the New Deal forest conservation program (Steen 1979: 199-204; Leake 1980). During the Depression Era, the general understanding of resource conservation finally reflected the ideas of Gifford Pinchot at the turn of the century. Rather than the hoarding of resources, Franklin Roosevelt advocated the protection and prudent use of the resources in a manner which would benefit a majority of the nation. Such an approach required the national planning of resource use, a major objective of the Roosevelt administration. The National Plan of the Forest Service thus represented such a national-level planning effort to ensure the proper utilization of the nation's forests and address their recreational potential (U.S. Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works 1934: 75; Owen 1983: 82, 102; Ahlgren 1987: 11).

In 1932, twenty percent of the American work force or 28 million were jobless and millions were homeless. Estimates indicated that over half of the young men between 15 and 24 were either unemployed or working only part time. Thus, Franklin D. Roosevelt faced tremendous economic and social problems as he began his presidency in early 1933. In response to this emergency condition, he developed the New Deal composed of a package of emergency legislation to both improve economic conditions and the nation's natural resources. A series of recent natural disasters underscored the long-term deterioration of these resources. The package addressed the problems of the cutover forests of the north and the dust bowl of the Plains and provided labor to resolve them. The acts which composed the legislation had been tried before in isolated instances. However, it was the rapid expansion of the federal bureaucracy in recognition of the government's responsibility to the welfare of its citizens which was innovative. This role had traditionally belonged to the family or at most the local community not the federal government (Ahlgren 1987: 10-12).

On March 15, 1933, Congress convened to act on emergency legislation. The following one hundred days of the Roosevelt administration produced a model for the legislation which followed and remained in effect during the 1930s and early 1940s. Later acts defined and supplemented this legislation, but they did not alter their substance (Schlesinger 1940: 1; Cohen 1980). In this legislation, Roosevelt attempted to effect the recovery for a major portion of the economy including agriculture, industry, and banking as well as provide relief to the unemployed and disadvantaged members of society (Otis 1986: 5-6). Because of the variations in the types of individuals who required relief and the multiple causes which gave rise to their needs as well as the fluctuations in the public attitude concerning how to meet those needs, the solution was equally complex.

In response to the Forest Service's National Plan and based on his own personal interest in conservation, Roosevelt announced his intent to develop an Emergency Conservation Work (ECW) program on March 21, 1933. It would enroll young men in a Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) to undertake conservation and recreation work in the national parks and forests. Rather than offering doles to the unemployed, the program's funds supported projects of public benefit to employ those needing work. The program lifted morale and sustained the skills of many American workers who had lost their jobs because of the state of the economy rather than their own negligence. The program also provided some training to those reaching the age of employment. By March 31, Congress passed the necessary legislation to establish the program. This legislation provided the president with broad authority to execute the act. On April 5, 1933, Roosevelt signed Executive Order 6106, Relief of Unemployment through the Performance of Useful Public Works which further defined the parameters of the legislation (Paige 1985: 7-19; Salmond 1967: 3-25; Wirth 1980: 67-70; Rawick 1957: 35-56; Owen 1983: 84; Isakoss 1938: 19-22).

The program remained formally titled the Emergency Conservation Work program until 1937 when it became the Civilian Conservation Corps program. Robert Fechner, a labor union official, directed the CCC and coordinated the program with other Federal agencies. Representatives of these agencies composed an advisory council which recommended policies to the director and oversaw the program's budget. The organizational structure of the ECW program mobilized four existing departments of federal government. The Labor Department undertook the selection of the enrollees from state relief records. The War Department provided staff for basic conditioning programs at the CCC district headquarters and for the operation of the CCC work camps. The Departments of Interior and Agriculture, known as the technical services, supervised the work projects. The National Park Service in the Department of the Interior served as the technical agency overseeing national and state park projects. The Department of Agriculture was responsible for soil conservation and, through the Forest Service, for fire protection, reforestation, and recreation projects in national and state forests. Nation-wide, the National Forest Service directed 82 percent of all the work projects in the first year. Both technical services were responsible for planning and executing the work projects, furnishing the equipment, tools, and supplies, and providing transportation to the projects. Although the technical services did not run the camps, they did locate each camp adjacent to a work project with which it was associated.

The act required that CCC enrollees be between the ages of 18 and 25 and unmarried and come from families on relief. In 1937, the government broadened the age limits. Enlistment lasted six months with the opportunity for re-enlistment. During this period, enrollees received clothing, food, shelter, education, job training of varying quality, and a thirty dollar-per-month allowance of which twenty-five went to their families. Effectively, this program put young men to work, provided funds to economically-distressed family members, brought money into communities near the location of camps and projects, and accomplished a tremendous amount of conservation work throughout the nation. The CCC program eventually enrolled 75,000 men from Wisconsin, and 92,000 enrollees served in Wisconsin.

After entrance into the program, the CCC assigned enrollees to one of nine Army Corps centers for basic training and physical conditioning. Most of the CCC camps operating in Wisconsin were formed from enrollees processed through the Sixth Army Corps headquarters located at Fort Sheridan, Illinois, near Chicago. The army subdivided each Army Corps area into districts whose sizes depended on the number of camps managed in the district. By 1935, the Sparta District included the CCC camps working on the Nicolet. Headquartered near Sparta, the district served northern Wisconsin north of an east-west line through Baraboo. Located near Eagle River along Upper Nine Mile Lake at Camp Nine Mile, camp number F-2, CCC Company 641 participated in the development of development of campground adjacent to Anvil Lake and Butternut-Franklin lakes (CCC Sixth Corps Area 1937: 181-82).

After completion of their basic training, CCC enrollees were assigned to camps. An advance group of enrollees and military staff proceeded to the camp site to prepare for the arrival of the remaining members of the 200-man companies. The early CCC camps used tents for housing. Later, prefabricated, permanent structures or "rigid camps" were built. Towards the end of the 1930s, the CCC employed movable units or "portable camps." Frequently, the CCC used small subcamps or side camps to reduce travel time from the main camp to the project site or to undertake small, short-term projects. Once the camp became operational, civilian technical staff from either the Forest Service or the National Park Service assumed supervision of the enrollees' work program. The federal agency provided all the design, planning, and technical background for projects. The CCC enrollees supplied the labor force available to the technical agencies for the completion of the projects (Ermentrout 1981: 11; Cohen 1980: 155; CCC Sixth Corps Area 1937: 23; Wirth 1980: 76-99; Rawick 1957: 56-63; Salmond 1967: 26-32; Paige 1985: 52-64).

For the most part, communities benefitted form the presence of CCC camps in their areas. The CCC employed a small number of locally unemployed, skilled men known as Local Experienced Men (LEM). The construction and conservation projects improved the community and often attracted revenue form travelers using new recreational facilities. To assist local businesses and maintain a positive image, the CCC directed the army to purchase many of the camp supplies including food, tools, and building materials locally. The five dollars per month allowance to the enrollees was usually spent locally on entertainment. Because of these benefits including the approximately 1000 dollars spent per month at

local businesses, the CCC camps retained a popular public image. The presence of a CCC camp considerably reduced the economic crisis faced by the local community (Salmond 1967: 35; Paige 1985: 73-79; Wirth 1980: 105-08, 111; Rawick 1957: 64).

As the CCC matured, additional legislation and executive action soon corrected some of the deficiencies in its original organization. The vast majority of the CCC enrollees were unskilled laborers from urban areas. Construction and forestry projects required experienced workmen with sufficient technical skills. On April 22, 1933, the president approved the hiring of Local Experienced Men (LEM) who were unemployed foresters and construction workers from communities near the proposed projects. They provided additional technical skills and leadership as foremen. The Forest Service camp thus included the camp superintendent; three to six foresters; three to four construction foremen, the LEM's; two to three subformen who were experienced enrollees; and the enrollees. The army added an educational advisor. By 1934, the CCC also hired local college students majoring in landscape architecture, engineering, forestry, geology, history, and science during the summer to provide added technical direction. The regional office in Milwaukee also employed individuals skilled in these areas to review project proposals; provide the necessary oversight, design, master plans, and individual building plans for the projects; and inspect their execution. The planning of each project to fit within the existing environment and meet the local needs was an important initial step in each project (Paige 1985: 44-45, 50-51, 69; Leake 1980; Wirth 1980: 111-14; Tweed, Soulliere, and Law 1977: 91; Elliott 1977 [1989]: 43).

The CCC projects advanced the cause of conservation and recreational development many years. The conservation projects frequently involved forest protection, tree planting, game and fish management, disease control, fire fighting in the forests, forest fire pre-suppression, road building and telephone installation across the forests, tree nursery development and maintenance, forest stand improvement through thinning, the protection of lake and stream banks, and erosion control. The Forest Service also undertook construction projects for recreational and administrative facilities. The administrative projects included the operation and management of the forest and resulted in the building of district headquarters, ranger station offices and dwellings, training centers, garages, storage buildings, nurseries, fire towers, bridges, dams, roads, and trails. Recreational projects provided for public activities non-harmful to the to the natural setting as the forests experienced a rising number of visitors. Forests supported several types of potential recreational areas depending on their natural setting. Most forests were capable of providing hiking, nature study, and camping. Recreational improvements supported by the Forest Service often along with other forestry work included trails, access roads, bridges, picnic and trail side shelters, dams for the creation of swimming, boating facilities, bathhouses, guest cabins, comfort stations, and water and sewage systems (Kylie, Hieronymus, and Hall 1937: 279-81; Owen 1983: 129; Otis 1986: 1, 10).

From the beginning, Congress viewed the CCC as a temporary relief measure. Enacting legislation appropriated money for a two-year period. Additionally,

each enrollment period for the CCC lasted only six months. The Emergency Relief Appropriations Act of 1935 extended and refunded the CCC until 1937. It expanded the CCC enrollment to 600,000 and raised the enrollee age limited from twenty-three to twenty-five. Peak enrollment occurred in September, 1935 at 505,782 after which the number declined gradually (Ahlgren 1987: 12; Paige 1985: 21). As the economy slowly began its recovery by 1935, the CCC began to shift its focus from relief to training to enable enrolles to better support themselves after their departure. The CCC more closely supervised the army's development of education and vocational training at the camps (Cohen 1980: 13). In early 1936, Roosevelt ordered the reduction of the enrollment to 300,000 by July 1, 1936. Seeking to create the CCC as a permanent agency in the federal government, he reduced its costs to make the proposal more palatable to Congress. Although the legislature did not favor a permanent agency, this reduction met considerable resistance from midwestern congressmen whose constituents sought its continuation. Faced with opposition, Roosevelt compromised. All camps remained active until the completion of their work projects at which time some were closed. Roosevelt's policy resulted in extensive camp closings. In December, 1935, the Nicolet National Forest included twenty-two camps. By early, 1937, there were forty-five CCC camps remaining in the Sparta District. Of the thirty-two camps assigned to the Forest Service, eighteen were associated with federal projects and fourteen with forestry projects. Nine of the eighteen federal project camps were then located in the Nicolet National Forest: Phelps, Scott Lake, Long Lake, Alvin, Rainbow (Florence), Cavour, Blackwell, Boot Lake, and Mountain (Elliott 1977 [1989]; Rawick 1957: 68-78; Salmond 1967: 63-70; Wirth 1985: 105, 121, 131; Pager 1983: 11; Oconto County Reporter 1935 [12/12/: 1/6; 12/5: 4/3]; Leake 1980).

Congress funded the CCC as a separate agency in June, 1937. Under this act, its name was officially altered from Emergency Conservation Work to the Civilian Conservation Corps, already its popular name. Unlike the 1933 act, the 1937 act incorporated specific directives. It emphasized vocational training rather than work relief by allotting up to ten hours per week to educational activities. The act lowered the enrollment number to 300,000 men between the ages of seventeen and twenty-three and included an additional 10,000 Native Americans. Each enrolle was allotted a term between six months and two years. The CCC remained a temporary agency, now extended for a period of three years (Cohen 1980: 132; Paige 1985: 21). In 1939, the CCC as well as the National Youth Administration, the Social Security Board, the Office of Education, the Public Health Service, and similar agencies were placed within the Federal Security Agency because they shared a similar purpose. They administered public welfare furthering economic and social security, educational opportunities, and health (Ahlgren 1987: 105; Johnson 1941: 150-51).

Despite official recognition of the Civilian Conservation Corps as the successor to the Emergency Conservation Work program on June 28, 1937, camps closed and enrollments declined. Reductions continued from 1937 through 1940 when the program was severely decreased as the Army Reserve officers who ran the camps were called to active duty. In 1940 and 1941, the work of the remaining CCC camps shifted from conservation and recreation projects to the construction of defense facilities. By 1941, the CCC itself experienced labor shortages as young

men joined the defense industries. The Civilian Conservation Corps ended on June 30, 1942 after Congress failed to appropriate funding for its activities in fiscal year 1943 (Rawick 1957: 72-94; Wirth 1985: 143; Leake 1980; Ahlgren 1987: 105).

Recreational Uses of the National Forests

Public interest in recreation in the national forests forced the National Forest Service to become involved in this use between its creation in 1905 and 1933 when it created its National Plan for American Forestry. During 1917, three million visitors used the national forests. However, because the Forest Service perceived its role as natural resource management within the forests, the agency hesitated to acknowledge recreation as a legitimate use of the forests and failed to develop policies guiding this function. Recreational development and timber management appeared to be incompatible uses. Controlling the forest reserves until the creation of the Forest Service, the General Land Office of the Department of the Interior received congressional authorization to issue special use permits for the location of hotels and sanitariums within the reserves. After the transfer of the reserves to the Forest Service, the General Land Office permit provision remained in place and served as a basis for Forest Service recreational management. Explaining the basis policies of the newly-established Forest Service, Gifford Pinchot's Use Book of July, 1905 did not specifically deal with recreational uses of the forests. But, the discussion of the rights of legitimate occupants and use permit procedures did address the operators of hotels and cabins. The Antiquities Act of 1906 directed the Forest Service to safeguard objects and areas of national heritage within the forests. As these resources became the focus of public interest, the Forest Service became involved in recreation despite its reluctance (West 1992: 52-53; Steiner 1970 [1933]: 41-42; Smith 1930: 79; Steen 1976: 78-80, 113-117; Tweed 1980: 2).

In 1915, the Forest Service supported Congressional action to develop a long-term permit policy for the national forests. This initiative resulted in the Term Occupancy Act permitting private use and development of forest lands for period up to thirty years. In 1916, the Forest Service undertook its first official recreation project, the construction of the Eagle Creek Campground in the Oregon National Forest. In this instance, the agency strove to control the increase in camping tourists visiting the Columbia River Gorge by defining specific camp areas. Competition with the recently established National Park Service probably stimulated the Forest Service's interest in forest recreation. Professional organizations such as the American Society of Landscape Architects contributed to this competition. Its members wrote articles weighing the suitability of the two agencies for the development of recreational facilities (Steen 1976: 114-20; Tweed 1980: 3-5; Chapman 1925).

Responding to the competition of the National Park Service to serve recreational needs, the Forest Service was advised by professionals in landscape architecture to undertake a study of the recreational potentials in the national forests. In 1917, the Forest Service hired Frank A. Waugh, a professional landscape architect from the Massachusetts Agricultural College, now the University of Massachusetts

at Amherst, to prepare such a study. Waugh visited the forests and prepared three reports: Recreational Uses on the National Forest, the main report (Waugh 1918); Landscape Engineering in the National Forests, and A Plan for the Development of the Village of Grand Canyon. Waugh drew numerous conclusions from these studies. The main premise guiding his conclusions stated that outdoor recreation was a "... necessity of civilized life." The government had created forest reserves to serve such a lifestyle. Since recreational uses were increasing, he indicated that the costs sustained by the Forest Service to develop recreational facilities were in the public interest. Comparing the cash value of forest recreation to other types of recreation such as movies, vaudeville, concerts, theater, baseball, and the circus, Waugh found that the public invested as much income in forest recreation as the other types. Because of the high value placed on forest recreation, he thus concluded that recreation be considered a major activity in the forests. Public need supported separate development by the Forest Service from the Park Service of recreational activities on the forests. Waugh urged the Forest Service to establish a committee within the agency to oversee recreational use and hiring of personnel with technical ability in recreation planning and landscape engineering (Tweed 1980: 6-7; Steen 1976: 120; Waugh 1918: 23-27, 35-36; Kneipp 1924: 302-303; Scott 1925).

Frank Waugh continued to serve as a consultant to the Forest Service into the mid-1930s. Most importantly, he convinced the Forest Service to hire a professional landscape engineer to undertake the implementation of his findings. In early 1919, Arthur H. Carhart became the Forest Service's first landscape engineer and recreation planner. Carhart viewed the act of visiting wilderness areas as a recreational experience. Because most of the national forests were in the West, the Forest Service assigned Carhart to the Rocky Mountain Regional Office in Denver. Although his first projects focused on single campgrounds within the forests, Waugh realized a need to develop comprehensive master plans for entire forests. He created his first master plan for the San Isabel National Forest in Colorado in late 1919. Because the Forest Service would or could not appropriate regular funding for the implementation of the plan, the local San Isabel Public Recreation Association supported his work at San Isabel by raising funds to execute the plan (Tweed 1980: 8-10; West 1992: 53; Carhart 1920: 268-72; 1920b: 549-53; 1922a: 437-40; 1922b: 597-601; 1923s: 210-13; 1923b: 49-54; 1923c: 10-14).

Despite Carhart's input, the Forest Service remained reluctant to acknowledge the need for recreational development and to fund recreational projects such as San Isabel. Because the Forest Service continued to believe that only foresters perceived all the needs of forest development and that their own personnel could manage recreational improvement, the agency funded Carhart's master planning efforts at low levels. Recreational development remained a low priority. Frustrated with the Forest Service's response to his efforts, Carhart resigned in 1922. Between 1923 and 1933, foresters oversaw recreation in the national forests. During this decade, the Forest Service provided space for recreation but not the facilities. Recreation was considered a local concern and was to be financed and developed privately through the Term Occupancy Act of 1915 (Tweed 1980: 12-13; Steen 1976: 120; Steiner 1970 [1933]: 171).

Waugh's and Carhart's efforts did alert the Forest Service to recreational uses on the national forests and the potential for further development despite the Forest Service's failure to establish a clear recreational policy defining permissible noncommodity functions. In May, 1924, over 300 delegates from 128 organizations involved in conservation and recreation formed the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation and met at Washington, D.C. Remaining in existence until 1929, this group promoted outdoor recreation, particularly in the national forests and parks (National Conference on Outdoor Recreation 1928; Hubbard 1924: 58-61; Brumbaugh 1924: 71-73; Chapman 1924: 44-47; Merriam 1926: 30-35). Two of the member organizations, the American Forestry Association and the National Parks Association, requested information from the Forest Service for an inventory of outdoor recreation resources on Federal lands as part of a national plan for recreation. The resulting report of 1928 found that the Forest Service viewed recreation as a revenue source rather than a conservation use of the forests. The agency had actually overdeveloped some wilderness areas to increase special use fees. The Forest Service continued to consider recreational uses by individual merit through the late 1920s. Increasing mobility through automobile travel raised the demand for outdoor recreation destinations and placed considerable pressure on the Forest Service to develop a recreation policy (U.S. Joint Committee on Recreational Survey of Federal Lands 1928; Steen 1976: 152-54; Dulles 1965 [1940]: 312-26).

Beginning in the early 1920s, wilderness preservation became a rather incompatible but major aspect of recreational development. The Forest Service possessed the authority to designate inaccessible, noncommercial areas for recreation. They were unused, undeveloped wilderness areas in the forests set aside for the public to view and experience. To the commodity-orientation of the Forest Service, such areas were unproductive but maintained to attract income from visitors. The degree of visitor development to and within these areas remained a significant issue. Following the advice of Aldo Leopold, a forester in the Southwest, Chief Forester William Greeley administratively designated part of the Gila National Forest in New Mexico as a wilderness area in 1924. Carhart had suggested the creation of such areas in the southwest as early as 1919 (Steen 1976: 154-56; Schmitt 1969: 173).

Competition between the Forest Service and the Park Service for funding increased through the 1920s as larger appropriations went to the national parks rather than the national forests. Reacting to these funding decisions, the Forest Service began to promote the recreational opportunities on the forests without establishing policies for such uses. In 1929, the Forest Service created two new areas of forest use: research reserves and primitive areas. The agency set aside research reserves for scientific and educational use and the primitive or historical areas for visitors wishing to experience the undeveloped "pioneer" wilderness. As the number of visitors to the forest climbed, the public became more aware of logging practices on the forest. As a consequence, portions of the public outside forestry began to demand greater regulation of forest uses. The Forest Service responded to this negative image by developing additional scenic and recreational areas to balance the industrial uses of the forests. By the close of the 1920s, the agency had become actively involved in forest recreation either by issuing special use permits or by establishing wilderness, research or

primitive areas. The agency's major concern remained the balance between expenditures for recreational facilities and management and the funding for and revenues generated by recreation (Steen 1976: 157-62: Schmitt 1969: 173; Tweed 1980: 13-14; Kneip 1931; 9-11; Morse 1933: 205).

By 1932, Forest Service continued to place the responsibility for recreation planning with the Regional Foresters and Forest Supervisors. But as the use continued to rise without guidance from a general recreation policy for forest development, Chief Forester Robert Y. Stuart ordered a nation-wide study of the national forests in the spring of 1932. Senator Royal Copeland of New York sponsored the request from the U.S. Senate to perform the study. Completed in March, 1933, the National Plan for American Forestry (U.S. Department of Agriculture 1933) or the Copeland Report presented a single national plan for American forestry. It documented the conclusions of the recreational study which linked recreational development to related forestry issues surrounding timber, range, and wildlife resources, research, state aid, and fire and watershed protection. It recognized the concept of multiple use within the forests. The Copeland Report became the strategy followed by New Deal forestry programs. Discussions in the Senate concerning the use of reforestation projects as part of a public works program for the unemployed had originally stimulated the study. In concert with this approach, the Forest Service responded to the proposal by confirming that forestry could indeed become a solution to the problems of unemployment under the auspices of the Forest Service in cooperation with state agencies and private organizations (Tweed 1980: 15; Steen 1976: 199-208; West 1992: 54).

Robert Marshall prepared the recreation section of the 1933 Copeland Report. A forester, Marshall became the leading advocate for wilderness preservation and served as the director of the Forest Service's Division of Recreation and Land established in 1937. Marshall stated that most forest types offered opportunities for one or more forms of recreation. However, certain forms of recreation required special environments. For example, superlative areas contained extraordinary scenic values; the primitive areas encompassing tracts of old timber growth reflected little evidence of human intervention; wilderness areas lacked permanent inhabitants or vehicle roads; roadside areas included timber stands along major roads; residential areas were set aside for private homes, hotels, and cabins; camping areas served overnight and organized camping; and outing areas provided limited scenic opportunities away from highway traffic. Marshall created an action plan for realizing these recreation types. His plan began with the identification of suitable sites, moved to acquisition of selected sites, and concluded with the planning, implementation, and administration of the developed sites. Congressional legislation and appropriations held the key to the implementation of the entire plan. Approved shortly after the completion of the Copeland Report, President Roosevelt's Emergency Conservation Work program which adopted the Copeland Report as the New Deal plan for American forestry and provided the necessary confirmation of the plan and its funding.

Marshall supported the need for recreation in the national forests by citing the statistics which counted 32 million visitors to national forests as compared with the three million visitors to national parks in 1931 (Buck 1933: 191-98). Based

on records dating between 1917 and 1931 from both the Park Service and the Forest Service, Marshall demonstrated that visits to the national forests had increased tenfold while those to the parks rose only eightfold. This preference for the use of national forests occurred during a period when the parks but not the forests were funded for recreational development. Marshall failed to note that the forests covered a broader area. Citing the rising population, shorter working weeks and more leisure time, probable rise in the standard of living and increased ability to travel, increasing ease of travel through the use of the automobile, and the greater psychological necessity to escape from congested urban areas, Marshall projected that recreational use of national forests would rise.

In the Copeland Report, Marshall found that Americans used the forests for a variety of recreational pursuits. They ranged from enjoyment of the outdoors as an opposition to the routine of everyday life; good health stimulated by pure air, exercise, and relaxation; aesthetic pleasure gained from experiencing nature; the spiritual communion with nature and contemplation; scientific study; historical interests, primarily the pursuit of the era's interpretation of pioneer heritage; and the desire to escape from mechanization and artificiality of modern day life (West 1992: 54; Schmitt 1969: 173-89; Marshall 1930; 1935: 11-13, 30; Steen 1976: 210-13, 228; Hall 1936: 382-87, 411-17, 475-80). Contemporary treatises confirmed the necessity of recreation with the rise of urban living. With the increasing mechanization of work through the 1920s, Americans gained a greater amount of leisure time. But, this increased speed of production also intensified the strain of work remedied through recreation. Additionally, man had substituted surroundings of his own making, the cities and even the farms, for the natural environment. Recreation in the natural environment returned modern man to his primeval origins and provided relaxation from the strains created by these artificial surroundings. Recreation, then, became "the pleasurable and constructive use of leisure time" and an opportunity to refresh body and spirit in a natural setting (U.S. National Park Service 1941: 1). The safeguarding of the inspirational qualities of the nation's natural environment whether they be natural scenery or scientific or historical values provided appropriate recreation (National Park Service 1941: v, vii, 9; Wirth 1980: 3-4; Steiner 1970 [1933]: 9-11, 34; Dulles 1965 [1940]: 386-97; Braden 1988: 305-22; Heaton 1929: 108-38; Schmitt 1969: 11-19, 154-76; Reiger 1975: 31; Sharp 1933: 193-95).

Marshall's 1933 contribution to the Copeland Report listed several different forms of recreational activities in the forests and described the kinds of development necessary to accommodate them. He focused on the proper use of wilderness areas which had gained considerable popularity during the 1920s. Because the activity disrupted natural surroundings, camping was an appropriate activity only in very large wilderness areas. Further, such modern developments as roads, settlements, and power lines were excluded from wilderness areas, but telephone lines, trails, temporary shelters for public use, and lookout cabins for Forest Service personnel were permissible. Roadside areas developed for the visual enjoyment of natural scenery by visitors as they moved through the forest included timbered strips 125 to 250 feet wide along highways, lakes, and river. He estimated a one-quarter acre tract per single tent site for campsites, and his

total campsite size ranged broadly from one tent site to a thousand tents. Marshall placed campsites adjacent to water and away from highways to eliminate such intrusions into the natural setting as noise and dust created by the automobile. After construction of the campsite area, areas disturbed by construction were to be landscaped to bring them into conformity with the natural surroundings. Because the private residential areas attracted considerable revenue for the Forest Service, such areas were continued. Marshall advocated the restriction of size to one-quarter of an acre and their separation by buffer areas from wilderness areas. The buffer areas contained locations for outings easily accessible to the public such as picnicking.

Marshall observed that the absence of an overall Forest Service recreation policy had begun to damage the forests through unregulated uses such as fires started by visitors, particularly campers. To avert further damage to the environment, he specified close management of these recreational facilities in the forests. Recommendations for regulation of use included the creation of additional campgrounds to avoid overuse of established facilities. Campgrounds permitted the concentration and control of camp fires. The efficiently planned campground protected the surrounding forest environment while including specific areas for parking, tents, camp fires, and eating meals. Campground development required management and inspection by Forest Service personnel and educational programs for campers. He estimated that a camping population of 16 million Americans required one and a half million acres devoted to campgrounds or one-tenth of an acre per each camper. By 1933, 1,800 campgrounds existed within the national forests and 2,300 addtional sites were needed to accommodate this demand (Marshall 1930; West 1992: 54; see also Kneipp 1931: 9-11; Steen 1976: 210; Coffman 1937: 210-14; Morse 1933: 302-07).

The Forest Service Recreational Program Implemented by the CCC

The National Forest Service became increasingly involved in recreational planning on the forests during the Depression Era. The Civilian Conservation Corps labor and additional funding provided through the New Deal permitted the agency to accelerate its recreation as well as its conservation program. Marshall's recreational segment of the Copeland Report which endorsed a unified and permanent commitment to recreation by the Forest Service provided the guidelines to rapidly implement this development. In 1935, his recommendations resulted in the hiring of a landscape architect, Ernest E. Walker, to the Washington office and in a nation-wide study of recreation in the National Forest conducted under the auspices of the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA). President of the ASLA, Albert Taylor, conducted and reported the results of the study. He noted that a portion of the regional Forest Service offices lacked professionally trained landscape architects and recreational specialist to produce recreation and landscape designs for forest development. The Forest Service thus possessed an inadequate recreation staff to guide forest development during the most active years of the CCC program between 1933 and 1935. The reorganization of the Forest Service in November, 1935 created the Division of Recreation and Lands with regional staff trained in recreational planning and design. The North Central Regional Office in Milwaukee hired its professional staff by 1936 (Steen 1976:

209, 213; Tweed 1980: 16-20).

The Washington office of the Division of Recreation and Lands finally hired a director capable of implementing this directive with the appointment of Robert Marshall in May, 1937. Between November, 1935 and May, 1937, the regional offices provided the recreational planning and design for forest development. Prior to 1935, many of these offices designed relatively simply structures and buildings. Repeating his visits to the forests in 1936, Albert Taylor observed that the regional offices emphasized quantity rather than quality of design. He recommended the preparation of designs for recreation facilities in a central Washington office. In his 1936 report, Taylor cited the numerous types of recreational projects completed during 1935 and 1936 in the regional offices. In 1935, the Forest Service had broadened the scope of recreational planning and design beyond simple campground sites, ranger cabins, and privies to include bathhouses, shelters, amphitheaters, and playgrounds. Rather than simply concentrating on isolated facilities, the Forest Service began to prepare more integrated designs including, for example, campgrounds, picnic shelters, bathhouse and public beach, nature trails, and a system of drinking fountains in one recreational area. Thus, during Marshall's tenure as the director of the Division of Recreation and Lands, recreation development received considerable emphasis (Kylie, Hieronymus, and Hall 1937: 279-91; Tweed 1980: 20-24; West 1992: 54; Arnold 1935: 662-67).

A 1932 study found the northern Wisconsin counties of Vilas and Oneida particularly well suited for recreational development. It cited the cool, healthful summers, scenic attractions created by the numerous bodies of water, and the recreational opportunities including bathing, boating, and fishing. The tourist industry had grown rapidly in the two counties since the 1920s. Despite the Depression, this usage continued to rise in the 1930s. Tourism was becoming a vital part of the counties' economy (Wehrwein and Parsons 1932). By 1935, the addition of facilities by the Forest Service through CCC projects not only enhanced forest usage in these counties but assisted the development of tourism in adjacent communities. Between 1935 and 1937, the CCC planted over 40,000 acres of trees, built camp and picnic facilities for over 420 people at six different areas three of which included swimming facilities, participated in game management, constructed over 129 miles of truck and fire roads, installed 54 miles of forest telephone lines, erected lookout towers, built forest service ranger headquarters at Eagle River and Keyes Lake near Florence, constructed additional buildings for Forest Service operation of the forests, fought forest fires, and conducted land surveys (Vilas County News-Review 1936: [11/2: 3/1; 12/18: 6/1-2] Oconto County Reporter 1935 [12/12: 1/6]; Cohen 1980: 88-89; Pager 1983: 13; CCC Sixth Corps Area 1937). CCC recreational development on the forests adjacent to Eagle River in 1936 included a campground at Anvil Lake and one at Butternut-Franklin lakes (Vilas County News-Review 1936 [1/7: 5/28]).

Nine Mile CCC Camp and the Imogene Lake Transient Camp

Two Depression Era works camps were associated with the building of the campgrounds at Anvil Lake. CCC Company 641 was located at Forest Service Camp

F-2 known as Camp Nine Mile on Upper Nine Mile Lake just south of Lake Anvil and twelve miles east of Eagle River in the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 36, T40N, R11E. It participated in the construction of the Anvil Lake Campground shelter. Camp Nine Mile was first established as a tent camp on May 9, 1933. Permanent buildings including seven standard barracks and service buildings were completed by March 1, 1934. The company disbanded in 1937. These buildings were later removed from the camp site (USDA Forest Service 1985). Its accomplishments included the planting of 4,600 acres of forest lands, 2,500 acres of timber stand improvement, rodent control over 5,600 acres, white pine blister rust control, roadside fire hazard reduction, construction and maintenance of eighty miles of roads, telephone lines construction, the building and operation of one trout rearing pond, fire tower construction with cabin and garage, the development of two picnic and campground areas at Butternut-Franklin and Anvil Lake, the construction of a ski trail along Anvil Lake (opened in 1936), and the fighting of forest fires. Now gone, a second shelter also erected by the CCC served as a warming house along the trail.

States operated their own relief camps which housed and fed unemployed transients in return for work on state and county highways. Wisconsin operated Camp Imogene for transients from 1935 to July, 1937. It was placed at the site of a former logging camp owned and used by the State of Wisconsin as an honor prison camp. It was located approximately twelve miles northeast of Eagle River near Imogene Lake. After removing the prisoners, the state provided work projects to the transients in 1934. Between 1935 and 1937, the Forest Service operated the camp. The 250 men ranged in age from thirty to seventy. According to correspondence from Forest Service officials in 1937, members of the camp participated in the first phase of construction at the Region Nine Training School at Eagle River, and they worked at the Anvil Lake and the Franklin Lake Campground. At Franklin Lake, the camp constructed a log and stone shelter house, log caretakers cabin and garage, stone toilets, a water tank, water system, sewer system, roads, stone fireplaces, and picnic and camping areas (CCC Sixth Corps Area 1937; Vilas County News-Review 1936 [10/1: 5/3]; 1937 [1/14: 6/3]; Elliott 1977 [1989]: 43, 47-48; Anvil Lake Property Owners' Association n.d.: 43; Goldsworthy 1993; USDA Forest Service 1934-81 [memoranda, 3/29/1937, 4/26/1937, 9/9/1937]; USDA Forest Service 1937; Civilian Conservation Corps 1933-43 [records of camp F-2, boxes 236-37, 1934-36]).

The Building of the Anvil Lake Campground and Shelter

Camp Nine Mile and probably Camp Imogene, either together or separately, began the construction of the Anvil Lake Campground facilities by January 30, 1936 and completed the project no later than October 1, 1936. The camp reports for Nine Mile list the improvement of a 16.5 acre campground during the seventh CCC period between April and October, 1936 (Civilian Conservation Corps 1933-43 [records of camp F-2, boxes 236-37, 1934-36]). Most of the improvements including the shelter were probably completed during the winter and early spring of 1936. Work on the road and beach continued through the spring. Original construction within the sixteen acre campground included the log bathhouse and shelter, a dock, log toilets, roads, a large parking lot, and grading and levelling of fourteen

camping areas with stone fireplace, picnic tables, and space for a tent. The tamarack logs for the shelter were cut from the STH 70 right-of-way cleared by Camp Imogene. The bathhouse/shelter contained two rooms for bathers. The CCC project also cleaned and prepared the white sand swimming beach and constructed an open air theater about 150 feet south of the shelter. Now partially lying under the Anvil Lake Road, the amphitheater included a stone stage and log seats placed along the hillside in front. Two enrollees from the local CCC camps provided fire wood and maintained this campground (Vilas County News-Review 1936 [1/30: 6/4; 10/1: 5/3; 12/17: 5/1]; Anvil Lake Property Owners' Association n.d.: 38). The local newspaper, the Vilas County News-Review (1936 [12/17: 5/1], reported that the campground accommodated campers during the fall hunting season of 1936. Camp programs were presented at the amphitheater once located south of the shelter. Use of the shelter and its adjacent improvements remained limited in the late 1930s and early 1940s but increased after the war (Vilas County News-Review 1937 [12/30: 1/6]; Anvil Lake Property Owners' Association n.d.: 38; Gumm 1993).

The Anvil Lake Campground Shelter is of local significance under criterion A as a resource that is closely associated with the effects of the Depression Era federal work programs on the Nicolet National Forest. The CCC erected the Anvil Lake Campground Shelter in 1936, during a period of accelerated recreational development in the national forests. Characteristic of this later period of development, the shelter was not designed as an isolated recreational feature but as part of a complete site development plan that incorporated multiple, interrelated design elements including the campground area itself, the shelter building, a beach, and an outdoor amphitheater. Construction projects such as this were among the important works of federal New Deal programs and the resources that resulted are now of importance as visible reminders of this period of change in public works policy. The significance of the shelter and its setting are enhanced by the high overall integrity level of the shelter.

Area of Significance: Architecture

The Anvil Lake Campground Shelter gains significance in the area of architecture as a representation of the Rustic Style of architecture. The design provided by the National Forest Service for the shelter was commonly constructed by the CCC in the early and mid-1930s. Most of the Depression Era resources constructed by the National Forest Service and the National Park Service within the national parks and forests under the work relief programs followed this style.

The Rustic Style guided the design of park buildings, structures, and landscaping in national parks and forests from 1916 through the Depression Era in the 1930s and early 1940s. The Rustic Style was a national level movement which provided guidelines for the construction of park facilities in the national and state parks and forests. The style was adapted by the National Park Service for the design of its facilities and adopted by the National Forest Service by the Depression Era. Although the National Park Service did not create the Rustic Style, it did expand the concepts of the Rustic Style as it erected park buildings and structures. The principles reflected by the Rustic Style meshed

with those on which the New Deal relief programs were based. Both required intensive labor. The large work crews necessary to provide materials, complete the stone work, and process and set the timbers as well as the amount and level of expertise required to supervise construction was financially possible only through such work programs of the 1930s and early 1940s (Missouri Department of Natural Resources 1984).

Buildings erected on the national parks prior to the establishment of the National Park Service in 1916 were generally make-shift ones in which concessionaires provided services. At this time, the Department of the Army patrolled the national parks. Railroad companies contributed the first major development associated with the national parks in the 1890s and during the first decade of the twentieth century. Providing transportation and accommodations for tourists, the railroads erected elaborate hotels following the prevalent Classical Revival Style. Between 1900 and 1910 as the railroad searched for an appropriate style to service their guests, landscape architects began to exert an influence on building design. In an essentially reactionary manner, they drew inspiration from the works of A.J. Downing who had designed picturesque landscapes and dwellings in the middle of the preceding century and from Frederick Law Olmstead who also reinforced the tie between architecture and the landscape. Both their designs called for natural materials native to the surrounding environment. The building form was a part of the overall building site so that landscaping formed an integral part of the whole.

The designs for the buildings railroad companies built adjacent to or in western parks between 1900 and 1910 went further. Every element of their construction including the massing and detailing attempted to harmonize the building with its surrounding. Ornament for its own sake was avoided. Architects heavily employed textural richness based on the juxtaposition of materials and shapes. These park buildings thus combined a romantic and naturalistic philosophy. Because the buildings were to blend with the natural setting, the design of these park buildings also varied by region. Thus, forms varied from southwestern pueblos to the Swiss style in the Rocky Mountains. These concepts heavily influenced the development of Rustic Style by the National Park Service after its formation in 1916 (Tweed, Soulliere, and Law 1977: 3-16).

The National Park Service began to formulate its own architectural guidelines in 1918. It retained the harmony of man-made improvements with the natural landscapes. Director Stephen Mather required the consultation of numerous professionals including landscape architects and engineers as well as architects to create a master plan for each park project. The Rustic Style matured quickly in the national parks during the early 1920s and climaxed in 1925 with the construction of Ahwahnee, a five story, irregular plan stone hotel built against the mountains of Yosemite National Park. It was a structurally modern building with a veneer of stone and logs to retain its romantic aspect. Its tall massing was specifically adopted to the mountainous region. As funding improved through the later half of the 1920s, the National Park Service elaborated but did not alter its vision of the Rustic Style. The funding level and expanded building program continued from its high point in 1927 through the Hoover Administration under the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932. The National Park

Service followed a six year development program begun in 1931. Each plan for landscaping and building was tailored to the park's region and each park's specific physical features. Essentially competing for development funds with the Park Service, the Forest Service also adopted this approach to park design (Tweed, Soulliere, and Law 1977: 23-26, 44-48, 74). Thus, this style reached maturity before the commencement of CCC park development of the 1930s.

The Rustic Style of the 1930s continued to express the design principals set in the preceding decades. Man-made resources were to be non-intrusive producing building forms which were inconspicuous and harmonious with their natural setting. To achieve this quality, the impact of building construction on the environment was minimized (Ahlgren 1987: 28; 1988; Tweed, Soulliere, and Law 1977: 63, 77). Design simplicity and the use of native materials became correlates of this principle. Simplicity of design was also suited to the limited skills of the available work force, the CCC enrolles (U.S. Federal Works Agency 1946: 52). Because each region was characterized by different environmental factors, design had to be specific to the region if not the park (Good 1938 (1): 1-3; Ahlgren 1987: 30; Tweed, Soulliere, and Law 1977: 55).

The Rustic Style possessed historical allusions through the use of the locale's pioneer building techniques and materials. The buildings and structures in each park were to represent or allude to a unified historical theme. The style thus retained some ties to the romantic movement from which it emerged. It also represented a reaction to the growing urbanism as did the establishment of the parks themselves. Visitors escaped from the cities into nature and the past (Tweed, Soulliere, and Law 1977: i, 94, 104; Ahlgren 1977: 28-29).

> This theme of regional cultural context as part of non-intrusive architecture would grow to include not only cabins, but also Indian pueblos, Spanish colonial adobes, and New England colonial frame structures (Tweed, Soulliere, and Law 1977: 35).

But, contrasting with the outlook of settlers, the philosophy of the Rustic Style continued to emphasize a respect for nature. Construction was not to overly scar the landscape. Albert Good (1938 (1): 5) who advocated its use and provided three volumes of park designs for the National Park Service espoused the prevailing philosophy stating that the Rustic Style

> ...through the avoidance of severely straight lines and oversophistication, gives the feeling of having been executed by pioneer craftsmen with limited hand tools. It thus achieves sympathy with natural surroundings and with the past. The scale of structural elements must be reduced proportionately as ruggedness and scale of the surroundings diminish.

Finally, all landscape and architectural design was to be guided by a master plan. The designer then assessed the park's physical setting and its scientific, historical, and archaeological values including its wildlife capacities and recreational possibilities during the planning stage. This approach allowed

unity of design assuring that buildings, structures, and landscapes reflected similar themes and blended the man-made environment with the landscape. Each built element contributed to the whole plan (Ahlgren 1987: 9, 22, 27, 80). This master plan specified the building form, materials, and the arrangement as well as the system of roads, trails, steps, benches, and other landscape features in proper relation to the natural landscape such as the wooded and open areas, the rock formations, and other vegetation forms. Such planning reduced the clutter of minor buildings by combining functions but was not to produce overly large, intrusive buildings (Ahlgren 1987: 186; Tweed, Soulliere, and Law 1977: 2). For example, a loose, uncrowded group of heavily used public buildings was placed in a service area rather than scattered across the park thereby reducing the impact on the environment. The utility area containing maintenance buildings occurred near to but was screened from the service area. Recreational areas receiving heavy use such as cabin, camping, bathing or picnicking areas were also placed in well-defined areas in their appropriate setting. Development for more extensively defined recreation such as hiking trails, trail shelters, and riding trails was to remain sensitive to the landscape. To fulfill their role, park facilities were to provide an inconspicuous access to landscape features valued for visitor use (Good 1938 (1): 8). Hence, the clustering of bathhouse and beach area, campground, and amphitheater disturbed a single, concentrated area.

From the principles of the Rustic Style including harmony of the built environment with the landscapes, unity of historical theme, and master planning, guidelines for park development specific to each region were derived. Forested areas of the Midwest possessed their specific qualities some of which were shared with other regions. The impact of site construction was minimized by the use of hand labor when feasible. The blending of man-made resources with the landscape was achieved through the use of native materials such as timber and stone. The CCC enrollees frequently took the building materials from the surrounding area and processed them by hand to leave natural imperfections such as rough edges and knots in the wood. But, logs were stripped of their bark to aid preservation. Buildings and structures were proportionately scaled to the environment. Rough stone was often used as a veneer to conceal modern building materials. Low, horizontal lines tied the building to the landscape as did coloring with grays and warm browns, the placement of native plantings near the foundation, the use of vegetation as a screen, the construction of battered or buttressed walls, and the use of rough stone foundations to ease the transition from the surroundings upward. Severely straight lines were avoided in favor of irregular, "...wavering, free-hand lines" (Good 1938 (1): 8). Regularity of shape was avoided. Materials were placed in their natural position so that stone was laid paralleling its bedding plane. The size of stone decreased from base to top to ensure a stable appearance. Relatively large timbers covered by heavy shakes often composed exposed roof elements. They were to be heavy and durable to harmonize with the usually heavy building walls (Ahlgren 1987: 5, 56; 1988; Tweed, Soulliere, and Law 1977: 30, 35, 54, 71, 93-94).

The use of a single stylistic theme throughout the park presented a less obtrusive presence and achieved unity of design. One theme required the use of fewer construction methods and a smaller variety of materials in CCC construction (Good 1938 (1): 8). Simplicity of design with limited, simple ornament allowed

each building to harmonize with its surrounding (Ahlgren 1988: 202-03). Any visible decorative detailing often follow the American Craftsman Style (1900-1930) introduced by Gustave Strickley. Often found on Bungalows in the Midwest, such buildings vaguely paralleled the principles of the Rustic Style. Utilizing largely rectilinear motifs, the style was simple in detailing; used brick, stone or stucco; and had broad, low gables, low massing, and large dormers. Decorative details included exposed rafters, purlins, knee braces, king posts, collar beams, tie beams, and additional elaboration in the peak of the roof; brackets; a dominating dormer; and enclosed porches (Gottfried and Jennings 1985: 140, 186, 222-23; U.S. Federal Works Agency 1946).

The Civilian Conservation Corps and other federal work relief agencies extensively employed the Rustic Style during the 1930s. To cope with the volume of design work required by the large number of projects and maintain the principles of the Rustic Style in their buildings, the Branch of Planning and Design of the National Park Service developed publications to guide design and materials selection. It published Albert Good's 1935 Park Structures and Facilities which was expanded to the three volume edition of 1938 (Good 1938; Ahlgren 1987: 27; Tweed, Soulliere, and Law 1977: 93). Although Good advocated the use of master planning, his designs were presented by function rather than as a part of a park plan. These individual designs were to be combined with attention to unity of materials, construction techniques, form, style, and thematic relationship to suit the environment and needs of a particular park (Good 1938). Coming at the end of the era rather than at the beginning, Good's publication summarized the recent work in Rustic park architecture. Plans for the recreational facilities from the regional offices of the National Forest Service and later the Washington office adopted similar designs.

The Anvil Lake Campground Shelter exhibits many of the principles advocated by Good (1938 (2): 45-72). Good describes this functional park building type, the picnic shelter, as one providing a roof against the sun and rain. It is generally open with one or more walls sheltering the user from the prevailing weather. It often contains a large fireplace and may accommodate additional functions such as a concession, public comfort stations, or custodial storage. The combination bathhouse and shelter appears to be less common although found in the Nicolet National Forest at, for example, Franklin Lake Campground in Vilas County and Green Lake Picnic Ground in Oconto County. The Anvil Lake Campground Shelter is intended as a primitive building constructed of logs, random rubble chimney stone, and wrought iron door hardware. It displays a low, horizontal aspect with its broad roof with wide overhang, low height, bold use of building elements, and unobtrusive position along a terrace above the lake. The use of native materials including timber and native stone continues the non-intrusive design and provides an historical link to the area's past. It relies on the placement of materials and exposed interior and exterior structural elements for its decorative embellishment including roof supports, rafters, and purlins. Despite the shelter's rustic appearance, its design displays a sense of order. The chimney is centered along its end wall. The three doors are evenly distributed along the bathhouse elevation. Building elements are evenly spaced.

In form and materials, the Anvil Lake Campground is similar to several other

shelters within the Nicolet National Forest. The log combination picnic shelter and bathhouse at the Weber Lake or Green Lake Picnic Grounds two miles south of Mountain, Oconto County, resembles the Anvil Lake example quite closely. The shelter portion is partially enclosed with horizontal log walls, a massive, rubble stone chimney rises along one side elevation, and the bathhouse portion occupies the other end. However, the logs of this shelter are milled and more finished than those at Anvil Lake, and their corners are flush, fitting by tongue and notch grooving into corner posts. The broad, gable roof is widely overhung and supported by exposed elements. Rather than concrete, the footings are stone although the floor is also concrete, the interior remains unfinished, and a broad stone fireplace occupies the center of the end wall. Door hardware is wrought iron. The Weber Lake Picnic Ground Shelter exhibits a similar high level of integrity to the Anvil Lake Campground Shelter.

The Franklin Lake Campground and Recreational Facility located between Butternut and Franklin lakes about two-and-a-half miles southeast of Anvil Lake in Vilas County includes two shelters. The campground was entered in the National Register in 1988. Erected in 1936, one is a combination bathhouse and shelter. Unlike the other two shelters, however, the Franklin Lake shelter includes two levels. The front elevation of the upper level (the picnic shelter) is at ground level, while the bathhouse in the story below (which rests partially against the side of a hill) has a main elevation that opens in the opposite direction. Horizontal, rounded logs compose the partial walls of the upper level which rest on a high rubble stone foundation that surrounds the lower level or bathhouse portion. The log corners are overhung and secured with saddle notching. A broad, asphalt shingle-clad gable roof with wide, overhanging eaves covers the building. An exposed, massive, random rubble stone chimney is centered on each end of the building. Structural elements are exposed and the interior is unfinished and dominated by the two large fireplaces. Built in 1938, the second shelter does not include a bathhouse and occupies a single level. It is composed of overlapping, saddle-notched, horizontal logs placed on a concrete footing and covered with an asphalt shingle-clad gable roof with broad overhang. Random rubble end chimneys are located on both end elevations. With the exception of the sliding doors across the multiple entrances, the shelter is similar in design, materials, and massing to the others (National Register Nomination 1988).

The Anvil Lake Campground Shelter represents one of four similar shelters and one of three shelter/bathhouse combinations identified within the Nicolet National Forest. They all display high levels of integrity. Alterations to the Anvil Lake Campground Shelter are few including replacement of the original roofing and some of the vertical boards along the doors into the bathhouse and the restoration of the log bench. Modifications to the setting are more extensive. The terrace and beach remain intact, but railroad ties replace the original steps and the board fence represents a recent addition. The campground and amphitheater are altered or demolished and excluded from the property boundaries. Thus, because the shelter follows a relatively common form for its locale, it gains significance at the local level.

The Anvil Lake Campground Shelter thus gains significance under criteria A and C in the areas of government and architecture. This recreational building

represents the climax of the slow incorporation of recreation planning into National Forest Service activities. Until the completion of the Copeland Report, such development by the Forest Service remained haphazard and controversial. The rapid influx of recreational monies into the Forest Service budget and the provision of a large, CCC labor force during the New Deal era resulted in the implementation of the report's recommendations beginning in 1933. This development gained momentum in 1935 and resulted in the creation of the Division of Recreation and Lands in 1937. The Anvil Lake Campground is a more complex Forest Service recreational development of the type that was more common to the second half of the 1930s. Built in the late winter and spring of 1936, the period and date of significance, the shelter was erected during the two years in which the Forest Service finally gave form to its recreational development plans. The shelter displays several of the key elements of the Rustic Style, a very common architectural style for Depression Era park buildings. This style was non-intrusive, blending the building into its natural setting. Use of the style and shelter building form also occurred at the Weber Lake Picnic Ground and the Franklin Lake Campground, both within the Nicolet National Forest. These examples also possess high physical integrity. Because the Anvil Lake Campground Shelter represents one of several intact examples of the same style and type, it gains significance at the local level.

1. Civilian Conservation Corps 1933-43 [records of camp F-2, boxes 236-37, 1934-36]; Vilas County News-Review 1936 [1/30: 6/4; 10/1: 5/3; 12/17: 5/1].

9. Bibliographic References

Ahlgren, Carol Ann
1987 A Human and Landscape Architectural Legacy: The Influence of the Civilian Conservation Corps on Wisconsin State Park Development. Master of Arts, Landscape Architecture, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

1988 The Civilian Conservation Corps and Wisconsin State Park Development. In Wisconsin Magazine of History, 71 (3): 184-204.

Anonymous
n.d. Map showing lands belonging to William Froelich in the Town of Washington, Vilas County. Ms., Charles Gumm, Chicklet Lane, Eagle River, WI 54521 (715-479-6819).

Anvil Lake Property Owners' Association
n.d. Woodland Whispers...Tales and Legends of the Great Wisconsin North Woods. Anvil Lake Property Owners Association, Eagle River [pamphlet available at Tree for Tomorrow, Eagle River].

Arnold, F.H.
1935 From Commercial to Recreational Forester. In Journal of Forestry, 33 (7/July): 662-67.

Becker, Folke
1952 Trees for Tomorrow. Wisconsin Magazine of History, 36: 43-47.

Braden, Donna R.
ca. 1988 Leisure and Entertainment in America. Henry Ford Museum and Greenfield Village and Wayne State University, Detroit.

Brown, George
1986 Farming the Cutover, Agriculture (section 4). In Cultural Resource Management in Wisconsin (volume 2), edited by Barbara Wyatt. Historic Preservation Division, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

Brumbaugh, M.C.
1924 Citizenship Values of Outdoor Recreation. In Proceedings, National Conference on Outdoor Recreation, pp. 71-73. Washington, D.C.

Buck, C.J.
1933 The Place of Recreation in the Forest Program. In Journal of Forestry, 31 (2/Feb.): 191-98.

Carhart, Arthur H.
1920a Recreation in the Forests. In American Forestry, 26 (May): 268-72.

1920b Vacation Opportunities in Your National Forests. In American Forestry, 26 (Sept.): 549-53.

1922a Man and Rural Recreation. In Parks and Recreation, 5 (5/May-June): 437-40.

1922b Trees and Rural Recreation. In Parks and Recreation, 5 (6/July-Aug.): 597-601.

1923a What Do Tourist Want? In American Forestry, 29 (April): 210-13.

1923b Recreation as a Basic Forest Product. In American Forester, 11: 49-54.

1923c Recreation in Forestry. In Journal of Forestry, 21 (2/Jan.): 10-14.

Carstensen, Vernon
1958 Farms or Forests: Evolution of a State Land Policy for Northern Wisconsin. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison.

Chapman, H.H.
1924 Compatibility of Recreational Uses with Forest Management. Proceedings, National Conference on Outdoor Recreation, 144-47.

1925 Recreation as a Federal Land Use. In American Forests and Forest Life, 31: 349-51, 378-80.

Civilian Conservation Corps
1933-42 Records of the Civilian Conservation Corps: Camp Inspection Reports, Wisconsin Camps F-2 (Camp Nine Mile) and F-19 (Mountain Company 1653). Mss., 12E1/9/12/4, boxes 236-37. National Archives, Washington, D.C.

Civilian Conservation Corps, Sixth Corps Area
1937 Sparta District, The Annual 1937, Sparta, Wisconsin.

Clepper, Henry
1971 Professional Forestry in the United States. Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore.

Cohen, Stan
1980 The Tree Army, A Pictorial History of the Civilian Conservation Corps. Pictorial Histories Publishing Co., Missoula, Montana.

Coffman, J.D.
1937 How Much and What Kind of Forest Land Should Be Devoted Exclusively to Recreation and Aesthetics. In Journal of Forestry, 35 (2/Feb.): 210-14.

Davies, Richard C., ed.
1983 Encyclopedia of American Forest and Conservation History (2 vols.). MacMillan, New York.

Draeger, Jim
1986 (1993) The Rustic Style, 1993 Update to Architectural Styles, Architecture (sec. 2). In Cultural Resource Management in Wisconsin (vol. 2), edited by Barbara Wyatt. Historic Preservation Division, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

Dulles, Foster Rhea
1965 A History of Recreation: America Learns to Play (2nd ed.). Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York.

Dunn, Michael
1978 Easy Going: Wisconsin's North Woods: Vilas and Oneida Counties. Tamarack Press, Madison.

Elliott, Kennell M.
1977 [1989] History of the Nicolet National Forest: 1928-1976 (1989 update). USDA Forest Service and the Forest History Association of Wisconsin, Rhinelander.

Ermentrout, Roger Allen
1982 Forgotten Men: The Civilian Conservation Corps. Exposition Press, Smithtown, New York.

Fay, Robert
1986 Later Railroad Lines, Transportation (sec. 6). In Cultural Resource Management in Wisconsin (vol. 2), edited by Barbara Wyatt. Historic Preservation Division, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

Goldsworthy, Walt
1993 Telephone interview and correspondence by Joyce McKay with Walt Goldsworthy, Three Lakes (715-546-3529) on 12/3.

Good, Albert
1938 Park and Recreation Structures (3 vols.). National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Gottfried, Herbert and Jan Jennings
1985 American Vernacular Design, 1870-1940: An Illustrative Guide. Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, New York.

Gumm, Charlie
1993 Oral interview on 10/15-16 with Charlie Gumm, Chicklet Lane, Eagle River, WI 54521 (715-479-6819).

Hall, L.G.
1936 Recreation in the National Forests. Parks and Recreation, 19 (July-Aug.): 382-87, 411-17, 475-80.

Hubbard, H.V.
1924 National Provisions for the Enjoyment of Our Scenic Resources. In Proceedings, National Conference on Outdoor Recreation, 58-61.

Huth, Hans
1957 Nature and the American: Three Centuries of Changing Attitudes. University of California Press, Berkeley.

Isakoss, Jack F.
1938 The Public Works Administration. In University of Illinois Bulletin, 36 (24). University of Illinois, Urbana.

Johnson, Jack
1941 The Iowa Department of Social Welfare. Iowa Journal of History and Politics (April): 146-79.

Kneipp, L.F.
1924 Recreational Value of National Forests. In Parks and Recreation, 8 (4/March-April): 300-04.

1931 Forest Service Pledged to Conserve Scenic Beauty of Forest Roads. Forest Worker, 7 (3/May): 9-10.

Kylie, Harry R., G.H. Hieronymus, and A.G. Hall
1937 CCC Forestry. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Leake, Fred E.
1980 Roosevelt's Tree Army: A Brief History of the Civilian Conservation Corps. National Association for CCC Alumni, St. Louis.

Lusignan, Paul
1986 Logging and Lumber Milling (sec. 5); Pulp and Paper Production (sec. 6), Industry. In Cultural Resource Management in Wisconsin (vol. 2), edited by Barbara Wyatt. Historic Preservation Division, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison.

Marshall, Robert
1930 The Social Management of American Forests. League for Industrial Democracy, New York.

1935 Priorities in Forest Recreation. In American Forests, 41 (1/Jan.): 11-13, 30.

Merriam, J.C.
1926 Federal and State Interest in National Recreation Policy. In

Proceedings, National Conference on Outdoor Recreation, 30-35.

Missouri Department of Natural Resources
1984 Emergency Conservation Work (ECW) Architecture in Missouri State Parks, 1933-42. Thematic Resources. Division of Historic Preservation, Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Jefferson City.

Morse, C.B.
1933 The Place of Recreation in the Forest Program. Journal of Forestry, 31 (2/Feb.): 203-07.

Nash, Roderick, editor
1982 Wilderness and the American Mind (3rd ed.). Yale University Press, New Haven.

1990 American Environmentalism, Readings in Conservation History (3rd edition). McGraw-Hill, New York.

Nicolet News
1985-88 Newsletter of the Nicolet National Forest, USDA Forest Service, Headquarters, Rhinelander.

Otis, Alison, et al.
1986 The Forest Service and the Civilian Conservation Corps, 1933-1942. United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

Owen, A.L. Riesch
1983 Conservation Under FDR. Praeger, New York.

Pager, John
1983 The Civilian Conservation Corps Program with Emphasis on Wisconsin. Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the Forest History Association of Wisconsin (Appleton), 9: 16-17.

Paige, John C.
1985 The Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Park Service, 1933-1942: An Administrative History. National Park Service, Washington, D.C.

Pinkett, Harold T.
1970 Gifford Pinchot, Private and Public Forester. University of Illinois Press, Urbana.

Rawick, George P.
1957 The New Deal and Youth: The Civilian Conservation Corps, the National Youth Administration, and the American Youth Congress. Unpublished dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Reiger, John F.
1986 American Sportsmen and the Origins of Conservation (rev. ed.).

University of Oklahoma Press, Norman.

Robbins, William G.
1985 American Forestry, A History of National, State, and Private Cooperation. University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln.

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

Schmitt, Peter J.
1969 Back to Nature: The Arcadian Myth in Urban America. Oxford University Press, New York.

Schlesinger, Arthur
1940 The New Deal in Action: 1933-1939. MacMillan, New York.

Scott, J.E.
1925 Forests as National Playgrounds. In American Forests and Forest Life, 31 (Jan.): 25-28, 52, 54.

Sharp, L.B.
1933 Need for Recreation in Time of Depression. Recreation, 27 (July): 193-95.

Smith, Darrell H.,
1930 The Forest Service: Its History, Activities and Organization. Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

Steen, Harold K.
1976 The U.S. Forest Service: A History. University Washington Press, Seattle.

Steiner, Jesse Frederick
1970 Americans at Play: Recent Trends in Recreation and Leisure-Time
(1933) Activities. McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York.

Sylvester, William
1992 The Early Days of Trees for Tomorrow: 1945-55. Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the Forest History Association of Wisconsin, Eagle River, Wisconsin. Print Shop, Wisconsin Rapids.

Tweed, William C.
1980 Recreation Site Planning and Improvements in National Forests, 1891-1942. USDA Forest Service, Washington, D.C.

Tweed, William C., Laura E. Soulliere, and Henry G. Law
1977 National Park Service, Rustic Architecture: 1916-1942. USDA Forest Service, San Francisco.

U.S. Department of Agriculture
1933 A National Plan for American Forestry (Senate Doc. 12.73 Cong., 1 session, 2 vol). Washington, D.C.

1949 Trees, The Yearbook of Agriculture. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

USDA Forest Service
1934-81 Land Records for National Forest Service Properties, Memoranda, Building Plans, and Work Reports. Mss. Conveyance Office, Supervisor's Office, Nicolet National Forest, USDA Forest Service, Rhinelander.

1937 Nicolet National Forest [map]. Compiled at the Regional Office, Milwaukee, Wisconsin under T.W. Norcross, Chief of the Engineering Division of the Forest Service (May, 1937). Copy, USDA Forest Service, Nicolet National Forest Offices, Rhinelander.

1985 Cultural resource inventory for properties within the Nicolet National Forest documented by Mark Bruhy. USDA Forest Service Nicolet National Forest Offices, Rhinelander.

United States Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works
1934 Final Report of the National Planning Board. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Federal Works Agency
1946 Final Report on the WPA Program, 1935-1943. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

U.S. Joint Committee on Recreational Survey of Federal Lands
1928 Recreational Resources of Federal Lands. Report of the Joint Committee on Recreational Survey of Federal Lands and the American Forestry Association to the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation, Washington, D.C.

U.S. National Park Service
1941 A Study of the Park and Recreational Problems of the United States. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Vilas County News-Review
1936-38 Published in Eagle River.

Waugh, Frank A.
1918 Recreational Uses on the National Forests. U.S. Department of Agriculture (Forest Service), Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Wehrwein, G.S. and K.H. Parsons
1932 Recreation as a Land Use. Wisconsin Agricultural Experimental Station Bulletin 422, 3-32 (Madison).

West, Terry L.
1992 Centennial Mini-Histories of the Forest Service. USDA Forest Service, Washington, D.C.

Williams, Michael
1989 Americans & Their Forests, A Historical Geography. Cambridge University Press, New York.

Wirth, Conrad L.
1980 Parks, Politics, and the People. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, Oklahoma.

Wisconsin Committee on Land Use and Forestry
1932 Forest Land Use in Wisconsin. State of Wisconsin, Madison.

Wisconsin Conservation Department
1955 History of State Forestry in Wisconsin. State of Wisconsin, Madison.

Anvil Lake Campground Shelter
Name of Property

Vilas County, Wisconsin
County and State

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:
_x_ State Historic Preservation Office
___ Other State Agency
_x_ Federal Agency
___ Local government
___ University
___ Other
Name of repository:
USDA Forest Service, Rhinelander

10. Geographical Data

Acreage of Property less than one acre

UTM References (Place additional UTM references on a continuation sheet.)

	Zone	Easting	Northing
1	1/6	3/4/0/2/4/0	5/0/8/8/9/2/0
2	/	/ / / / /	/ / / / / / /
3	/	/ / / / /	/ / / / / / /
4	/	/ / / / /	/ / / / / / /

___ see continuation sheet

Verbal Boundary Description (Describe the boundaries of the property on a continuation sheet)

Boundary Justification (Explain why the boundaries were selected on a continuation sheet)

11. Form Prepared By

name/title Joyce McKay, Cultural Resources Consultant
organization private consultant date 2/25/94
street & number P.O. Box 258, 21-4th Street telephone 608-424-6315
city or town Belleville state Wisconsin zip code 53508

Additional Documentation

Submit the following items with the completed form:

Continuation Sheets

Maps A USGS map (7.5 or 15 minute series) indicating the property's location. A sketch map for historic districts and properties having large acreage or numerous resources.

Photographs Representative black and white photographs of the property.

Additional Items (Check with the SHPO or FPO for any additional items)

10. Geographical Data

Verbal Boundary Description

The boundaries of the property form an approximate rectangle running between the southwest edge of the road to the parking lot to the edge of the lake and 35 feet southwest of the shelter and 53 feet northeast of the shelter.

Boundary Justification

The boundaries for the Anvil Lake Campground shelter include the shelter, the terrace on which it sits, the immediate landscaping along the terrace, the hillside to the southeast and the beach area in front of the shelter. Although modified by the addition of a recent post and board fence, a wooden fence barrier to the rear, and steps composed of railroad ties, this area represents the property modified by the CCC when constructing the shelter and clearing the beach. The Rustic Style was to blend into the immediate landscaping of the building. Disruption by construction was to be returned as closely as possible to its natural state. Thus, the immediate landscaping of the shelter is an important element in the overall design of the shelter. And, the boundaries exclude recent modifications in the campground area.

Photographic Documentation

Property: Anvil Lake Campground Shelter
Location: Eagle River, Vilas County, Wisconsin
Photographer: Joyce McKay
Date: October 17, 1994
Negative Location: State Historical Society of Wisconsin

Photographic Description:

1. The southeast and southwest elevations of the shelter facing north (14a).
2. The northwest and southwest elevations of the shelter with Anvil Lake in the background facing south (13a).
3. The southeast and northeast elevation of the shelter facing east (19a).
4. The beach and shelter in the background facing north (10a).
5. The fireplace along the northeast within the shelter facing northeast (20a).

Anvil Lake Campground Shelter
Name of Property

Vilas County, Wisconsin
County and State

Property Owner
Complete this item at the request of SHPO or FPO.)

name USDA Forest Service, Nicolet National Forest
street & number 68 South Stevens Street telephone 715-362-1300
city or town Rhinelander state Wisconsin zip code 53501

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.).

Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18.1 hours per response including time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Chief, Administrative Services Division, National Park Service, P.O. Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reductions Projects, (1024-0018), Washington, DC 20503.