

65361248  
COVER

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form

This form is used for documenting property groups relating to one or several historic contexts. See instructions in National Register Bulletin *How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form* (formerly 16B). Complete each item by entering the requested information. For additional space, use continuation sheets (Form 10-900-a). Use a typewriter, word processor, or computer to complete all items

RECEIVED 200

AUG 14 2015

New Submission  Amended Submission

Nat. Register of Historic Places  
National Park Service

A. Name of Multiple Property Listing

National Park Service Mission 66 Era Resources

B. Associated Historic Contexts

(Name each associated historic context, identifying theme, geographical area, and chronological period for each.)

Pre-Mission 66 era, 1945-1955; Mission 66 program, 1956-1966; Parkscape USA program, 1967-1972, National Park Service, nation-wide

C. Form Prepared by

name/title Ethan Carr (Historical Landscape Architect); Elaine Jackson-Retondo, Ph.D., (Historian, Architectural); Len Warner (Historian). The Collaborative Inc.'s 2012-2013 team comprised Rodd L. Wheaton (Architectural Historian and Supportive Research), Editor and Contributing Author; John D. Feinberg, Editor and Contributing Author; and Carly M. Piccarello, Editor.

organization the Collaborative, inc. date March 2015  
street & number 2080 Pearl Street telephone 303-442-3601  
city or town Boulder state CO zip code 80302  
e-mail collab@thecollaborativeinc.net

organization National Park Service Intermountain Regional Office date August 2015  
street & number 1100 Old Santa Fe Trail telephone 505-988-6847  
city or town Santa Fe state NM zip code 87505  
e-mail sam\_tamburro@nps.gov

D. Certification

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

( See continuation sheet for additional comments.)

*Roddy L. Wheaton Deputy FPO* August 13, 2015  
Signature and title of certifying official Date  
*National Park Service*  
State or Federal Agency or Tribal government

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

*[Signature]* 8/13/2015  
Signature of the Keeper Date of Action  
*Dugan*

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
National Park Service**

Mission 66 Era Resources of the National Park Service  
Name of Multiple Property Listing  
NPS Form 10-900-b (Rev. 01/2009)

Nationwide  
State

OMB No. 1024-0018

**TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR WRITTEN NARRATIVE**

Provide the following information on continuation sheets. Cite the letter and title before each section of the narrative. Assign page numbers according to the instructions for continuation sheets in National Register Bulletin *How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form* (formerly 16B). Fill in page numbers for each section in the space below.

	<b>Page Numbers</b>
<b>E. Statement of Historic Contexts</b>	
(if more than one historic context is documented, present them in sequential order.)	
<i>Introduction</i> .....	1
<i>Directors Newton Drury and Conrad Wirth</i> .....	5
<i>Construction</i> .....	10
<i>The Visitor Center</i> .....	12
<i>Administration, Maintenance Buildings, and Ranger Stations</i> .....	18
<i>Park Employee Housing</i> .....	19
<i>Other Building Types</i> .....	22
<i>Concession and Other Partnership Buildings</i> .....	23
<i>Landscape Development, Park Roads, and Trails</i> .....	30
<i>Historic Preservation and Interpretation</i> .....	39
<i>Mid-Course Corrections</i> .....	41
<i>George B. Hartzog, Jr., and the "Road to the Future"</i> .....	43
<i>Park System Expansion</i> .....	45
<i>Parkscape USA Program</i> .....	46
<i>Epilogue</i> .....	48
<i>Endnotes</i> .....	49
<b>F. Associated Property Types</b>	57
(Provide description, significance, and registration requirements.)	
<b>G. Geographical Data</b>	99
<b>H. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods</b>	107
(Discuss the methods used in developing the multiple property listing.)	
<b>I. Major Bibliographical References</b>	110
(List major written works and primary location of additional documentation: State Historic Preservation Office, other State agency, Federal agency, local government, university, or other, specifying repository.)	

**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.460 et seq.).

**Estimated Burden Statement:** Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 18 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, PO Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reductions Project (1024-0018), Washington, DC 20503.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 1

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

**STATEMENT OF HISTORIC CONTEXTS**

***Introduction***

The “Mission 66 Era” was announced by the National Park Service in Washington, D. C., during a Mission 66 Research Working Meeting on May 28-29, 2003. Historical Landscape Architect Ethan Carr, then an employ of the National Park Service Historic Structures and Cultural Landscapes Program in the Washington Office, detailed the development of a nationwide “Mission 66-Era (1945-1973) Contextual Essay and Multiple Property Documentation Form.”<sup>1</sup> The first phase of the Mission 66 era, “pre-Mission 66” (1945-1955), provides context which includes the vastly increased visitation after World War II, the overuse and deterioration of park facilities, and the increased feasibility of using ten-year funding programs as evidenced by other federal agencies. In the pre-Mission 66 period, design experimentations in the Modern Movement style were being planned and conducted in the parks for the following phase. After the establishment of the Eastern and Western Offices of Design and Construction in 1954, the design and planning processes were carried out in Philadelphia and San Francisco. The Modern Movement style formed the basis for architecture, landscape architecture, engineering, and construction during the National Park Service’s “Mission 66 program” (1956-1966). The Mission 66 program was the largest construction program in the history of the agency. This phase was intended to conclude with the celebration of the National Park Service’s 50th anniversary in 1966. After the “close” of the Mission 66 program, a long list of projects remained incomplete, and new parks were planned, designed, and constructed. As a result, the program was extended under a new name, “Parkscape USA” (1967-1973). The third phase authorized the conclusion of the construction program in time for the Yellowstone National Park centennial celebration in 1972. The end of the Mission 66 era came also with the closing of the Eastern and Western Offices of Design and Construction and the consolidation of personnel into the Denver Service Center in 1972. The entire era represents the National Park Service’s presentation of a new way for the American public to experience national parks. Addressing the public was particularly significant because national park visitation increased due to the rise of American automobile culture following World War II and enhanced access via the construction of the interstate highway system.

**Pre-Mission 66**

The first of three periods of the Mission 66 era represents immediate post-World War II park development from 1945 to 1955 and the park system’s experimentation with the Modern Movement style, or “Park Service Modern” style, as defined by Sarah Allaback, author of *Mission 66 Visitor Centers: The History of a Building Type*.<sup>2</sup> Until Congress passed Mission 66 program funding, hotels constructed with private concessioner funds were the largest property types in the national parks. Most were located in close proximity to park focal areas, such as geysers or canyons. Secondary to concession properties, National Park Service facilities were built using public funding drawn from the New Deal programs of the 1930s. These small-scale structures were characterized by the Rustic style and indigenous design inspirations. Small crews built structures with limited construction equipment and close-at-hand materials to blend the buildings with their environments. National Park Service architect-, landscape architect-, and private architect-designed structures were usually devoted to a single function and were clustered near park focal points and private concession operations. Planning in the parks was largely under the control of the regions’ planning and design staffs. Superintendents of parks, particularly at national monuments, struggled to secure funding for needed facilities and road construction. Buildings and roads were constructed by various means of funding in order to accommodate the increased number of visitors brought by the railroads and subsequently by transcontinental roadways. The Rustic style period, which ended at the beginning of World War II in 1941, is detailed in Albert H. Good’s *Park and Recreation Structures* originally published in 1938.<sup>3</sup>

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 2

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Rustic style architecture became associated with leisure and parks. Inspirations can be traced from the eighteenth century. In the nineteenth century, Rustic style reached its apex within the stone-and-log-constructed summer camps of the Adirondacks of upstate New York and in remote eastern areas such as the deep woods of Maine. Typically, the Rustic style represented a retreat from civilization. Rustic elements, such as the nineteenth-century log and stonemasonry bridges and walls of New York City's Central Park and the carriage roads of Acadia National Park, Maine, continued to be the focus of the architectural style of local, state, and national parks during the New Deal programs of the 1930s. The Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) supplied inexpensive labor and hired locally. The builders used locally available materials, such as stone and logs that characterized the Rustic style and extended the use of these materials beyond building construction to road and trail landscape features.

During World War II, the shortage of funds and lack of construction materials crippled the ability of the National Park Service and most state parks to build and maintain park employee facilities, visitor facilities, roads and trails. Many parks closed temporarily to conserve funding and respond to gasoline rationing. Such actions deterred visitation. Once rationing and travel restrictions ended after World War II, a flood of visitors inundated parks. In Yellowstone National Park more than one million visits were recorded annually beginning in 1948, which was up from 500,000 in 1940 and wartime low of 86,000 in 1944. The numbers climbed to unprecedented visitation levels in all parks. In 1955, there were 56 million visits to the national park system compared to 17 million in 1940. National Park Service budgets remained at or below prewar levels.<sup>4</sup> Immediately after World War II, several key park development projects were initiated in the late 1940s and early 1950s to resolve parks' needs. These projects established a precedent for the evolution in planning and design concepts that became integral parts of the subsequent Mission 66 program. Now referred to by the National Park Service as the pre-Mission 66 phase of the Mission 66 era, this planning and construction phase reflected the postwar capacity to produce building materials. National production shifted to domestic products and construction materials while labor costs rose. Simultaneously, a new architectural style emerged, Modernism. The National Park Service architects began the shift to the Modern Movement style and its use of cost-efficient materials and systems, as did the architects for concessioner projects in the parks. In 1949, the American Oil Company gas station at Bryce Canyon National Park incorporated local stonemasonry with a modern automobile service station facility. The National Park Service architects, generally located in regional offices, experimented with Modern Movement housing in Glacier National Park and Zion National Park as well as other parks. These experiments became prototypes for new park housing during the second phase of the Mission 66 program. Although Modernism since the 1920s became a notable architectural style in America prior to and after the World War II, the national parks continued to adhere to the Rustic style with its revered ability to blend park structures with the environment.

The decision to employ modernism in the parks was not revolutionary for the time; it was revolutionary for the place. An early Modern Movement style project was Grand Teton National Park's Jackson Lake Lodge overlooking Jackson Lake and the Grand Tetons. The lodge was completed as a private venture by the Grand Teton Lodge and Transportation Company which had direct ties to the Rockefeller family, the benefactors of the park. The Jackson Lake Lodge, its separate motel units, and landscape were designed by Gilbert Stanley Underwood, the architect of many Rustic style park lodges including those at Bryce, Zion, Grand Canyon, and Yosemite National Parks. After Grand Teton National Park's expansion in 1950, visitation dramatically rose to 587,000 in 1951, which established an expanded hospitality market. To respond to increased demand, Underwood designed a lodge in 1955 executed in concrete with wood grain formwork to give the surfaces a natural finish. The exterior concrete was stained reddish brown to suggest the Rustic style. The public and press response was mixed, but Jackson Lake Lodge set a precedent for the use of Modernism in a national park. Though revolutionary for the place, the acceptability of the design was aided by the prestige of the Rockefeller

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 3

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

family as the developers and their architect who had previously exemplified Rustic style architecture in western parks.

**Mission 66 Program**

National Park Service Director Conrad L. Wirth recognized that postwar projects in the parks were being funded by various means through regional offices and designed by regional staffs. In order to achieve his vision for service-wide construction goals, he consolidated regional design and construction staffs into two centralized offices in San Francisco and Philadelphia and realigned architects, landscape architects, engineers, and project administration. The Eastern and Western Offices of Design and Construction were established in June 1, 1954, with direct oversight from professional division offices in Washington, D.C.<sup>5</sup> Director Wirth, influenced by the multi-year program of the Federal Highways Administration, began to implement a similar systematic, long-term program for new construction and improvements in the national parks. In 1955, using national park-wide planning proposals, he put forward a ten-year construction program and, with the approval of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, it was embraced by Congress. As envisioned by Wirth and his Washington office staff, the new Mission 66 program, fully underway by 1956, was intended to modernize, enlarge, and even reinvent the National Park system by its 50th anniversary in 1966. Congress indicated a willingness to comply with the over \$700 million budget for the ten-year program. The agency's budget increased for fiscal year 1957 to \$68 million above the \$32 million appropriated in 1955. Further increases led to annual budgets greater than \$100 million by 1962. The planning and policy initiative of the Mission 66 program proved to be the most effective means of increasing National Park Service appropriations since the 1930s.<sup>6</sup> The full historic details of Director Wirth's implementation are detailed in Ethan Carr's book, *Mission 66, Modernism and the National Park Dilemma*, published in 2007.<sup>7</sup>

At the beginning of fiscal year 1956, a large number of projects were planned through park-wide studies and formulated to support the Mission 66 program. These projects were funded and began quickly to demonstrate the efficiency of the National Park Service to manage the ten-year proposal. These initial projects demonstrated the readiness of the agency's centralized planners, architects and landscape architects. Contractual agreements with private design offices supplemented program demands. Most importantly, the Modern Movement style, or Park Service Modern style, was adopted as the premier design idiom. The pre-Mission 66 designs demonstrated the national trend toward Modernism during post-World War II construction. The National Park Service's ten-year Mission 66 program was initiated as the largest construction program to upgrade the parks in the history of the agency.

By 1966, Congress spent about \$1 billion on land acquisition, new staff and training, general operations, and construction activities in national parks. 70 new "units" of the park system were authorized between 1956 and 1966. The National Park Service constructed or reconstructed over 2,700 miles of roads and over 900 miles of trails. Many parks received adequate water, sewer, and electric service for the first time. Hundreds of park residences, comfort stations, and other public use property types and park administration were built. The Mission 66 program expanded and professionalized National Park Service employees by establishing two new training centers, the Albright and Mather training centers, for park staff. Above all, the Mission 66 program funded more than 100 visitor centers, a new property type invented by the agency's planners and architects, which were at the heart of the revised park Master Planning goals. Modernist advances in park architecture forged a new identity for the agency.<sup>8</sup> Although the development and redevelopment of national parks at this scale was beset by controversy, by the end of the Mission 66 program, much of what Wirth envisioned was accomplished. The

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 4

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

reinvention of the National Park Service—and to some extent the national park idea—met the urgent demands of postwar American society.

From the outset, the Mission 66 program was criticized for emphasizing capital construction, a one-dimensional solution, for complex social and environmental problems that park managers faced. Critics complained that Mission 66 construction abandoned the natural landscape architectural theory and building technology of the Rustic era. Postwar park architecture integrated steel, concrete, prefabricated elements, nontraditional fenestration, climate control, and other aspects of mid-century American architecture. Distinctive new property types emerged from various approaches of postwar modernism to the programmatic and aesthetic requirements of the national parks.<sup>9</sup> New park development included contemporary planning and landscaping to provide naturalistic settings for buildings, roads and trails. For example, the visitor center, a one-stop centralized service center, was accessible to large numbers of people in automobiles. The Interstate Highway system influenced Mission 66 road design and sometimes determined the locations of developed areas to provide easy access for visitors to park facilities. Conservationists generally denounced these changes in the American landscape and saw the results in the national parks' front country as deeply disturbing. The Mission 66 program began in an atmosphere of intense optimism, but the program soon led the National Park Service into bitter controversy as the postwar conservation movement began to organize and exert strength. The Mission 66 program hastened the initiation of environmentalism by igniting genuine concern that the Park Service was overdeveloping parks and failing to take steps to preserve wilderness.

As the Mission 66 program implemented new planning procedures and design concepts, it remained profoundly committed to facilitate public enjoyment of the parks. Wirth continually insisted that the Mission 66 program should be seen as a conservation program and not as a development program that would, ultimately, preserve and not destroy wilderness. Wirth, a landscape architect who worked in the parks in the 1930s, managed Civilian Conservation Corps projects. He firmly believed, along with landscape architect Thomas Vint, that the naturalistic park landscapes should be maintained and reflected in the new architecture. Wirth made clear the idea that "parks were for the people." Preservation outside the context of public enjoyment was simply not what the National Park Service intended to achieve during the Mission 66 program.

#### Parkscape USA

The Mission 66 program did not conclude with the celebration of the National Park Service's 50th anniversary in 1966 as intended. At the end of the Mission 66 program, a long list of projects remained incomplete, and new parks were planned, designed, and constructed. As a result, "Parkscape USA" (1967-1973) became the third phase of Mission 66. Parkscape USA authorized the remaining construction in time for the Yellowstone National Park centennial celebration in 1972. In preparation for the new program, EODC, WODC, and the Washington Office of the Assistant Director, Planning and Construction reorganized. By July 1966, the eastern and western offices became the Philadelphia and the San Francisco Planning and Service Centers. The change of Directorship from Conrad Wirth to George B. Hartzog initiated a rebranding which included five major goals: "completing" the park system by 1972; developing "cooperative programs with other agencies;" "utilizing the national park concept" to improve life in American cities; "communicating the values of park conservation;" and developing an international assistance program in anticipation of the second World Conference of National Parks which was scheduled to be held in Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks in 1972.<sup>10</sup> The primary intent was to fulfill previously unmet needs.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 5

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

The Parkscape USA program's principal accomplishments resulted from the completion of the Mission 66 program projects that were underway or planned in 1966. Additionally, parks proposed during the Mission 66 program were added to the system and required appropriate facilities. In addition to completing projects and providing services to parks established in the Mission 66 program, new parks were introduced as part of an emphasis on national trails and national scenic riverways, under Parkscape USA. Congress passed the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act in 1968. Subsequently, five wild and scenic rivers joined the national park system. The National Trail System Act was passed in 1968, which included the Appalachian Trail into the national park system. The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 allowed Hartzog to "expand the National Register of Historic Places to include properties of state and local significance," and become "a record of all that merits preservation and a yardstick against which to measure the rightful roles of all concerned in the preservation movement."<sup>11</sup>

The end of the Mission 66 era came with the 100th anniversary celebration of Yellowstone National Park, the closing of the Eastern and Western Offices of Design and Construction and the consolidation of personnel into the Denver Service Center in 1972. The entire era represents the National Park Service's presentation of a new way for the American public to experience national parks. Addressing the public was particularly significant because national park visitation increased due to the rise of American automobile culture following World War II and enhanced access via the construction of the interstate highway system.

The Mission 66 era was the last period of intense construction activity that achieved a system-wide program of national park development. The developed areas of national parks would not be recognizable to the American public today would be unrecognizable without visitor centers, roads, campgrounds, and other facilities planned and built during these years. Mission 66 expanded the park system and entire categories of parks, such as national recreation areas and national seashores. Currently, the national park system and the National Park Service are in many ways representative of Mission 66, but park managers continue to face the challenges that the Mission 66 program attempted to solve. As Mission 66-era facilities age and require rehabilitation or replacement, the National Park Service needs to assess the resources for potential historical significance.<sup>12</sup>

***Directors Newton Drury and Conrad Wirth***

Although the Mission 66 program was presented to the public in 1956 as a dramatic, new initiative to accommodate increased visitation, the program responded to years of severe pressure on the national park system. Many aspects of the Mission 66 program were first suggested in the 1930s, but the new program responded to the events, realities, and trends of the first postwar decade. Examples of national park architecture in the Modern Movement style first appeared in the 1940s, and many of the basic assumptions became cornerstones of Mission 66 planning executed on during that decade. The story of the Mission 66 program begins in 1945 when the dismal postwar situation described as "the dilemma of our parks" rapidly unfolded because of the huge increase in visitation.<sup>13</sup> This characterization was advanced by National Park Service Director Newton B. Drury who believed that the National Park Service failed to protect wilderness aggressively enough. A few years earlier, many of these areas seemed relatively remote due to rudimentary road systems, but after 1945, they were opened to a broader, larger public, and the impacts of improved access.

When Newton Drury was appointed director in 1940, his reputation as a preservationist was such that David R. Brower, later executive director of the Sierra Club, believed that it was "the beginning of a new era" in national park management.<sup>14</sup> Drury, a director well-suited for the special wartime conditions by fending off timber, stock,

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 6

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

and mining interests that exploited patriotic sentiments and tried to force national parks to open to commercial uses. For Drury, these preservation battles were familiar. However, when the war ended in 1945, the National Park Service plunged into an increasingly unfamiliar world. In 1946, Drury reported that lifted travel restrictions in August 1945 opened “the floodgates of travel immediately.” Drury did not disguise that “facilities and services to the public during 1945-46 were not—and could not be—up to the usual park standards.”<sup>15</sup>

Drury was acutely aware of what he described as the “dilemma” that resulted from a number of postwar factors and trends. During, the New Deal, the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) provided the primary construction and maintenance workers in the parks. New Deal spending programs, such as the Public Works Administration, funded many park improvements, including roads, buildings, campgrounds, and museums.<sup>16</sup> In 1942, this program ended and the much smaller staffs of the National Park Service could not fulfill the resulting, immediate labor shortage. Staff members now worked a 40-hour workweek, which was down from 48 hours before World War II. During World War II, funding was redirected to the war which halted construction in the parks. Immediately following the war, construction was limited to a few isolated projects.

At the end of 1951, the Eisenhower Administration appointed Conrad Wirth as director. His first major effort in considering the future of the national park system resulted in the consolidation of the design and construction offices. The reorganization was implemented in 1954 with the establishment of the Eastern Office of Design and Construction (EODC) in Philadelphia and the Western Office of Design and Construction (WODC) in San Francisco. Both offices answered directly to the National Park Service’s Washington Office. The lead architects, landscape architects, engineers, and other professionals were generally drawn from the regional offices, and largely consisted of senior staff members augmented by new hires. They hardly settled in before Wirth proposed his ten-year modernization and expansion plan to the national park system, then estimated to cost at least \$700 million. The specific ideas and events Wirth described in his memoirs were based, in part, on a 1958 history by National Park Service historian Roy E. Appleman who interviewed the director in 1956.<sup>17</sup> According to Wirth in *Parks, Politics, and the People*, he considered the increased multiyear budgets of the Bureau of Public Roads, Bureau of Reclamation, and the Army Corps of Engineers that allowed these agencies to complete massive public work programs as a solution. In early 1955, Wirth decided to present the redevelopment of the national park system to Congress on the same terms, as a national priority requiring a long-term, major commitment of funds.<sup>18</sup> This strategy was the essence of “Mission 66,” a name Wirth used to evoke the wartime zeal of a mission. Ten years was believed to be the right balance between short-term planning and not going too far into the uncertainties of the future. Its end date, in 1966, coincided with the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service.<sup>19</sup>

On February 8, 1955, Wirth announced to his staff that normal operations would change immediately in the Washington Office. A new working group was formed to provide details and estimates for the ten-year program to modernize and expand the park system.<sup>20</sup> The task was to “secure a reasonable protection of the parks and yet provide for increased public use in such a way as to not wear them out.” Wirth charged his staff to delineate a program to accomplish that objective.<sup>21</sup> Though the Washington Office solicited for opinions, the lack of official outreach to private conservation groups and park concessioners proved to be a strategic error that projected an atmosphere of insularity by the National Park Service.<sup>22</sup>

The first policy stated that travel to national parks “should not be actively encouraged” and that an “optimum visitor load” should be determined for the present and future. It advocated for the removal of development within park boundaries, and specifically, from overcrowded and focal areas. The working group sought new strategies for relocating hotels and administrative facilities to less sensitive sites. Finally, new plans for national parks



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 7

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

would have to consider “completely revamping park transportation systems,” to increase the efficient use of bus systems.<sup>23</sup> In the Mount Rainier National Park prototype prospectus, an initial planning effort, a basic premise of the entire Mission 66 program emerged. The prospectus suggested that the impact of larger numbers of visitors in cars could be absorbed without “impairment” of the parks if the patterns and types of public use were rearranged. The “difficult problem” of eliminating overnight accommodations to reduce visitation in parks became a central challenge.<sup>24</sup> Planners discovered that public facilities were easier to build than remove. Strong constituencies of users and concessioners mounted campaigns with the support of local congressional delegations to overcome the insularity of park planning. In order for larger numbers of cars and tourists to enter, travel through, and exit parks efficiently, the Mission 66 program required the modernization of hundreds of miles of park roads. To accommodate higher traffic volumes at higher speeds, winding routes were to be straightened and widened, and bridges replaced. Mission 66 planners recommended ending existing park transportation concessions. The decision to increase the capacity of park roads assured that the private automobile became the primary means to experience most parks. Transportation enhancements were seen as integral to the overall concept of reducing the impact of the large numbers of people by making movement through parks easy, efficient and quick.

From the experience of creating the pilot Mount Rainier National Park planning prospectus came a generalized procedure for how other Mission 66 prospectuses would update and transform National Park Service master plans. The first task was to “determine and state the important park resources.” Following this inventory, planners were to “fix a road and trail systems” that would allow visitors to “see, experience, and enjoy the values to be derived from” the “important park resources” described at the beginning of the document. Then, they were to “determine what visitor facilities, other than roads and trails,” were required in order to “provide a reasonable opportunity to enjoy the Park resources” and meet “administrative requirements...in terms of protecting [the park’s] resources and providing visitor services.” Finally, they were to decide what land acquisitions should be recommended.<sup>25</sup>

Mission 66 program staff had access to an important survey regarding housing preferences among park staff and their families. At the 1952 park superintendents’ conference at Glacier National Park, a group of wives of National Park Service employees formed the National Park Service Women’s Organization. The women addressed the substandard housing conditions in many national park residential areas. Herma Albertson Baggley, the first woman to achieve permanent naturalist status in the National Park Service, organized a systematic survey of existing employee housing characteristics. She gathered information over the next year from women in almost every park.<sup>26</sup> Baggley described the needs and aspirations of women managing households in sometimes remote and isolated settings. They asked for standard American postwar housing for two- or three-bedroom, single-family, detached homes. In 1955, standard plans were endorsed for two- and three-bedroom ranch houses followed by “Standard Plans for Employee Housing” which was published in 1955 with amendments through 1964.<sup>27</sup>

The drafting of the “Guiding Precepts of Mission 66” in March 1955 reflected the views and contributions of many, but Wirth had great influence on the ideas presented. The precepts reiterated the basic themes of National Park Service policy guided the entire Mission 66 project. “Visitor enjoyment” of parks was the “best means of protecting them against exploitation or encroachment.” Visitors must be “channeled to avoid overuse” and deterioration in certain areas, and “channeling use” required “proper development.” The Mission 66 program was to be a “use and development program” and achieve the “preservation objectives of the Service.”<sup>28</sup>

By August 1955, the principles reached final form in the first section of the “MISSION 66 Report” which was drafted for the September presentation at the Great Smoky Mountains National Park superintendents’ conference.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 8

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Additional “discussion sections” elaborated on the principles. “All visitors desiring to enter a national park,” the planners agreed, “may do so,” by private vehicles, “drive-yourself” rentals, or permitted tour buses. “Limitations on numbers are not to be considered except for certain...ruins or buildings which...require limits.” The Mission 66 planners strongly believed that expanded use of the parks could occur without impairing the quality of visitor experience and resources. Success required a new model of how parks were to function as public places and redeveloped accordingly. Making parks into day-use destinations was to be achieved with wider roads, larger parking lots, and expanded “visitor use centers.” Visitor centers would provide ample interpretive displays, restrooms, and administrative areas for increased numbers of proposed employees. But while visitors were not to be turned away, they would not be “guaranteed overnight or meal facilities” in every park. The new iteration of the national park idea was intended to preserve the parks for public use even under the greatly increased pressures of the postwar era.<sup>29</sup>

The Mission 66 program planners determined that the “interpretive presentation” of a park or historic site needed to “take full advantage of the actual scene, object, or structure as the interpretive exhibit.” By extension, encroaching concession hotels were to be removed and replaced by businesses outside the park or by new concessions sited in less sensitive areas. When overnight accommodations were considered necessary in a park, because of remote locations and public “travel patterns,” “competition in providing concession facilities” would be encouraged by seeking new concessioners and sometimes multiple concessioners. National Park Service administrative and maintenance buildings would be relocated and similarly removed from sensitive areas of parks wherever it was deemed practicable.<sup>30</sup>

As envisioned during the summer of 1955, Wirth created a ten-year program that revised the previous opportunistic model for park construction, which took advantage of whatever monies became available. A park-wide planning archetype was taking shape which responded to postwar travel patterns and social trends. Wirth described his program in historical terms as “supporting the ideals and the vision of the pioneers of the national park movement” through an “intensive study of all the problems facing the National Park Service—protection, staffing, interpretation, use, development, financing, needed legislation, forest protection, fire.” Wirth ultimately rejected the idea of “rationing park use,” stating that, “the principle that is guiding the Mission 66 Committee and Staff is that the parks belong to the people, and they have a right to use them.” Redevelopment and spread of visitor use both geographically and seasonally would make it possible.<sup>31</sup>

Wirth asked his staff to have the entire Mission 66 program, including draft prospectuses and budget estimates for most of the parks, monuments, and historic sites of the park system, in complete form in order to submit to the Bureau of the Budget for approval in December 1955.<sup>32</sup> With approval, the appropriations process could begin early in 1956, making possible Congressional action by the end of June, and in time to launch the Mission 66 program at the beginning of fiscal year 1957—July 1, 1956. The overall costs of the program would need to be estimated and broken down into annual appropriations requests covering the next ten years.<sup>33</sup>

When Wirth and his staff presented their ongoing work on September 20 at the Great Smoky Mountains Superintendents’ Conference, he used the presentation as a public relations event augmented with an illustrated booklet, “The national park system.” A longer “Mission 66 Report” was still in draft form without budget estimates.<sup>34</sup> Wirth described Mission 66 as a “fresh start” based on three assumptions. Annual visitation would grow to 80 million by 1966; the “visitor load” “must be accommodated without undue harm to the parks”; and a third, new priority that Mission 66 plans would “include all existing facilities that are usable.” He ended with the observation that, as Americans experienced increased opportunities for leisure in the postwar era, “the way we use leisure will determine the kind of Nation we are tomorrow” and that national parks set “a national pattern for the

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 9

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

most wholesome and beneficial kind of recreation” that would instill “pride in their government, love of the land, and faith in American tradition.”<sup>35</sup>

Wirth refrained from giving the details of proposed budgets, but the broad scope and policy of the program was delineated which included much more than a “development program.” Chapters on roads, trails, concessions, housing, and other forms of capital development were augmented with increased “operating needs.” Needs would have to be met to run the modernized park system. New personnel were required to direct “management, protection, and interpretation” programs. Permanent increases in annual operating costs beyond a ten-year construction program were necessary to match operational needs.

By the end of 1955, Wirth and his staff’s planning tasks were complete. Park information and recommendations were assembled into a complete, ten-year Mission 66 report dated January 1956. Approved by Secretary of the Interior Douglas J. McKay, the report included a complete annual budget breakdown with \$66 million proposed for fiscal year 1957 and annual increases building to \$83 million in 1966. The total cost to the federal government, not including concessioner investments, would be \$787 million over ten years. Approximately \$475 million of that total was apportioned for construction; the rest supported management, protection, maintenance, and rehabilitation. The Mission 66 program doubled the agency’s average combined annual appropriations and entailed a permanent expansion of the park system, park staff, and activities of the National Park Service.<sup>36</sup>

Though President Eisenhower endorsed the program in his State of the Union address, on January 27, Wirth and his staff presented the program in full to the president and his cabinet.<sup>37</sup> On February 8, exactly one year after Wirth first presented the Mission 66 idea to his staff, the Department of the Interior and the American Automobile Association jointly sponsored an elaborate dinner in the basement dining room of the Interior Building. At the event, Wirth gave a presentation and distributed copies of a new and expanded edition of the illustrated booklet for the Mission 66 program, *Our Heritage, A Plan for Its Protection and Use: “MISSION 66.”*<sup>38</sup> The Eisenhower administration submitted a \$66 million National Park Service appropriation request to the Senate in February. The Appropriations Committee approved it and increased funding to \$68 million; the House of Representatives approved the action before the end of the month. The House of Representatives Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations approved the 1957 request and went beyond, agreeing to a supplemental \$17 million request that was made available immediately as part of fiscal year 1956.<sup>39</sup> Total National Park Service budgets over the next ten years would exceed \$1 billion. Significantly, the Mission 66 program introduced a new level of Congressional support for the park system.<sup>40</sup>

Wirth knew that public relations would now be critical to continued political success. Public interpretive programs and brochures were prepared to describe the Mission 66 program. Wirth oversaw the drafting of a scripted slide show that was made available in every park, for which he and other officials recorded narratives.<sup>41</sup> The priority of almost all information prepared for the public was to present the Mission 66 program as a “conservation” effort. Park redevelopment was one of the means by which “enjoyment-without-impairment” could be accomplished. This included educating visitors to cause less damage and spreading “visitor load” geographically and seasonally. Mission 66 was a “comprehensive program” that would aim to provide “facilities and adequate staffing to permit proper protection, interpretation, maintenance, and administration.”<sup>42</sup>

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 10

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

***Construction***

By January 1956, Wirth and the National Park Service evolved their new model for park planning with an emphasis on continuity and adaptation to evolving needs in core principles; however, many noticed change first. A dramatic new approach to park architecture had already taken place in several parks during the early 1950s which reflected the new postwar optimism. At Grand Teton National Park, the Jackson Lake Lodge was planned by the concessioner as a \$6 million complex and designed by Gilbert Stanley Underwood, the architect of Yosemite National Park's Ahwahnee Hotel and other prewar park lodges from the 1920s and 1930s. The Jackson Lake Lodge design, completed in 1955, confirmed the influence of contemporary American Modern Movement style in architectural design.<sup>43</sup> However, in August 1955, *The New York Times* reported on the "debate over national parks design" that the lodge incited. "Those who bitterly deride the appearance of the ...lodge," noted the reporter, "...level their aesthetic barbs at the mammoth central structure chiefly because it does not look 'rustic.'" Critics were outraged because the lodge did not look more like Yellowstone National Park's Old Faithful Inn or like other classic examples that were more effective in "blending with the scenery." Concern stemmed from Wirth's comments at the dedication that the lodge would serve as a design precedent for the new "10-year program."<sup>44</sup> From the outset, the Mission 66 program expressed a commitment to progressive, sometimes striking, Modernist architectural and landscape designs that were the heart of the construction program.

The potential for commitment to the Modern Movement style was enhanced in June 1, 1954, with consolidation of many service-wide planners, engineers, architects, and landscape architects into two offices: the Western and Eastern Offices of Design and Construction, WODC and EODC, in San Francisco and Philadelphia. This change responded to a 1953 study by the Department of Interior that required reorganization of the National Park Service.<sup>45</sup> The reorganization brought prewar planners, architects, and landscape architects together with a new generation of professionals. Sarah Allaback, in her study, *Mission 66 Visitor Centers, the History of a Building Type*, describes how longtime National Park Service architects, who produced important Rustic style buildings in the 1930s, were, by the early 1950s, developing new approaches in response to postwar conditions. "We couldn't help but change," explained National Park Service architect Cecil J. Doty. Doty continues, "I can't understand how anyone could think otherwise, how it [architectural design] could keep from changing." Allaback observes that this statement is "a key to understanding" the purpose of Mission 66 architecture, "which was not to design buildings for atmosphere, whimsy or aesthetic pleasure, but for change: To meet the demands of an estimated 80 million visitors" and to do so efficiently using new building technologies to reduce the effect of emerging higher costs of labor and materials.<sup>46</sup>

The consolidation of planning and design and the increase in staff put the National Park Service into the mainstream of American design in the mid-1950s. New professional staffs were hired, and many were recent graduates from progressive institutions where curriculums were restructured towards modernism. The Modern Movement style became the choice of corporations, cultural institutions, housing developers, retailers, and other federal agencies that were remaking the American landscape. Because the Mission 66 program generated sudden increases in the amount of work expected from the new in-house design force, the agency expanded its use of private consulting architectural design and engineering firms. The increased use of consultants further influenced Mission 66 design. The National Park Service set guidelines for consultants to follow.

No official policy statement regarding the adoption of the Modern Movement style at the National Park Service was ever made. Following the Great Smoky Mountains Superintendents' Conference, where he was asked to issue an official policy on architectural design, Wirth responded with a brief statement: "Structures should be designed to reflect the character of the area while at the same time following up-to-date design standards. Park

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 11

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

structures are to conform, to some extent, with the trend toward contemporary design and the use of materials and equipment accepted as standard by the building industry. However, restraint must be exercised in the design so that the structures will not be out of character with the area and so that the structures will be subordinated to their surroundings.”<sup>47</sup> In January 1957, Wirth gave the Offices of Design and Construction “guiding principles” for architectural design: “Whatever we do in the line of development in the parks, it must fit the terrain and be inconspicuous; durability is an important attribute; sound planning is basic to economic results; nothing should be built unless the need is already realized; don’t try to lead your profession in fancy design.”<sup>48</sup> For Wirth, architectural design was not a primary concern. For example, he wrote in 1958, the result would be the same “regardless of decorative colors used, or the style of architecture selected.” These were “details” that were important “in their way.” But, “park resources [were] neither destroyed nor preserved merely by application of a paintbrush or by a choice of...architectural décor.”<sup>49</sup>

By 1957, more Mission 66 property types appeared in the parks. These designs gave rise to a debate between the architectural profession and other groups, including purists, often represented by local newspaper editors and reporters. In general, those in the architectural profession strongly supported the new architecture. Devereux Butcher, in the *National Parks Magazine*, a publication of the nonprofit National Parks Conservation Association, grew increasingly incensed. He derided Welton Becket’s 1956 concessioner buildings at Yellowstone’s Canyon Village, for example, as “colossal and of freak design.” He insisted that the National Park Service was violating “national policy governing our national parks” by creating “conspicuous park structures.” Returning to Jackson Lake Lodge, he condemned it as “Alcatraz” and the “ugliest building in the park and monument system.” In the same publication, Director of the National Wildlife Federation Ernest Swift charged the Mission 66 program with “prostituting the scenic grandeurs of our national parks.” He claimed that the Mission 66 program accommodated too many visitors in buildings like the Jackson Lake Lodge, calling it “a concrete monstrosity built for that sub-species of *Homo sapiens* called the tourist.”<sup>50</sup> The virulent rhetoric focused on the theme of “modernistic” design, which was often associated with “overdevelopment” and inappropriate levels of use.

However, architectural trade magazines expressed pleasure that the National Park Service had abandoned “associative rusticity” in favor of “better and more imaginative architecture.” In January 1957, *Architectural Record* published a long defense of Mission 66 architectural design by stating, “...we are happy to join in the current campaign of improvement...known as Mission 66.”<sup>51</sup> This critical appreciation of Mission 66 architecture continued through the 1960s. In 1964, architectural critic Wolf Von Eckardt concluded that “the Park Service dares to build well.”<sup>52</sup> In 1970, the American Institute of Architects (AIA) awarded a citation to the National Park Service as an organization for its “continuing effort to provide excellent design at all levels in our national parks.” In the next year, the *AIA Journal* featured a portfolio of Mission 66 architecture, including the Dinosaur Quarry National Monument in Colorado and Utah, Wright Brothers National Memorial in North Carolina, and Everglades National Park visitor centers in Florida (among others), which were the basis of the national award.<sup>53</sup>

In professional and critical circles, the Mission 66 program endowed the National Park Service with the highest reputation for architectural patronage that the agency enjoyed. To a great degree, this reputation was based a few exceptional examples by well-known consulting architects. The San Francisco firm, Anshen and Allen helped establish the California Modernist style with their design of Eichler homes and other residences, schools, hospitals, and institutions in California and throughout the country in part because of its 1956 critical successes with the Chapel of the Holy Cross in Sedona, Arizona, and the Dinosaur National Monument Quarry Visitor Center. The critical success of the Wright Brothers National Memorial Visitor Center, which opened in North Carolina in 1960, similarly helped launch the Philadelphia firm of Mitchell/Giurgola. EODC recruited Ehrman Mitchell and Romaldo Giurgola after they left the office of Gilboy, Bellante, and Clauss. The architects designed

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 12

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

the visitor centers for Yorktown Battlefield and Jamestown of Colonial National Historic Park. The architects went on to become major figures in the profession with an international practice that won the AIA National Award in 1976 and the Gold Medal in 1982. Taliesin Associated Architects, founded by Frank Lloyd Wright, contributed to the Mission 66 program with the design of the Beaver Meadows Visitor Center in Rocky Mountain National Park that opened in 1967. Each sought appropriate expressions of the Modern Movement style in a national park.<sup>54</sup>

*The Visitor Center*

The most important single category of the Mission 66 program in the creation of a new type of building was the visitor center. The context for the visitor center is developed by Sarah Allaback in her *Mission 66 Visitor Centers, The History of a Building Type*. The programmatic activities housed in a single structure included a larger museum space for showing park interpretive films and a dedicated auditorium space for other interpretive activities. Uniting functions in a single building allowed for a more efficient use of park personnel. They could handle larger numbers of park visitors and provide for greater reduction in overall operational costs. The new building type was the heart of planning goals and policies for the park system where increased functionality and efficiency could be achieved through modernist design, materials, and building. In the offices of the WODC and the EODC between 1954 and 1957, the idea of a visitor center was conceived as the successor to park museums, administration buildings, and comfort stations. These functions were consolidated into a single building as initially defined by National Park Service architectural designer Cecil Doty. The two antecedents were his 1954-1955 Grand Canyon Visitor Center and Anshen and Allen's 1956 Dinosaur National Monument Quarry Visitor Center which featured one interior wall of natural strata exposing the interpretive relief of dinosaur bones from the Morrison Formation. The public functions were typically combined with administrative offices, conference rooms, research libraries, and work rooms. However, these areas were physically separate from public spaces.

The Mission 66 designers modified the traditional design concepts of the prior Rustic style period. While the visitor center aggregated into one building what had previously been dispersed functions, the result was a building of greater scale and consequently greater potential for visual impact on the natural landscape. Previously, the task to blend buildings into the landscape was less daunting task due to the use of small-scale structures constructed from logs and native stone. The consequently larger building with paved parking areas required larger flat sites in which the visitor centers would sit with minimal topographic disturbance and more extensive natural plantings to repair the construction scars to restore the site's previous character. Historic plant materials were to be used at historic sites. Chief Architect John B. "Bill" Cabot's guiding principles recognized the consequences of siting a visitor center within a visually important landscape and siting one where a landscape was less important to the visitor experience. Because the park landscape was one of the primary reasons for visitation, Cabot believed that the visitor center needed to be subservient to the landscape. Invariably, this placed significant restrictions on architects to keep the buildings low, break up the massing into smaller units, and use materials and colors on the exterior to blend with the site. The landscape architects were burdened with siting buildings in locations that were not visually prominent and where buildings could be constructed with the least amount of ground disturbance and native vegetation removal. Sensitivity to topography was often prioritized in siting parking lots and roads parallel to the contours. Native plantings ringed parking lots and filled planting islands in the parking lot to soften the visual intrusiveness. Conversely, Cabot felt that in a less dominant and less visually strong landscape, the visitor centers could express a stronger presence; however, the principles of blending the site development remained.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 13

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Many of the Mission 66 visitor centers that best achieved the Modern Movement style ideals and met the objectives espoused by National Park Service designers and interpreters for the redevelopment of national parks were less expensive, smaller buildings. Cecil Doty's visitor centers in Zion National Park (1957) and Montezuma Castle National Monument (1958) typify the functional approach to architecture that met the parks' needs for visitor and administrative functions with dignified efficiency and minimal visual intrusion on the landscape. The public experience these visitor centers as light-filled pavilions oriented to the surrounding landscape without being aware of all the included functions.<sup>55</sup> While examples such as Zion were designed entirely in-house with consultants producing only the working drawings, other visitor centers were true collaborations. The Flamingo Visitor Center at Everglades National Park (1957) was partially funded by the new restaurant and motel concessioner who hired architect Harry L. Keck, Jr., of Coral Gables, Florida. Keck's office produced the final design and working drawings. Set high on columns and accessed by ramp, and constructed of concrete with horizontal bands of windows, the geometrical massing evoked the new modernism. From the elevated main level, a restaurant and the visitor center were connected by an open bridge. Visitors could experience the Florida Bay view. Such collaborations were typical of many visitor centers including the Logan Pass Visitor Center at Glacier National Park, Montana, which was designed by Cecil Doty and refined by the firm of Brinkman & Lenon of Kalispell, Montana.

Cecil J. Doty (1907-1990) designed many Rustic style park projects in the late 1930s, including the National Landmark Pueblo revival style Region III Headquarters building in Santa Fe, New Mexico. Doty also designed many of the Modern Movement style visitor centers for the Mission 66 program. He directly contributed to the development of the building type that became the hallmark of the construction program. As the principal architectural designer of the WODC, Doty was responsible for the preliminary designs of 54 national park visitor centers, several completed designs for visitor centers, and a notable addition to the Rustic style museum at Chiricahua National Monument in the early 1960s. The Chiricahua project demonstrated Doty's ability to combine a Modernist addition with the older building, creating a new visitor center that harmonized with the natural environment. Doty, who experimented with modernism before the war, had the ability to relate buildings to their environments which met National Park Service needs and visitor expectations of architecture in the parks. Not all of Doty's preliminary design projects were built. Many design were significantly altered by other architects as they completed the final designs for construction drawings. Nevertheless, Doty's contribution to Mission 66 visitor center design was substantial. Doty provided architectural expressions of park planning goals and visitor center spatial flow that influenced buildings in the western parks and visitor centers throughout the national park system.<sup>56</sup>

Within the EODC, Architects Don Benson, J. Walter Roth, and Ben H. Biderman were the leading designers under the direct supervision and collaboration of Division Chief Architect John B. "Bill" Cabot who exercised great influence on visitor center design both in the Eastern region. Later his influence extended throughout the park system due to his position as the Chief Architect of the National Park Service in the Office of the Director in Washington, D.C. As Chief Architect in both organizations, he established and refined standards and procedures for the planning and design of visitor centers during the Mission 66 program. Like Doty, Cabot stressed the use of spatial relationship diagrams and traffic flow diagrams as initiatives for preliminary design. Cabot felt "freedom of expression in architecture during this postwar period" could not be ignored. He ensured that the National Park Service hired the best possible consultants since "the cheapest investment is to hire the very finest design talent available."<sup>57</sup> After the first season of Mission 66 construction, Cabot traveled the United States and reported that new park buildings appeared "very refreshing design-wise when viewed in comparison with the other [Rustic style] units in their immediate environment" but that the details of construction had not consistently been "given sufficient thought."<sup>58</sup> By 1957, Cabot sought a larger role for consulting architects who increasingly

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 14

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

developed preliminary National Park Service designs into fully articulated construction documents to augment the in-house design offices' workload. Cabot selected consultants that were progressive, modernist designers including some leading figures in American architecture, such as Richard Neutra and Robert Alexander who designed the Gettysburg Visitor Center and Cyclorama Building and the Painted Desert Community at Petrified Forest National Park. The role of the consultant varied according to the project. In some cases, they produced construction drawings from preliminary designs. In higher profile areas, consultants developed entire designs based on the National Park Service program and at designated sites.<sup>59</sup>

The locations of Mission 66 visitor centers were carefully considered in concert with National Park Service interpretation leaders.<sup>60</sup> Interpreters, architects, and landscape architects stressed the importance of the views from the visitor centers. They criticized Grand Canyon National Park Visitor Center for being "too far removed (1/3 mile) from the Canyon rim" and failing to stimulate visitors to investigate the canyon's natural history and ask questions of the visitor center staff. The initial planning suggestion that visitor facilities should be relocated away from "sensitive" areas such as the rim of the Grand Canyon put interpreters at odds. The interpreters praised visitor centers that afforded "a good view of park features" such as at Yorktown National Park in Virginia and Hopewell Furnace National Historic Site in Pennsylvania. Outdoor or roof terraces at visitor centers, such as at the Gettysburg Cyclorama Building in Pennsylvania, were ideal for interpreters to conduct their programs. Interpreters used the background view, the battlefield, to explain and illustrate topics such as troop movements. Experienced interpreters knew visitor centers more distant from the attractions—regardless of the quality of the museum exhibits—could not compete with interpreting a site while looking at the discussed landscape. Foreground views were often manipulated by landscape architects to heal the construction scars, to provide interpretive planting showcasing native species, and to interpret historic sites with period plants.

Architect John Cabot described three strategies for visitor center locations: at park entrances, "en route" along a major park road or intersection, and at a "terminus" or major destination within the park.<sup>61</sup> In larger parks, there were often several visitor centers at different locations. A tension existed between the desire to remove visitor centers from the "sacred" or "sensitive" areas where older visitor services congregated and the desire to maintain interpretive strength offered by proximity. At Yellowstone National Park, the Canyon Village and proposed Grant Village developments replaced visitor services considered to be too close to scenic views and thermal features. However, in the Parkscape USA program, the National Park Service built the 1971 Old Faithful Visitor Center with a direct view of the famous geyser. In smaller cultural parks where the role of interpretation was considered to be even more vital, visitor centers were located to provide an expansive view of the park landscape as was accomplished at Petersburg National Battlefield. This planning decision determined the visitor center location, near or directly in the interpreted historic scene. Since historic sites were considered to be more difficult for the public to appreciate, they were subjects of more elaborate interpretative plans including reconstructions, living history reenactments, and other means that were sometimes promoted under the Mission 66 program to bring "history alive." Following the reconstruction in 1950-1951 of the McLean House at Appomattox Court House National Historical Park, the courthouse was reconstructed to serve as a visitor center in 1963-1964 in order to recreate the historic scene. At Fort Davis National Historic Site in Texas, a partial reconstruction of barracks served as the visitor center, while other visitor centers were historically inspired and placed near archeological ruins to control visitation in and around the resources. In small historical parks, interpretation was given priority over maintaining more absolute integrity of the setting in part because of the lack of land.

In several parks, designers used the visitor centers to interpret the parks themes. Based on a preliminary design by Cecil Doty, John Morse Associates architectural firm provided the final design and construction documents for the Sitka National Monument Visitor Center. The final design of 1964 was based on a Tlingit long house that



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 15

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

provided museum space and space for tribal artisans to demonstrate their particular arts to visitors. Doty designed the 1962-1963 Tonto National Monument Visitor Center as a modern interpretation of the historic Pueblo revival style. Doty excelled at interpretation of the Pueblo revival style in the late 1930s. In 1966, WODC architect Robert Cox designed a Hawaiian-inspired visitor center for Hawaii Volcanoes National Park at Kalapana that featured an open-air lanai surrounded by the museum and office pavilions all located on pilings. The building was destroyed by a lava flow in 1989. Coronado National Memorial Visitor Center designed in 1959 by WODC Architect Robert Newcomb reflects Spanish Colonial history with its burned adobe walls and red tile roof. The visitor center at Big Hole National Battlefield National Historical Site designed in 1964 by WODC architects, suggests a tepee with its conical central structure. The 1964 Far View Visitor Center at Mesa Verde National Park was designed by Denver, Colorado, architects Joseph and Louise Marlowe to represent the shape of a traditional, circular, stonemasonry, Pueblo kiva.

Several National Park Service visitor centers expressed the Modern Movement style without directly relating to the natural or historical environment of their respective parks. Within the Mission 66 program, the trend of buildings dominating the landscape rather than blending occurred in many new parks and on battlefields where the design precedent was derived from modern forms. The EODC produced many designs based on geometric shapes, particularly hexagons. Donald Benson designed the multi-hexagon Saratoga National Historical Park Visitor Center in New York in 1960. The three hexagons are connected with wide hallways connecting the lobby to the audio-visual room and museum. In 1964, Ben Biderman designed the Salt Pond Visitor Center at Cape Cod National Seashore that has two elongated hexagons flanking a central hexagon. Biderman continued the geometric theme with his flat-roofed, octagonal design for the 1965 Petersburg National Battlefield Visitor Center. The well-crafted red brick octagon floats over the ground-level basement windows. The entrance is a trapezoidal form projecting from the octagon at grade and contains the lobby space. Within the upper octagon, the museum wraps around a central space that contained a map of the battlefield. In the basement, the offices are wedges around what was originally a circular fallout shelter below the map. Large windows of the first floor at the north prow look out over the battlefield landscape. Geometric forms in the western United States include Lake Mead National Recreation Area's Temple Bar Visitor Center designed by Robert Newcomb and based on a 1961 preliminary study, which was signed by WODC architect "Fishstein." The main space is a large triangle containing lobby and exhibit functions. An office wing extends to the west. Finally, at the beginning of the Parkscape USA program, Robert Newcomb designed the Jewel Cave Visitor Center as four octagonal pods with mansard roofs and connected corridors radiating from a central lobby space. Architect Gerald Patten designed the exhibit pod, which radiates from the lobby, to connect to a restroom pod via a corridor with integrated offices that look out the entrance landscape. Most importantly, the 1967 building contains the elevators to the cave.

Mission 66 made possible the funding of substantial improvements at many smaller parks, monuments, and historic sites with lower visitation numbers. New Deal projects of the 1930s had begun to address the imbalance created by the National Park Service's concern with its large natural parks.<sup>62</sup> However, the magnitude of the Mission 66 program and the substantial need for visitor facilities in most of the smaller parks brought an unprecedented level of consistency to all the benefiting units of the national park system. By the end of the Mission 66 program, most of the small parks enjoyed new and enhanced facilities, a visitor center, a maintenance yard, and housing for employees. The suite of basic facilities became the functional unit of the national park system. Without a visitor center, it seemed, no park could be expected to adequately preserve and interpret its resources. The series of the buildings were considered necessary at larger parks for the same reasons. New visitor centers represented a consistent standard for the convenience of visitors and staff and a standard of organization in every park.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 16

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

The construction of visitor centers was linked to the expansion and training of staff to work in them. Significant improvements in museum planning, exhibits, services, and media were to be used to more efficiently interpret a park to its visitors as directed by Ronald F. Lee, Chief of the Division of Interpretation, Washington, D. C. Museum planning was a significant focus of each visitor center's design and construction in order to interpret the parks natural and cultural resources to visitors. Exhibits were designed to provide an overview of park features, an understanding of why the park was established and a visual of artifacts relating to geologic, natural, and historical precedents. This situation was particularly true where minimal spatial opportunities existed to use media to interpret a park. Visitor center planning and construction was programmed to minimize the idea that visitor centers were museums through the inclusion of exhibits and media as interpretive features.

Visitor Center Land Planning and Landscape Architecture

Mission 66 landscape architects were a highly influential within the National Park Service because they were managers of the planning process and they constituted the majority of design professionals. Their role in the planning process began in a structured manner in 1932 and was to prepare general development plans from the development outlines created in the previous year by park superintendents. The plans defined the features and areas to be developed for the entire park, such as roads, utilities, and buildings, in accordance with "General Planning," an adopted scope outline prepared in 1929.<sup>63</sup> In 1939, the National Park Service issued *Master Plans: A Manual of Standard Practice for Use in the National Park Service*.<sup>64</sup> In the advance development of the Mission 66 program in 1955, the simple needs statements of the individual parks were aggregated rather rapidly into an overall park development plan. The needs expressed in 1955 were mostly the same and formed the original park development plans of 1940-1942; however, the scale of the proposed developments changed in response to the postwar increase in park visitation, and the new visitor center building type had to be integrated into the plan. As Mission 66 program funds came available, park planners focused on transportation networks and site-specificity for visitor-oriented projects such as visitor centers and expanded campgrounds. Formal planning was instituted in 1968-1972 during the Parkscape USA program and folded into the "General Management Plan," which is still the current practice with modifications to incorporate environmental issues such as National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance and NHPA Section 106 considerations.<sup>65</sup>

Typically, landscape architects worked with engineers and architects to site the features and layout parking areas and access road alignments. Trail systems from the new visitor centers that connect to existing or new trails were the domain of the landscape architects. Specific site features, such as an amphitheater or picnic area associated with the visitor center, were planned and designed by the team's landscape architect. The notable Carlsbad Cavern Amphitheater is sited at the mouth of the cave from which bats make their daily flight. It was executed as sweeping arcs of random ashlar stone masonry seating which responded to the site topography and cliff walls. Its tiered seats are stylistically neoclassical. The long-term principles of the National Park Service were carried forward into the Mission 66 projects. However, the number of projects grew, and the development of new parks in urban areas provided new opportunities to execute plazas, gardens, and other more architectonic and less naturalistic projects.

Landscape architects were part of teams that designed many of the modernist plaza and courtyard areas defined by hardscape, site walls, building walls, seating areas, planting beds, and raised planters that were associated to Mission 66 visitor centers. Two notable examples are the visitor centers at Boulder Beach, Lake Mead National Recreation Area and Furnace Creek, Death Valley National Park. At Boulder Beach, the Burlingame California firm, DeLong and Zahm Associate Architects designed a series of mansard-roofed pavilions connected by a rectangular building dedicated to office space. The complex, constructed in 1966-1967, created an entry plaza

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 17

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

which is partially defined by the structures to the west and north. The complex was executed with repetition of geometric patterned pavement and a double row of palm trees, eight in total, integrated with the paving pattern. At Furnace Creek, the original design was executed by Cecil Doty in 1957, and the construction drawings altered by Welton-Becket and Associates of San Francisco in the following year. Doty designed a central courtyard that was partially enclosed by individually functioning structures. The courtyard, enclosed with a geometric design idiom of a zig-zag wall, has pavement grid system that diagonal extends from the elongated, hexagonal auditorium to the wall. Doty placed an elongated rectangular water feature within the grid paving, reflective of water features in Moorish garden design. This overall design visually connected the buildings to one another with diagonals lines and created a space with its own sense of place. The Welton-Becket design, which was constructed in 1959, substituted the Doty-designed water feature with a kidney-shaped pool, popular in the California Modern Residential style (1930-1965).

When a visitor center was designed by National Park Service architects, the associated landscape features were designed in collaboration with National Park Service landscape architects. When designed by private architects and firms, the associated landscape features were either designed by the firm or their consulting landscape architects. At Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado, the site design of architect William C. Muchow's Trail Ridge Visitor Center was created by WODC Landscape Architect Jay O'Shea to take advantage of the optimum view.<sup>66</sup>

The National Park Service hired a private landscape architect once during the Mission 66 program. Dan Kiley of Vermont designed the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial's Gateway Arch landscape. The landscape of the new park was designed in 1947, built as a Mission 66 from project 1963-1965 under the direction of Park Superintendent George B. Hartzog, Jr., and dedicated in 1968 during the Parkscape USA program. "In 1937, National Park Service landscape architects designed a memorial landscape for the riverfront consisting of a formal mall parallel to the riverfront levee, which terminated at either end with neoclassical Museum buildings."<sup>67</sup> A national design competition resulted in the selection of noted architect Eero Saarinen's design of the 630-foot high arch. The design for the gateway arch plaza was completed by Saarinen's associated landscape architect Dan Kiley and his firm. The Mission 66 program funded the arch construction and the implementation of the landscape plan after the hiring of Dan Kiley. After Kiley's contract expired, WODC Landscape Architect John Ranscavage oversaw the completion of the design. The Gateway Arch was dedicated in 1968. Many aspects of the Gateway Arch project extended to other projects to demonstrate how the National Park Service could effectively interact with local officials, preservation groups and urban renewal efforts that removed an entire neighborhood to prepare the site in St. Louis, Missouri. The long-planned visitor center beneath the arch was finally completed in 1976. It represented a national bicentennial project.

Mission 66 prospectuses made the iconic visitor center the architectural and functional centerpiece of the reinvented National Park Service. More than 100 visitor centers were planned and, by 1959, 35 were opened with many more under construction. By 1964, 72 were opened. By 1966, there were 95 with 16 more let to contractors and under construction for a total of 111 (at least by one agency count).<sup>68</sup> That year, 254 units were part of the park system. Of the 99 visitor centers completed or "programmed" through fiscal year 1963, 33 cost less than \$100,000, 43 less than \$200,000, 20 less than \$400,000, and only three more than \$400,000.<sup>69</sup> The visitor center was the featured building of park redevelopment plans and subsequently adopted by park agencies of all types around the world. The new building type was one of the most influential public land management strategies targeting interpretation and visitor satisfaction.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 18

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

*Administration, Maintenance Buildings, and Ranger Stations*

Prior to the Mission 66 program, administrative functions at a park were carried out at a desk in the park custodian house. The scale of the administrative area was proportional to a park's acreage and indirectly related to the number of staff, which was in relation to the number of visitors. Part of the intent of the Mission 66 program was to have all parks present more professional, new or expanded programs in interpretation, more visible rangers, more maintenance staff, and more office staff. The need for increased administrative space was met within one or more of three locations: the new visitor center, the maintenance complex, or a separate dedicated building.

In the large parks, there were multiple visitor centers and separate administration buildings. At Glacier National Park, visitor centers were merely interpretive facilities. Brinkman & Lenon of Kalispell, Montana, designed the 1962-1963 Glacier Administration Building in the West Glacier Headquarters area. It is partially masked from public view unlike the prewar Rustic style administration buildings at Grand Canyon National Park and Mount Rainier National Park that were sited on village "plazas," giving an identity to the civic administration of the park. A few Mission 66 administration buildings, such as the 1962 Ash Mountain Administration Building in Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks designed by Cecil Doty and Walter Wagner & Partners, had similar importance. In these cases, as at Ash Mountain, the buildings featured interpretive displays and a "public contact" area comparable to prewar information desks. More often, new visitor centers combined administrative functions with interpretive functions and replaced the need for facilities in separate building types.

The National Park Service's Interpretive Design Center, a unique administration building, was constructed 1966-1970 just above the core historic district of Harpers Ferry National Historic Site. Designed by New York architect Ulrich Franzen, the center manages the preparation of media including publications, films and museum exhibit planning and museum object curation for parks nationwide. The construction of this administrative building represented the National Park Service's desire to improve park interpretation and nationally assure consistency as defined in the Mission 66 program goals.

New administrative areas built outside park boundaries to replace old administration and maintenance buildings in prewar park villages were more noteworthy examples of Mission 66 development. The El Portal administrative complex outside Yosemite National Park and Tahoma Woods outside Mount Rainier National Park were intended to replace the administrative and maintenance functions in Yosemite and Longmire villages, respectively. At El Portal, the Mission 66 administration and residential area was later expanded. In both cases, the prewar Rustic style villages were never demolished. The overwhelming need for maintenance and administrative space resulted in two administrative areas in each of these parks.

At Olympic National Park, intense controversies over timber management and wilderness preservation produced a distinctive approach for developing a national park administrative area. When the park was established in 1938, the creators defined "controlling development policies" for the park. The new Olympic National Park headquarters was built outside park boundaries in Port Angeles in 1940. Similarly, existing roads were deemed sufficient to provide "reasonable access," and overnight accommodations were limited to nearby towns.<sup>70</sup> Origin and inspiration were provided by the U.S. Forest Service, which had administered the former Mount Olympus National Monument since 1909. The U.S. Forest Service typically sited administration buildings in nearby communities rather than the forests. This placement reinforced the close ties between national forest management and local economies and communities. Olympic National Park's 1940 building revealed a stylistic transition. Constructed primarily of wood, it featured Modernist design details and spatial composition. Its design

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 19

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

demonstrated, particularly after World War II, the transition between the Rustic and Modern Movement style of park architecture.

Of the 257 administrative and service buildings built during the Mission 66 program, the considerable variety includes visitor contact buildings that function as park headquarters and small modular buildings that provide office space. Mission 66 administration buildings, as at Glacier National Park, were sited directly adjacent to maintenance yards. In most parks, maintenance buildings and adjacent yards were utilitarian areas usually defined by a single maintenance building containing a variety of functions or a group of sheds or garages in a linear arrangement forming a central work area. The new maintenance yards were not functionally different from the utility areas built as part of the Rustic style villages before the war. Mission 66 maintenance buildings were built of concrete block and other economical construction materials that characterized most new maintenance buildings in the park system during the postwar period. Roofs were gabled or flat in response to the park's setting, climate, and earlier architectural precedents. Some maintenance buildings were integral parts of visitor centers, such as those at the Painted Desert Community at Petrified Forest National Park or at El Morro National Monument. Wirth counted 218 new "utility buildings" built through the Mission 66 program. These included storage buildings, workshops and structures with garage bays for maintenance vehicles and mechanical equipment for the utility lines and other basic services being modernized, or provided for the first time, in many parks.<sup>71</sup> In large parks, secondary maintenance facilities included the Saint Mary area near the east entrance into Glacier National Park. Often, new buildings contained some office space and break rooms for maintenance personnel. Administrative and maintenance/utility buildings all had very limited public access or no public function at all. As a result, many were built using standardized plans and did not benefit from the level of design attention and detail that the visitor centers received.

The ranger stations, another type of park administration building, was intended to provide visitor services at a very limited level in areas remote from park headquarters or in place of in-park headquarters, such as at Wahweep at Glen Canyon National Recreation Area. Ranger stations were built at secondary entrances into parks and were described by Sarah Allaback as being secondary visitor centers. In these instances, the ranger stations were often part of a small developed area. The ranger station functions provide local policing, information, permits to special park locations and activities, and emergency services. The spaces provided for visitor contact and a separate office or offices for the personnel assigned to the area. The ranger station at the Morefield Campground at Mesa Verde National Park is typical of a small station that is part of a village. In this case, a concessions quadrangle from 1963-1966 that provided camper services for the nearby campground. Swedish-trained architect Per Rundberg of WODC designed the pavilion-like building to blend with the modern Pueblo revival style concession buildings but be distinctive in design to assure a visual National Park Service presence in the area.<sup>72</sup>

### *Park Employee Housing*

The quantity of park housing in the parks at the end of World War II was inadequate. Quality was often below reasonable expectations for the time. The Mission 66 program planned construction of 1,000 units of new housing with significant design input from an organized effort of the wives of National Park Service employees who, among others, requested standardized housing. Some of the resultant standardized design plans reflected modifications to meet local climatic and material availability considerations. Standardized designs were based on the designers' input but were reflective of government regulations for cost per square foot. Initial limits were set at 1,200 square feet. The National Park Service developed residential plans in 1956 entitled, "Standard Plans for Employee Housing," which was later amended with additional plan variations.<sup>73</sup> Based in part on postwar

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 20

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

housing in various parks, the unit plans and later supplemental elevations provided accommodations for a variety of family situations: single men, married couples, various sizes of families, and seasonal workers. During the ten years of Mission 66 implementation, the total quantity of housing units needed and the attributes desired shifted. Policy considerations for housing evolved during the ten-year period with no single standard design. Onsite employee housing needs varied by park based on park security, remoteness from established communities, staff increases, available suitable land, and the local cost of living index. Park superintendents' application of these considerations was inherent in the development of the each park prospectus.

Size and cost constrictions kept the quantity of proposed units lower than need required—an effort to keep budget costs down. Later, the size of new units was raised to 1,500 square feet. Consequently, the Mission 66 program budget rose from \$18,000 to \$20,000 per unit. These per-unit costs were averages with the more remote areas having higher costs. Reducing costs led to prefabrication at Glacier National Park where wall sections and roof structures were delivered for on-site assembly. Even through the use of consultants, the National Park Service could not provide many individual residential designs, which was the driving rationale for standardized plans.<sup>74</sup> Typically, new park residences were based on the suburban, single-family, detached-style houses. Construction was subject to Federal standards and rules, specified by legislation or Bureau of the Budget policy that provided “design standards”; for example, the standards and rules limited two-bedroom houses to 1,080 square feet and three-bedroom houses to 1,260 square feet.<sup>75</sup>

In addition, new residential complexes required the expansion of infrastructure including utilities, access roads, streets, and trails. Infrastructure was constructed at Fort Laramie National Historic Site, but the planned residences were never built. Typically, these infrastructure costs were covered under their own line item budgets and were not included in the per-unit maximum cost. The locations of the residential complexes balanced the desire for reasonably close access to the other park facilities, such as administrative offices, visitor centers, and maintenance yards, and the desire for the complexes to be separated from public access both visually and physically. Site planning, for housing or administration buildings, was an important characteristic of the Mission 66 program and was accomplished by National Park Service landscape architects rather than outside design consultants. The park housing followed the standard designs developed by National Park Service architects with limited local adaptations, such as the type of siding used. At the Painted Desert Community, Petrified Forest National Park, architects Richard Neutra and Robert Alexander designed the visitor center and all the support buildings as one rare central complex that included employee housing with each residential unit connected around a private courtyard. Occasionally, the standard plans were bypassed depending on the area. Robert Newcomb designed three housing units located at Lake Mead National Recreation Area's Boulder Beach in response to the climate. The overall number of units at an individual park was subdivided into the following unit types by need: detached single family, semi-detached single family, and apartment units for seasonal use. In older parks, renovations of existing units supplemented new construction to meet the new qualitative standards.

The 1953 housing survey was unusual in that it was nearly system wide. It was internally developed and had highly specific recommendations. Recommendations were effectively adopted by the National Park Service leaders. The National Park Service Women's Organization, founded in 1952, conducted an extensive survey of the existing units, identified qualitative issues, and provided recommendations for features of new housing and renovation of existing housing. Former botanist, Junior National Park Service Naturalist and superintendent's wife, Herma Baggeley, organized the survey and three years later worked to integrate the findings into the Mission 66 program to raise the qualitative standards for park housing. Park housing remained the specific concern of the National Park Service Women's Organization, and they continued to provide advice. National Park Service women welcomed standard plans because the plans assured decent housing, even in remote areas, and brought an

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 21

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

element of consistency to a lifestyle that demanded frequent moves of household goods. Baggley also advised that they would like to see more storage space, separate entrance areas (“mud rooms”), larger kitchens, and more bedrooms.<sup>76</sup>

In the fall of 1956, John B. Cabot, as the lead architect for EODC, issued his own memorandum on “the design of Park Service houses” in which he described shortcomings of planned housing. The National Park Service Women’s Organization recommendations had not yet been incorporated. He urged that National Park Service housing plans needed to meet contemporary expectations, especially among women, for a modern standard of living. Cabot reminded his colleagues of their duty to build houses that would fulfill those identified needs for the occupants for the next 40 years. He then requested that existing stock plans be “held in abeyance” while the WODC and the EODC developed designs that would be “architecturally up to date with current national thinking.” The two offices could “collaborate to work out plans solving actual conditions throughout the country and, if possible, arrive at plans and designs that solve many varied conditions of climate and topography.” However, the question of architectural style went unmentioned in the 1956 memorandum.<sup>77</sup>

The initial housing design program was developed and immediately moved forward to construction beginning in fiscal year 1956. Simultaneously, the National Park Service expanded the design program into the set of “Standard Plans for Employee Housing” that became the model for housing unit plans. At Glacier National Park, the plans used for the Mission 66 first housing units constructed in 1957 in the headquarters area were modified into a more standard plan for the second housing construction project. The desire for standardization in the parks resulted primarily in single family, detached housing units and formed suburban streetscapes that soon became known as the “Mission 66 ranch.”

The one-story ranch house, more than any other type, symbolized a standard of life that was consistent with what park staff and their families could see in “surrounding communities.” It was a familiar building type that had its origins in the architecture of California, particularly when *Sunset Magazine*, in collaboration with noted architect Cliff May, published *Sunset Western Ranch Houses* in 1946. The one-floor plan is reflected in a National Park Service standard plan.<sup>78</sup> Familiarity and standardization assured that local contractors could be found at reasonable cost and that contemporary building materials and technology—from slab concrete foundations to manufactured windows—could be effectively utilized. The ranch house was flexible; plans could be easily flipped into “right-handed” and “left-handed” versions, and garages, entry portals, and other extras could be added. Siding materials and different rooflines could be applied to reflect local conditions and availability, though low, gabled roofs were nearly ubiquitous regardless of location. Local contractors could be given latitude on construction materials and techniques to reflect economical building methods appropriate to different regions of the country. The two standard houses at Montezuma Well, part of Montezuma Castle National Monument, were composed of prefabricated wall sections that were trucked to the site.<sup>79</sup> Typically, whether “stick built” or prefabricated, the houses were finished on the outside followed by installation of interior walls and finish.

Cabot’s “Standard Plans for Employee Housing,” was issued in time for the 1957 construction season which, included variations of two- and three-bedroom ranch houses, designs for multiple units and dormitories. The first house design was based on two 1951 houses that were built at Glacier National Park’s West Glacier Headquarters area. These were approved by Cabot when he was the Region II Regional Architect in Omaha, Nebraska.<sup>80</sup> The house variations included typical gable-roofed ranch houses without basements, Glacier National Park’s split-level floor plans and Tuzigoot National Monument’s rare one-story, flat-roofed, attached housing style with three concrete block thick walls (1964-1965). All construction was assumed to be “frame wall,” but the choice of siding depended on local material availability, construction practices, and the park superintendent’s desire. All

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 22

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

units were to have a minimum level of conveniences, including modern appliances, central heating, connections for washers and dryers, and linoleum floors in kitchens and bathrooms. Superintendents were to choose their preferred plans and submit them to their regional directors for approval.<sup>81</sup>

In 1958, Wirth observed that "...so far we have taken between 200 and 250 National Park Service families out of rundown, outmoded—well, shacks is the right word—and put them in new houses and apartments more suited to the dignity of the job they are performing so ably." In February 1960, the 1957 standard plans were revised in an attempt to provide more space and amenities while still being able to stay within the new \$20,000 per unit limit. Five types were now offered: three-bedroom standard, four-bedroom standard, two-bedroom duplex (attached side by side), three-bedroom "superintendent" (slightly larger), and four-bedroom superintendent. The floor plans, including those that provided space for larger families, showed improvement in circulation and organization with more storage and a more defined entrance area in addition to a slight increase (200 square feet) in overall size. Standard plans now included front elevation designs, although the choice of siding remained open. A 1959 National Park Service Women's Organization survey influenced the new plans that now had entry vestibules with closets, extra storage, dining areas adjacent to the kitchens, and garages with storage.<sup>82</sup> The standard plans served as the basis for quick development of working drawings that were adapted to individual parks, almost always on flat sites. By the end of 1963, the process was further standardized with additional standard plans designed specifically for hillsides. New standard plans, approved in 1964, closely resembled the 1960 ranch houses. The average living space square footage of was reduced, reverting closer to the original 1957 size. By this time, the three-bedroom, approximately 1,200 square foot ranch with attached carport had become a ubiquitous standard.<sup>83</sup> Ultimately a total of 743 single family and semi-detached houses were built, as well as 496 apartment units.<sup>84</sup>

Park staffs most appreciated the Mission 66 program new employee housing. In terms of staff morale and the efficient administration of parks, Mission 66 addressed what had been a serious crisis caused by the dearth of adequate staff housing. However, housing had no public function and was rarely ever seen by visitors. Beyond the severe externally applied cost limitations, National Park Service leaders wanted to appear as providing modest housing for its employees. Providing an adequate standard of living within the cost limitations was a challenge. In the larger, more remote parks, the National Park Service was required to meet the added burdens of creating additional critical services in neighborhoods, such as the construction of elementary schools to reduce the commute to adjacent communities. A school was part of the new subdivision built at the Mammoth headquarters area at Yellowstone National Park, Wyoming. A three-classroom school was integrated into the Painted Desert Community at Petrified Forest National Park, which featured a community center auditorium for students, employees, and visitors. Death Valley National Park included a teacherage apartment building in conjunction with the school.

***Other Building Types***

Standardized plans were used to build 584 comfort stations (restrooms), another type of Mission 66 program architecture. The typical comfort station was standardized by John Cabot, who considered himself the National Park Service's comfort station designer. The standard comfort station was constructed of concrete block with a low-pitched or nearly flat roof and ribbon windows under the eaves to provide natural light to the men's and women's sections.<sup>85</sup> Comfort stations were generally associated with campgrounds, though some were built at strategic locations along park roads. New campgrounds were constructed as alternatives to overnight accommodations in hotels or lodges. Comfort stations were built as part of day-use picnic areas and other campground structures, which sometimes included shower buildings and camp tender residences. More often,



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 23

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

shower buildings were operated by concessioners at nearby developments that catered to campers by providing camp stores, gas stations, and other facilities as was developed at Morefield Campground at Mesa Verde National Park. Associated with campgrounds, amphitheaters were designed for evening interpretive programs. Amphitheaters replaced earlier fire circle interpretation by providing permanently installed arced rows of benches generally on a sloped surface. The projection screen, housed by a rectangular structure, faced the audience. An audiovisual equipment structure was located behind the audience for the convenience of the interpretive rangers. Built in 1963-1964, the amphitheater overlooking the natural entrance to Carlsbad Caverns National Park is one of the most significant structures of its kind. The classically inspired, tiered stone masonry benches, stepped aisles, and enclosing walls allowed visitors to comfortably hear the interpretive program and view the spectacle of the nightly egress of bats from the caverns.

The development of national park interpretive programs, overseen by Ronald F. Lee, Chief of the Interpretation Division in Washington, D. C., included visitor center museum planning, exhibits, construction of ranger kiosks, roadside interpretive structures, interpretive signage along roads and trails, and entrance signs. All were typically produced from standard plans. In addition, 39 entrance stations were built, and they often required individual design.<sup>86</sup> Some were freestanding, and other attached to visitor centers which were constructed at park entries such as at Saint Mary's, Glacier National Park. The entrance station was a slightly later addition when it was decided to more efficiently collect park entry fees as all visitors did not enter the visitor center. The folded-plate roof of the West Entrance to Yellowstone National Park provided a monumental approach to the park, and with its steeply pitched-shingled roofs, it reflected the Rustic style influence. To provide enhanced traffic flow at parks that had experienced backups at the entrance, the entrance stations added lanes to accommodate taller vehicles and recreational trailers. Attention to overhead clearance required either higher overhead canopy as at the West Entrance to Yellowstone National Park or none at all.

Employee training was recognized as part of the Mission 66 program and ultimately, became required in order to meet the needs of newly hired employees. The Mission 66 program funded centralized training centers which included: the Mather Training Center at Harpers Ferry, West Virginia, where the historic Storer College was adapted for training purposes in 1961-1964 and later. In the west, an entirely new facility at Grand Canyon was designed to fulfill the needs of expanded park management programs for law enforcement, fire protection, resources protection, facilities management, and interpretation. The new Horace M. Albright Training Center at Grand Canyon National Park was designed by Cecil Doty 1961-1966. A main classroom, administrative building and five student residence buildings originally featured family apartments to support 12-week training sessions. The apartments, like seasonal housing, were designed with a series of apartments that modified from studio units to one- and two-bedroom units by opening and closing interior doors.

***Concession and Other Partnerships Buildings***

The National Park Service initially called for the removal of overnight accommodations from within the parks. The Mission 66 program ultimately did not change how concessioners built their facilities nor did it establish new policies, lease provisions, compensation standards, or oversight requirements. Instead, the program identified \$47 million of new concessioner-built facilities that were expected to be built, but during the ten-year program, the concessioners, for a variety of reasons, only invested \$33 million.

Prior to the Mission 66 program funding, most of the major buildings in the large early parks were hotels constructed using private capital. The predominant developers built railroads and their lodging subsidiaries that

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 24

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

had long recognized the economic value of tourism focused on scenic areas. Railroad capital allowed for the development of the transportation infrastructure to then remote parks and the subsequent development of concession operations, particularly what are now known as landmark hotels that were and remain integral to the visitor experience. The concessioners made major investments in national parks and came to expect to have a virtual monopoly in transportation and park lodging. All hotel and lodge owners shared this need to protect their investment, despite legal title to “improved property” being vested in the United States. After 1916, National Park Service management assured concessioners that they would be compensated for the value of any capital improvements they made (less depreciation) if for any reason their contracts were not renewed and their businesses were taken over by other companies. This policy implied that a concessioner owned the value of their improvements and that they could not be replaced by another concessioner without being compensated for that value.<sup>87</sup> The position of the National Park Service was weak when faced with replacing or renewing poorly performing concessioners due to the requirement of compensating for their investment. Since many 20-year concession contracts dated to the 1920s and 1930s, the implications of the policy complicated park management in the 1940s and 1950s.

As the federal government usually was the landowner, it was critical that the concessioners maintain a close partnership with the National Park Service. The characteristics and qualities of these partnerships varied greatly and were subject to what was, at best, loose oversight and minimal policies from the administrators. In 1946, some 275 national park concessioners operated facilities that represented \$30 million in private investment.<sup>88</sup> Increased visitation, the poor condition of facilities, and the opportunity to revise the terms of renewed contracts all combined to make concession policy a critical issue. Attempts to reform concessions were rejected by the concessioners after World War II. Parks at the local levels often supported concessioners, due to their necessity to daily operations. When many operators refused to sign new contracts, they were granted extensions under the old terms. The stalemate continued for years and prevented the investment of private capital at a crucial time.<sup>89</sup> Park concessioners organized as the Western Conference of National Parks Concessioners, put forward the legal idea of “possessory interest” in 1948, which implied ownership in all but title of their improved properties. Congress held hearings on park concessions in 1948 and in 1949.<sup>90</sup> In October 1948, the federal comptroller general issued an opinion that park concessioners had rights “equivalent to equitable title in the facilities they have financed,” which was an endorsement of the idea (if not the term) of possessory interest. Subsequently, a new generation of contracts extended the basic framework of traditional concession policy.<sup>91</sup>

The business of park concessions changed with the patterns of travel and recreation, which were dominated by greatly increased automotive tourism. With respect to the initial National Park Service Mission 66 solution to remove hotels from the parks, concessions developed adjacent to the parks. Problems were exacerbated when gateway communities were too far away and often were unable to provide adequate visitor services. In addition, most concessioners and visitors sought to keep concessions in parks and add additional overnight accommodations to provide a “park experience.” But, the Mission 66 policy memoranda and the “pilot prospectus” developed for Mount Rainier National Park implied radical changes for park concessions. This planning goal, to remove concessions from the park, conflicted directly with the interests of all concessioners for whom overnight stays were often considered desirable and even a necessary aspect of their business models. Renting rooms made greater profits than stores, restaurants, and snack bars. Overnight accommodations assured longer visits, which in turn increased business for other services. In 1953, 173 national park concessions grossed \$32 million, and total concessioner assets were reported at \$60 million in 1957.<sup>92</sup> When Wirth and his policy makers began Mission 66 planning, they never seriously considered abandoning the park concession system particularly as the Eisenhower administration sought to expand the role of the private sector.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 25

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

The political influence and contractual rights of park concessioners, combined with the expectations of park visitors to be near prime resources, made it difficult to consider the removal of overnight accommodations. In June 1955, Wirth had begun to modify the tone of Mission 66 policy to include “greater participation of private enterprise.” In part, this statement meant that demand for visitor services would be met by private businesses outside park boundaries; but, it also was an assurance that new concessioner investments would be a major feature of the Mission 66 program. It stated that relocation of overnight facilities away from “major park features” would still be required in many cases. Every situation would be considered “on its own merits,” and while in some cases overnight concessions might indeed be removed, others would merely be relocated and “recommended for considerable expansion.”<sup>93</sup> These “principles” reflected the political realities of dealing with the park concession system.

Mission 66 did not affect comprehensive or significant change as to where concession overnight accommodations were located, but ushered in significant changes in both the types of lodging units and the concessions. While older hotels and lodges with their individual cabins were retained, in many larger parks, the older facilities were augmented with new motel-type units that could more efficiently serve larger numbers of tourists and their automobiles. New lineally designed motel units with centralized registration lobbies provided “modern conveniences” that the postwar traveling public wanted. Old cabins were relocated to connect in rows, and in some instances, new units were constructed in lodge areas. Under these pressures, many concessioners began to reorganize or sell to larger businesses that specialized in hotel and restaurant management. For example in 1954, the Santa Fe Railroad abandoned its businesses on the south rim of the Grand Canyon. The company donated many of its utility buildings to the government and sold its interest in El Tovar Hotel and the Bright Angel Lodge to the reorganized Fred Harvey Company. The Yosemite Park and Curry Company went through a series of management changes in the 1940s and 1950s as did concession ownership in 1960 at Glacier National Park. After 1956, Congress required its own review and approval of all park concession contracts involving gross annual incomes over \$100,000. In 1965, Congress passed the Concession Policy Act that finally gave legislative recognition to possessory interest and the preferential renewal of contracts.<sup>94</sup> As these issues were resolved, banks more readily loaned money against the future earning potential of contracts, though the political and financial difficulties with the concession system persisted throughout the Mission 66 program.

Two important concessioner projects occurred in Yellowstone and Yosemite National Parks. In 1949, the National Park Service gave approval of a design for the reconstruction of the Yosemite Lodge in Yosemite Valley, which was completed in 1956. Though Yosemite Park and Curry Company made clear that no investment in new buildings would be made until the contemporary controversy over concession contracts was settled, the concessioner was anxious to expand and hired California architect Eldridge Spencer to design the new lodge. While the Mission 66 prospectus was still being prepared, Spencer’s completed plans for the new lodge, sited on the same location as the old lodge. The concessioner secured over \$1 million in bank financing and received approval to begin construction. The new Yosemite Lodge featured a central service building with associated groups of motel units. Spencer designed a series of four low buildings with redwood sheathing connected by covered walkways. The projecting eaves, large windows, and the sparse ornamental details gave the complex a contemporary look. Some of the older cabins were retained in the new complex and other motel units were added later, more than doubling the concessioner’s investment. Yosemite Lodge suffered few of the financial and management problems that plagued other concession developments. Since it was a “redevelopment” of an existing lodge, it remained close to the visitor facilities of Yosemite Village, and did not require extensive construction for utilities, roads, or other new services.<sup>95</sup>

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 26

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

At Yellowstone National Park, in 1948, when the park broke the one-million visitor mark, negotiations over the critical and expansive role of the park's concessioner would affect the future of the entire Mission 66 program. National Park Service officials had plans for a complete modernization of the park roads and overnight facilities. But, neither Congress nor the concessioner, the Yellowstone Park Company, could be convinced to make such investments at the time.

In 1955, the Yellowstone Park Company needed to renew its contract to remain salable, and the terms of any new contract would mean becoming a full partner in the implementation of Mission 66.<sup>96</sup> The company secured a large bank loan and hired Welton Becket and Associates of Los Angeles, California, to assemble proposals for three developed areas with motel complexes and other services. The proposed developments followed the outline of the draft Mission 66 prospectus for the park, and the preliminary site designs reflected the park's Master Plan. Canyon Village was to replace the 1911 Canyon Hotel, which was considered to be too close to the Grand Canyon of the Yellowstone River. Grant Village, left uncompleted by the end of the Mission 66 era, was to replace the facilities at West Thumb Geyser Basin and increase the room count in the park. Bridge Bay was constructed as a new marina and campground with visitor services that included a ranger station and camper store development to allow for the removal of an older development at the nearby Fishing Bridge and Lake areas.<sup>97</sup> When the preliminary plan for Canyon Village was approved to proceed, the concessioner signed a new 20-year contract based on an initial commitment of \$3.5 million to develop the site with 500 motel units, employee dormitories, and a lodge building that housed a cafeteria, restaurant, and other services. On June 25, 1956, Canyon Village became the first Mission 66 project funded by the National Park Service to break ground. It was scheduled as a "fast track" project to be opened the following summer. The National Park Service already completed site preparation, including roads and utilities and the concession contractor was working offsite on the prefabricated motel units designed by Welton Becket. Wirth made the Canyon Village groundbreaking ceremony the first of many celebrations of Mission 66 progress.

The new village development was located about a mile away from the rim of the Grand Canyon of the Yellowstone River. It was planned around an important intersection of the Yellowstone Grand Loop road system. The intersection divided the developed area into functional zones around a central parking area with a gas station near the parking area entrance. The central plaza was described in Master Plan drawings as the "parking lot" with a new lodge, a Hamilton Store, a Haynes Photo Shop, a post office, and the Canyon Visitor Center all in a Modern Movement style. The new buildings formed a horseshoe around three sides of the parking lot.<sup>98</sup> The park village planning concept was transformed into a more efficient development where every aspect was predicated on the universal and pervasive use of automobiles. In its location, scale, layout, and functionality, the early 1950s National Park Service concept for Canyon Village resembled a contemporary shopping center complex. The subsequent choice of a proven shopping center designer as the consulting architect for the project indicated how the Yellowstone Park Company perceived the economic potential of the development.

Welton Becket was a pioneer in the design of postwar retail complexes in California. At Canyon Village, Becket designed the central lodge building with a massive, shingled roof and a covered arcade along the façade of the building which connected to the separate registration building. The covered arcade supported the shingled roof on dramatic "Glulam" roof beams which extended beyond the eaves directly to concrete anchors at ground level. The prefabricated motel units, sited along access drives behind the lodge, were assembled in attached clusters. Of inexpensive construction with rectangular plans and flat roofs, the motel units were simple but convenient with modern utilities. Becket designed other concession buildings to create a unified visual theme. All larger buildings represented the Modern Movement style and extended towards the National Park Service's 1958 Canyon Visitor Center at the main entrance into the parking lot plaza.<sup>99</sup> The National Park Service landscape

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 27

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

architects and engineers designed site and infrastructure improvements at Canyon Village with a broad sidewalk connecting the main buildings to a parking lot with long islands planted with native trees and shrubs. The islands separated and screened individual parking corridors, breaking up and concealing the lot's full extent. According to Wirth at the groundbreaking, the entire complex was a demonstration of "the ability of private capital to work in harmonious cooperation with the Federal Government to provide for the betterment of the parks." Indeed, with the concessioner committed to shouldering a significant portion of the cost of modernizing Yellowstone, Wirth had reason to feel Canyon Village would be a major success. Newspapers from San Francisco to Denver picked up on the enthusiasm of the day and were impressed by the extent of the commitment of private capital as well as the breadth and ambition of the redevelopment plans for the nation's oldest national park.<sup>100</sup> However, continued financial and management woes of the Yellowstone Park Company made full participation in subsequent Mission 66 plans nearly impossible. This included the abandonment of the plans to develop Grant Village.

At Yellowstone, the National Park Service believed that new development replaced "poorly planned" development and that it additionally demonstrated the growing concern for more protection of park scenery. The site for the new Canyon Village had no significant views within its Lodgepole pine screening but did allow the "sensitive" scenery of the approach to the Grand Canyon of the Yellowstone River to be visually restored to more natural conditions. At the same time as Yellowstone National Park's Canyon Village development, Yosemite National Park advanced a redevelopment plan that could provide services in a less conspicuous way. The plans compared replacing the "Old Village" in Yosemite Valley with the new Yosemite Village. In the heart of the valley, new Yosemite Village was seen as harmonizing as a picturesque element among the stunning landscape scenes.<sup>101</sup>

At Yellowstone and Yosemite National Parks, lodges were among the earliest Mission 66 projects. They made considerable public impressions. Construction of massive motel complexes contradicted the original, central goal of Mission 66 to reduce the impacts of larger numbers of visitors by redeveloping parks more as day-use destinations. In reality, Mission 66 program concession planning did not make a bold break from prewar policy but proposed greatly expanding the established concession system. By the end of Mission 66, this expansion did not take place. Later market studies indicated that, in cases like at Yellowstone National Park, such ambitions were not supported by sound business plans. While visits to the park had doubled between 1940 and 1959, the Yellowstone Park Company found the percentage of visitors staying in hotels and cabins dropped by half from 84% to 42%, during the same period.<sup>102</sup> The economics of park concessions and of automotive tourism, in general, had permanently changed. As was the case in other parks, remote location and high elevation combined to create high construction costs and short seasons. Competitors in gateway towns, such as West Yellowstone, had lower construction costs, longer seasons, and full title to their properties for mortgage purposes. Older park hotels had the advantage of being in the park in direct view of its natural wonders. The less intrusive Canyon Lodge could not provide that, as it was sited away from "sensitive" scenery. While the modernist style of Canyon Village's architecture often was blamed, separating the architecture from the surrounding landscape had far more influence on the perception of Canyon Village than the style of the structures.

At Grand Canyon National Park, the Master Plan called for a relocation of the main automotive entrance into the park so that visitors would be able to approach from the southern Arizona communities as well as from the east. The realignment was completed in 1954. The Master Plan became the basis for the park's prospectus in 1956, which was the year that park visitation reached one million. Concession construction at Grand Canyon continued throughout the Mission 66 program and into the early 1970s during Parkscape USA. However by 1973, the "shopping plaza" between the visitor center and the Yavapai Lodge was enlarged, completing what park historian Amanda Zeman documents as the park's "Mission 66 Village." Originally conceived in 1956, more along the

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 28

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

lines of Canyon Village, the enlarged commercial area included a general store (1971), bank (1972), post office (1972), and several other buildings set around a large and uninterrupted parking lot.<sup>103</sup> By the 1970s, it would have been difficult not to compare the park's Mather Business Zone with many other shopping plazas springing up across the country.

At both Big Bend and Glacier Bay National Parks, which are in remote locations with low numbers of visitors, the Mission 66 program required construction of the lodges by the National Park Service. The National Park Service then leased the lodges to concessioners. The limited hospitality market restrained concessioners from the necessary investments to construct facilities. Big Bend National Park, Texas, was established in 1944 and initial development was minimal. The Civilian Conservation Corps built park roads and maintained a camp in the Chisos Basin while the area was still under state jurisdiction. Located in one of the most remote regions of the country, commercial possibilities for a concessioner were limited. The National Park Service established an administrative zone in the Panther Junction area in 1950. The subsequent Mission 66 program called for \$14 million in improvements in the park, which resulted in the first comprehensive, park-wide development scheme. Over the next ten years, the National Park Service built new visitor and employee facilities at Panther Junction including utilities throughout the park. In 1966, the concessioner completed the new Chisos Mountains Lodge in the Chisos Basin where the 5,000-foot elevation provided an island of respite in the vast surrounding desert. The complex of the Modern Movement style lodge building and surrounding motel units had an overnight capacity of 150, which reflected the park's low visitation. The Chisos Mountains Lodge, even after a later expansion, remains one of the best examples of the understated, efficient character of the Mission 66 "motel-type" lodgings.<sup>104</sup>

At Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve in Montana, plans for a park lodge, accessible only by boat and plane, were dated at least to 1945. The commercial potential for a concessioner was limited. Mission 66 provided for the building of park facilities in the Bartlett Cove area near the Gustavus airport, but lodge construction was delayed. In 1960, the National Park Service invited potential concessioners to invest \$150,000 in a lodge, but there was no interest. In 1964, Congress appropriated funds to pay for the construction of Glacier Bay Lodge, which was one of the few examples of congressional add-on funding used to build overnight accommodations in a park during the Mission 66 program. A contract was let to a private concessioner to operate the lodge. Seattle architect John M. Morse, who had recently designed the Sitka National Historic Site Visitor Center, designed what became perhaps the most striking of the Mission 66 national park lodges. The complex consisted of a central service building and surrounding motel units connected by boardwalks. The boardwalks laced through existing forest which preserved the site and functioned to keep visitors dry in the exceptionally wet climate. The lodge building featured a massive, gabled roof and a large dining room with views across the cove to distant glaciers and mountains. The asymmetrical pitch of the roof, reminiscent of the outline of the Canyon Lodge in Yellowstone National Park, cantilevered over an outdoor deck. The combination of large windows, patterned wood sheathing, and period light fixtures and furniture made the Glacier Bay Lodge a complete statement of Modern Movement style that suggested rusticity. It has retained the intended postwar aesthetic of National Park Service Mission 66 architecture.<sup>105</sup>

The design of new concession facilities developed during the Mission 66 program abandoned the more traditional Rustic style in favor of economics. For example, at Grand Canyon National Park, two new accommodation units were added to the Rustic-style El Tovar Lodge. The Thunderbird and Kachina Lodges were executed in the Modernist Movement style with flat roofs and deep fascias suggesting canyon wall strata when viewed from afar. In many parks, concessioners built gas stations, convenience stores, gift shops, and restaurants/cafes. Some were integral parts of larger designed complexes such as the 1958 Flamingo Visitor Center's attached restaurant at

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 29

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Everglades National Park. Another example is the concession building at Petrified Forest National Park, which includes an attached service station. It was a significant part of the 1960s Painted Desert Community courtyard design by Los Angeles architects Richard Neutra and Robert Alexander. Other concessions were part of previously developed areas such as the 1964-1965 Lake McDonald Coffee Shop at Glacier National Park, which was designed by Bert Gewalt of Brinkman and Lennon of Kalispell, Montana. At Mesa Verde National Park, the Mesa Verde Company contracted with the Denver, Colorado, firm Anderson Barker Rinker in 1963-1964 to develop the Morefield Village buildings in a modernist version of traditional Pueblo revival style architecture. The location of the Morefield complex and the new park campground served to remove public-use facilities away from the park's archeological sites.

The National Park Service worked with other federal agencies to provide service structures in large parks that were remote to nearby communities. The United States Postal Service and the Public Health Service worked in concert with the National Park Service to provide new post office buildings, clinics, and hospital facilities in parks such as Yellowstone National Park. The Lake Area at Yellowstone National Park was the beneficiary of a hospital, nearby housing for medical personnel and a standard designed post office that was constructed behind the old Lake Hotel. A clinic facility was constructed at Yellowstone National Park's Mammoth Area. As part of Grand Canyon National Park's South Rim development, a large hospital was built. These facilities, often constructed for summer use, were intended to provide services for park employees and visitors. Typically, all are examples of the Modern Movement style that expresses functionality.

The National Park Service architects and landscape architects were required to work closely with the private design firms retained by the concessioners with respect to planning the location of new and improved facilities, collaborating on the individual site development, designing the utilities infrastructure, and approving the final building and site design. The National Park Service design staff was assisted with experience through their collaboration with outside design consultants on their own park facilities. The primary differences with concessioners initiated architecture were that the concessioners' program focus for design was to meet the changing market demand for hospitality services, loan repayment, increased profit, and reduced investment risks. These factors differ in the design of a visitor center. For park superintendents, the primary concern was the provision of necessary hospitality services. This most often required a close working relationship with concessioners that fostered the belief that the associated risk of investment of private capital was reasonable. Over the course of Mission 66, Director Wirth compromised on factors including the initial goal of moving every lodge away from the direct views of the central features of the park, practical control over the concessioner contracts, and ability to induce the concessioners to invest the initially desired \$47 million and that every project would meet with a positive response from the public, press, and conservation organizations. Although concessioner projects by program end totaled only \$33 million, their visual impact was significant. The process of engagement by the National Park Service staff enhanced their understanding and ability for handling similar circumstances and factors throughout the conclusion of the Mission 66 program.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 30

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

***Landscape Development, Park Roads, and Trails***

The Mission 66 era created significant changes in the landscapes of the parks, modified the planning and design process, created new internal working groups, and responded to the evolution in the landscape architectural profession of the period. The leadership of Mission 66 landscape development was essentially an extension of the 1930s as it was directed initially by landscape architects Thomas Vint and Director Conrad Wirth. Both were long-term National Park Service employees who had been integral participants in the design of parks, park features and practiced the concepts of “naturalism” in landscape design in concert with Rustic-style buildings. Vint and Wirth advanced the ethos and design concepts of the two fundamental approaches that were at the core of their experience. According to interviews with WODC and EODC landscape architects who worked on site development projects during the Mission 66 program, Mission 66 landscape architects were influenced to continue to use the design principles developed during the 1930s. The principles were simple in practice: new construction was to lay lightly on the land to assure the buildings, site features, and road alignments were designed to minimize cuts and fills and to allow final grading to blend with the natural topography; native plant materials were to be used to repair construction scarring; and the removal of trees was to be minimized. As reported, these principles permeated nearly all landscape design and construction projects across the National Park Service. Landscape architects of EODC were to use historic plant materials at historic sites and plan for vista clearing along parkways.

Notably, the planning and design process was efficient; planning and design one year to construction the next. During the period of 1945 through 1955, staff and funding was limited, which gave ample time for planning. The Mission 66 program saw significant increases in the number of staff which was the result of hiring design professionals. All were imbued with National Park Service design standards. Consultants were selected, hired, managed, and similarly imbued with the design standards. Most of the funded projects had very limited and tight budgets and had to be planned, designed, and completed in short time frames. In the Parkscape USA program, there were more new parks to be designed and planned as well as competition of the previous projects planned or begun during the end of the Mission 66 program. In addition to these largely internal factors was the requirement for coordination with two external groups: the conservation organizations that were principally focused on the western parks and local governments with whom coordination was vital in the development of many of the principally urban parks in the east.

The planning and design process was changed in Mission 66, most significantly to assure flow in the approval process. Prior to 1954, park superintendents developed Proposed Construction Projects (PCP) that detailed the need and program for new construction. Next, the PCP was submitted to the regional office where a schematic design and plan with cost estimates was developed. If the regional director prioritized the project for funding, the schematics would be developed into construction drawings and the plans set for bids. With the establishment of the WODC and EODC in June of 1954, the process changed. Design professionals from the regional offices largely staffed the two offices. This reorganization reduced both the regional offices’ capacity and influence. After 1954, the PCPs were sent directly to WODC and EODC based on park location. The regional directors continued to prioritize construction budgets for their region. However, the two offices, WODC and EODC, provided the schematic designs at minimum, respecting the design standards. Depending on the resources of the park and where the project was located, the project construction documents could be completed with localized park staff or field representatives detailed from the two central offices.

Landscape architects were usually the project managers for park master plans, which initiated development in the park and involved architects, engineers, and interpreters. The Washington Office and respective park



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 31

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

superintendent approved a final park Master Plan from several alternatives. Within the recommendations of the approved Master Plan, a concept plan was prepared with several alternatives for final approval through the same process. The approved concept plan defined the location of buildings and structures; the rough design of the buildings; the site needs including circulation, parking areas, roadways, and trails.

A landscape architect's work in parks included managing changes to natural landscapes, creating designed landscapes, and preserving natural landscapes. From the planning phases for a park, the approved plans went directly to the architects and engineers, as necessary, for building and structure designs and construction drawings. The field representative often adjusted the location of the building and site improvements to further minimize tree cutting and cuts and fills regardless of the construction documents. At Beaver Meadows Visitor Center in Rocky Mountain National Park, Colorado, the building site was moved to the opposite side of the entrance road. Former WODC Landscape Architect John A. Ronscavage (WODC 1957 to 1972), in an interview stated part of his year was spent in Yellowstone National Park on numerous planning and design projects that involved directing onsite fieldwork. These projects included oversight of the Bureau of Public Roads' Grand Loop redevelopment, site restoration for building and structure removal, and siting buildings within the landscape. Similarly, the National Park Service program managers from the Washington Office often spent time in the parks during the summer. They imparted their knowledge and skills to those working in the field.<sup>106</sup>

The landscape architects were actively engaged in adjustments in the field for the larger projects, such as fitting roadways, parkways, campgrounds, and complexes of buildings into the park environment. Alignments of roads and parkways were adjusted to respond to constraints, including rock formations, and opportunities, such as views. These adjustments were made between the schematic design phase and the final construction document phase.<sup>107</sup> Campgrounds and residential units were sited on curvilinear roads, which enhanced the potential for privacy. However, the use of curvilinear roads was a long-standing National Park Service design practice that pre-dates the Mission 66 program. At the West Glacier Headquarters area in Glacier National Park, Montana, the curved street system was planned before World War II. Roads were designed to curve in level areas at Everglades National Park in Florida, to respond to privacy considerations of neighboring residential subdivisions and associated road layouts, not topography. Siting houses to maximizing privacy was accomplished by angling units on their lots reduced views of neighboring houses.

The Mission 66 program architecture reflects the change in architectural design that led to the Modern Movement style. Design professionals of the National Park Service had so successfully established the naturalistic Rustic style in national, state and local parks, that any change in style was difficult and even more difficult for the landscape architects than for the architects who had a freer range of options. Many examples of modern architecture in the National Park Service were executed by outside private architectural firms whose reputation depended in part on being stylistically current. The number of contracts for private landscape architects to execute commissions in the National Park Service was nearly non-existent. The reasons were two. Most areas that landscape architecture would critical were part of a contract with a lead architectural firm and not landscape architectural firm. And, there were simply not many places where modernist landscape architects could express their design philosophies. The few exceptions were Yellowstone National Park's Canyon Village by Welton Becket and the larger and rare designs of the Petrified Forest National Park's Painted Desert community complex by Richard Neutra and Robert Alexander who created a desert oasis in a central courtyard. Larger parks, where larger projects were executed, often retained their own "in-house" landscape architectural staff who maintained the design standards of the 1930s. According to an interview with Charles Riebe, a former engineer with the National Park Service during the period, there were conflicts with design consultants who tried to introduce modernism into park landscapes.<sup>108</sup>

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 32

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

There were bold changes in the private landscape architectural profession, particularly in the practices of those who were known as modernists: Thomas Church, Lawrence Halprin, Garret Eckbo, Dan Kiley, Hideo Sasaki, and Peter Walker. Examples of these changes in design included the use of rounded earth berms as decorative forms with paths curving between man-made obstructions, and features designed to bring abstractions of nature into the city as in Lawrence Halprin's Keller Fountain in Portland, Oregon. Perhaps the most significant modernist landscape architect was Roberto Burle Marx of Brazil with his use of both active and reflective water features, bold repetitive paving patterns, geometric forms, and plants as singular forms, patterns of forms, and textural fabric. His work included individual gardens, major parks and urban areas. His designs were greatly admired by the landscape architects of the United States. However, Thomas Vint and Conrad Wirth admired Frederick Law Olmsted and Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., who both designed in the naturalistic style and more intimately connected with the history of the National Park Service.

Frederick Law Olmsted's early engagement with what was to later become a national park began with Yosemite for which he drafted a charter and a development plan. Yosemite National Park's establishment by grant to the State of California was signed into law by Abraham Lincoln in June 1864. Olmsted set out principles for Yellowstone National Park that would apply to all the national parks that followed. He believed that it was a political duty to set aside "great public grounds for the free enjoyment of the people." The charter emphasized, by reference to the words and concepts of the Declaration of Independence, the rights of Americans to access parks. Later as detailed by Ethan Carr he "cautioned that these places not become the playgrounds of only the privileged few." Wirth relied on these words, and the principles were embodied in his responses to critics who believed the parks were being opened up to the people by the Mission 66 improvements.

In 1912, Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr. was requested to create the definitions of purpose for the Organic Act of 1916 that created the National Park Service: "To conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." The firm displayed its consummate skill in implementing the physical manifestation of this credo in the development of urban parks and park systems for the people. Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr.'s work for the National Park Service included both urban parks and large existing natural environment parks. The urban parks were in and around Washington, D.C., such as the National Mall, Thomas Jefferson Memorial, Theodore Roosevelt Island, President's Park (White House grounds), and Rock Creek Park. The firm's affiliations to larger national parks include Acadia, Everglades, Great Smoky Mountains, and Yosemite National Parks. Both Vint and Wirth, who were landscape architects by training, found much that they could directly apply Olmsted's project examples and principles to their own practices and leadership through the 1930s and after World War II.

The primary challenge for the landscape architects was to accommodate the increased numbers of visitors and cars, which required emphasis on better roads, more campgrounds, and the accommodation of new visitor centers. Director Wirth and Vint set out a further challenge to the landscape architects to remove services from the parks. Servicing visitors without negatively affecting the visitor experience posed a challenge for the modernist park. Their solution was a planning driven approach that began with the implementation of the Mission 66 prospectus for each park and subsequent master planning. "Development was often sited according to new criteria. Visitor centers were located according to functional concerns relating to park circulation, and so were not calculated as components of larger landscape compositions."<sup>109</sup> Onsite details, to mitigate the necessary intrusions, were then left to landscape architects to practically restore the areas affected by the construction or from demolition activities. Mission 66 landscape architecture designs brought into the parks new planning models like shopping

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 33

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

centers. However, the fundamental naturalist design philosophy remained a constant presence. This design philosophy was applied to campgrounds, trails, roads, and other features of built environments. The programmatic requirements remained except for the necessity to accommodate larger automobiles and increasingly larger recreational vehicles, design for higher speeds, and to have an enhanced focus on safety. Landscape architects worked as planners and designers to accommodate the increased visitation without degradation to the resources and quality of the visitor experience.

### Park Roads

Articles declared the terrible status of the national parks in the early 1950s. They depicted photographs of extended traffic jams with cars stacked up along the roads at entry stations and pullouts. Park visitation numbers of 21 million in 1941 were once again reached in 1946 and, by 1954, had reached 50 million with more projected increases. The combination of more leisure time due to the reduced work week, post-war baby boom, expansion in income, and increase in the number of automobiles further increased the traffic on park roads. Much of the parks road systems were in disrepair due to small budgets for maintenance before WWII and virtually none during it. Automobiles increased in size, weight, and speed capability. Driving on roads designed for smaller and slower vehicles, and in some cases designed for stagecoaches, meant congestion and apprehension toward perceived unsafe conditions. Concurrently, a new national focus on road safety was taking place, the creation of a network of interstate high speed superhighways, a rise in status and numbers of highway engineers, and an increase in public awareness of highway construction effects on sensitive landscapes, scenery, and nearby land use. Much work was to be completed before the negative association to photographs of traffic jams could be changed to positive views of free-flowing vehicles through the idyllic park landscape.

The Bureau of Public Roads (BPR) partnered with the National Park Service in effort to pair their safety-focused road and bridge engineers with the landscape architects and engineers of the National Park Service to have roads sit lightly on the land. Per the Division of Labor, National Park Service personnel planned and supervised construction, and BPR engineers realized the designs. The engineer's safety concerns included narrow bridges, roads, shoulders, tight curves, compound curves, uneven surfaces, guard rails, sight distances and trees near the pavement edges. Members of the National Park Service design staff shared these concerns but were also required to locate roads away from the scenic focus, keep speeds low, provide pull-offs at overlooks and interpretive sites, maximize retention of vegetation, minimize cut and fill, heal road construction scars, retain historic features such as bridges, avoid open up new areas to roads if it would impact a sensitive landscape, and maintain a sensitivity to the criticism of outside groups. The design staff implemented key principles of the National Park Service by increasing flow and increasing safety. The team was aware of the difficulties of road design and construction in the national parks through learning lessons from high-profile road projects.

At Yellowstone National Park, the road system was widened and modernized throughout. Most bridges were replaced. The alignment of the main Grand Loop was relocated away from sensitive areas and bypasses were redeveloped to the Lake Village and Old Faithful developed areas. For the latter, the Bureau of Public Roads designed and constructed an overpass to ease entrance and exit traffic when a large number of cars left *en masse* after the geyser's eruption, a popular attraction. At the west park entrance, a new entrance station was built by the National Park Service. Interpretive displays, new trails, and signage were completed throughout the park. Pullouts along roadsides and parking lots were expanded or constructed at major resource viewing locations with improved access trails. Some 50 new picnic areas were planned for the park in conjunction with new campgrounds at major road intersections and at developed areas. In addition, landscape architects were responsible for directing the restoration of areas where buildings and bridges were removed.<sup>110</sup>

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 34

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Landscape architect John A. Ronsavage recalled his experiences with working with the BPR to develop circulation patterns and road and parking areas for the primary sites within Yellowstone National Park. Sometimes what was designed could not be constructed. He recalled designing a suitable large parking area for the Old Faithful area. Construction funds were required to purchase concessioner lodging cabins that were in the way of construction. Due to the redirected construction funds, no landscaped islands were funded or constructed in the large area of parking.<sup>111</sup>

Accessing many western parks was difficult due to the distances from established communities and the terrain within the parks. Access became the gatekeeper on visitation, dictating the numbers of people, locations of their visit, length of their visits, and focus of their activities. During the Mission 66 program, the primary modes of transport changed, and with each evolution of the transportation network, the land use and building types changed and so did visitor expectations. As the parks became more accessible to ever-larger numbers of people arriving by automobile, pressure mounted to provide more services and better access to focal areas. For those seeking peace and quiet of the natural environment, they found more people flooding their favorite near-in locations and, as a consequence, expressed their opposition to the popularizing of parks.

More roads would be embroiled in controversy during Mission 66 construction. However, the National Park Service had a foundation of great pride in a trio of beautiful scenic highways: Going-to-the-Sun Road at Glacier National Park, Trail Ridge Road at Rocky Mountain National Park and Zion-Mt. Carmel Road in Zion National Park. These roads provided access to previously inaccessible, high-elevation scenic terrain. The roads were praised as engineering feats sustaining the scenic qualities of the areas traversed. National Park Service completed the two high-elevation roads in the 1930s which amazed the public. Trail Ridge road accesses the high country where more than 11 miles is above 11,500 feet in elevation. Going-to-the-Sun road clings to the sides of the steep high mountains and passing through the rock faces by tunnels. Each road traversed difficult terrain of great scenic value using engineering techniques, tunnels, stonemasonry arched bridges, and extensive stone retaining walls. The roads allowed park visitors backcountry experience otherwise accessible by horseback or hiking only. Safety concerns limited location selection for pullouts with overlook. Framing great views was a lesser priority, for these were abundant. Scenic touring was the purpose of all three roads. Higher speeds of travel were not a concern. At the time of construction, scenic road speeds were similar to non-scenic road speeds.

The vast majority of the Mission 66-funded roads did not face such engineering challenges. The ongoing challenge was to establish whether a new road was really needed or the improvements to an existing road were justified as expressed by the conservation organizations. Criticism was focused on how a road was designed. The hierarchy of design factors differed for the BPR, the National Park Service, and the conservation organizations that were monitoring development.

Many of the parks with a scenic road as their primary focus continued their development during Mission 66. The Blue Ridge Parkway begun in 1935 as a New Deal Era program, halted by World War II, and resumed as a Mission 66 program with the majority of the parkway completed in 1966. The completion of Linn Cove Viaduct linked the parkway segments in 1987.<sup>112</sup> Skyline Drive, in Shenandoah National Park, is 105 miles long, has a speed limit of 35 miles per hour, provides 75 overlooks, and has extensive concession development. The park still touts, "a slow meander down Skyline Drive will give you a whole new driving experience." The presence of these roads and parkways became a major factor in experiencing the parks.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 35

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Prior to the Mission 66 program proposal, several road improvement projects served as learning experiences for National Park Service administrators and for conservation and wilderness advocates. Typically, issues centered on evaluation of effects. Evaluated effects include: increased traffic on adjacent land, relative state of unaffectedness of adjacent land relative to past use, the disturbance factors of construction, and engineering alternatives such as gradients, alignment, width, curve radii, landscape scarring, and slope stabilization. The National Park Service had to meet its own standards for engineering roads and protecting resources and aesthetics. Conservation groups maintained a narrower focus. The Tioga Road in Yosemite National Park began as a planning project in 1934 and continued through the early 1950s. It set a trend for reduced development. The Sierra Club, the most engaged conservation organization, was fully involved in the design and planning process. They influenced the downscaled road projects at Olympic National Park and at Kings Canyon National Park.

Road development during the Mission 66 program improved access in the parks and helped crystallize opposition of many conservation groups that sought a reserved classification for public lands that would stay wilderness. The reactions to the Tioga Road development and, later, the maintaining of Denali Road as largely unpaved were intense and changed how the public, the Department of the Interior, and some employees of the National Park Service perceived Mission 66. Controversies around these roads were not typical. Hundreds of less dramatic road improvements and realignments were undertaken throughout the park system. The majority of these projects did not incite opposition. During Mission 66, some roads received a light touch. For example, Montezuma Pass Road improvement at Coronado National Memorial repaired Civilian Conservation Corps construction of headwalls and culverts to ease tightness of some hairpin turns and provided new access and parking at the crest. However, this road was unpaved in order to maintain a visitor experience similar to before Mission 66 improvements. The dirt entrance road into Chaco Culture National Historical Park, New Mexico, and its Mission 66 visitor center are examples of the needed improvements [demolished November 2010].<sup>113</sup>

For Wirth and his Mission 66 staff, road projects remained critical to their modernist concepts for the parks. For example, plans for overnight accommodations could be canceled, as they were at Mount McKinley. Leaving roads in a relatively undeveloped state meant restricting overnight and day use. Such restriction in access limited the "parks for people" idiom. Such parks became a reserve for a smaller, self-selected group. There was an important distinction, at least for Wirth and his staff, between building a new road and improving an existing one. National Park Service officials repeatedly observed that neither the Tioga Road nor the Denali Road projects involved the disturbance of a previously road-less area. For conservationists, this distinction was without difference; increasing the capacity of a road could be almost as bad as building a new one.

In cases where new proposed road in road-less wilderness areas, Wirth and his planners were willing to cancel prewar road construction plans. They often described Mission 66 as a redevelopment plan. Roads would be within the overall footprint of development in the park. An existing footprint of development was subject to interpretation. Developments such as those at Yellowstone National Park's Canyon and Grant Villages stayed within the park's 1908 development footprint. They were sited along the corridor of the park road system, which was planned by that date. In other cases, where new road development would enter existing wilderness, Mission 66 planners tried to be true to their remaining policies.

The National Park Service design staff engaged in developing creative solutions appropriate to the resource base. For example, widening narrow roads, the roads could be made into one-way loops. At Mount Rainier National Park, Washington, a new road bypassed a section of existing road by a new road; use was continued, but now restricted to a one-way downhill drive. Similar treatments were used for sections of Yellowstone National Park's

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 36

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Grand Loop Road. At Rocky Mountain National Park, Old Fall River Pass Road became a one-way road to the Trail Ridge Visitor Center.

The Roaring Fork “Motor Nature Trail” was one of Mission 66’s most unusual road-building experiments. It afforded a 5.5 mile-long excursion along the course of a historic wagon road in Great Smoky Mountains National Park. The ten-foot-wide, one-way drive wound around trees, boulders, waterfalls, log cabins and other historic sites, with a posted speed of ten miles-per-hour. In keeping with the Mission 66 emphasis on visitor education, numbered posts along the way keyed to a guidebook and explained natural and cultural features. Another low-speed loop in Colonial National Historical Park led visitors through tidewater woodlands past a series of roadside paintings. The “Gallery in the Woods” depicted scenes of early life in the Jamestown settlement. The narrow roadway surrounded by dense vegetation was intended to give modern visitors a sense of the Colonial travel experience.<sup>114</sup>

Additional interpretive activities off the main park roadway at Great Smoky Mountains National Park included the 1959 construction of a unique observation tower on the states’ line. Designed by Bebb and Olson of Gatlinburg, Tennessee, Clingman’s Dome Tower is a modernist helical concrete ramp extending to a top platform to give visitors an expansive overview of the park across the two states.<sup>115</sup> Critics cited it as “inappropriate architecture” in a national park as much as the Tioga Road had provoked similar criticism.

By Wirth’s 1966 estimate, 1,570 miles of roads were “reconstructed” under the Mission 66 program, while 1,197 miles of new roads were built “mostly in new areas” of the rapidly expanding park system.<sup>116</sup> But, the ambitious pace and scope of the Mission 66 program was initially considered its virtue, later worked against its public image. The “bulldozers of bureaucracy” were active everywhere by the late 1950s. Ansel Adams, Olaus Murie, and other activists suggested the bulldozer should be the symbol of the Mission 66 program. By the early 1960s, conservationists had succeeded in characterizing the program as one of rampant overdevelopment for a significant and influential segment of the national park public.<sup>117</sup> Among the major roads built or improved in parks were the loop drive at Acadia National Park, Maine, portions of Skyline Drive in Shenandoah National Park, Newfound Gap Road at Great Smoky Mountains National Park, main park road at Everglades National Park, roads at Glacier National Park, and the Grand Loop Road at Yellowstone National Park.<sup>118</sup>

The 1966 “Mission 66 Progress Report” noted that roads and parking areas for concession operations totaled \$2,797,656 which included over 45 miles of roadway and 208 parking areas. It also included reconstruction to improve road and parking facilities that resulted in an additional \$1,050,475 for 20 miles of roadway and 123 parking lots. The total automobile capacity was for 9,363 parked cars. Of the noted 9,164 miles of trails constructed, 359 miles were reconstructed. In addition to roads, parking, and trails in the parks, the Mission 66 program funded \$244,248,761 in the development of 1,103 miles of parkways across the country. An additional \$140,777,400 was budgeted beyond 1966 to complete 204 miles of parkways.

Parkways begun in the 1930s were funded for completion during the Mission 66 program using 1954 Federal Highway Act funds. Parkway were generally designed to the standards of the Bureau of Public Roads’ Interstate system, but with extensively managed natural landscape design to screen development and control vistas. They were mostly located in the eastern United States. In Virginia and North Carolina, the Blue Ridge Parkway consisted of designed and managed viewsheds. The historically themed Colonial Parkway linked Jamestown, Williamsburg, and Yorktown Battlefield, Virginia. The 51-mile Foothills Parkway connected the Tennessee River Bridge in Alabama to the Meriwether Less National Monument in Tennessee with Williamsburg and Yorktown in Virginia. The George Washington Memorial Parkway included a section of the Capital Beltway and

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 37

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Interstate 95 through Maryland and Virginia. The Natchez Trace Parkway extended from Tennessee across Alabama and through Jackson and Tupelo, Mississippi. Natchez Trace included the notable rest areas, the Jackson Falls area and the Jeff Busby Overlook. 32 million dollars was expended for the Natchez Trace Parkway, which was over 400 miles long, similar to Blue Ridge Parkway. It was completed under Mission 66 but was not dedicated until 2005. The longer parkways included significant developments at intervals for concession operations with overnight accommodations and restaurants and for the interpretation of historic sites at overlook structures. Most of the new construction represents notable examples of the Modern Movement style.<sup>119</sup>

### Trails

Trail construction in the “Mission 66 Progress Report” of 1966 was combined with the statistics for road construction and reflects that trails were a secondary program effort. The report noted that there were 8,228 miles of trails in 1956. As of June 1966, there were 9,164 miles of trails resulting in a net gain of only 936 miles. Conrad Wirth in his book, *Parks, Politics, and People*, reported that there were 359 miles of reconstructed trails and 577 miles of new trails. No specific costs were provided in the report, though the narrative on trails extolled that the addition to trails would “...bring (the) visitor closer to nature and have him savor wilderness and the parks’ historic, scientific, and archeological features.” Most of those trails already existed. The author, or authors, went on to define trails as walks through Yellowstone National Park’s thermal features, through the giant sequoias in Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks, on elevated boardwalks across the Everglades National Park, and on “...underwater ‘trails’ in the Virgin Islands National Park.”<sup>120</sup> Emphasis was placed on frontcountry nature trails rather than on construction and reconstruction of trails in the backcountry of a park. The 1966 report, “Mission 66 for the national park system,” reflected the trail types of the 1956 report. The 1956 report noted “...close-in trails which lead from convenient parking to places of or features of special interest...” were recognized as the most used type of trails. The 1956 plan specifically stated that, “...there is no need to increase the total back-country trail mileage.” Improvements were to be considered, such as new connecting links between existing trails, but the backcountry should be largely unchanged during the Mission 66 program.<sup>121</sup> Thus trail construction was limited to less than a thousand miles within the national park system. It was primarily for a park’s interpretive program rather than a backcountry nature experience.<sup>122</sup>

Typically, the construction or improvements to trails during the Mission 66 program consisted of wider trails with a hard surface for safety reasons and ease of maintenance. Materials consisted of concrete, concrete with exposed aggregate, asphalt paving, or compacted crushed gravel. In many instances, like at Montezuma Castle National Monument in Arizona, the path was edged with stone to retain the surface and visually soften the edges. Logs, often part of backcountry trail construction, were used to contain frontcountry trails; all reflected a continued reliance on natural materials. The 1966 report mention that in parks with wetlands, such as Yellowstone or Everglades National Parks, boardwalks may be considered temporal as the sawn lumber or other materials deteriorate rapidly and required extensive repair and replacement. A trail’s location and layout have been changed to avoid sensitive areas or due to natural forces and conditions.

Trails were also a means of interpreting the park to visitors. Landscape architects and planners worked with Ronald F. Lee’s Division of Interpretation, in Washington, D. C., to develop signage and exhibits to interpret landscape features and historical sites along roads and parkways. Lee quoted Aldo Leopold who suggested that the essential task was to “improve the quality of park use.” For Lee, “a boring interpretive program” made for low quality public use.<sup>123</sup> Interpretive exhibits on a trail, panels in rehabilitated kiosks and new kiosks at overviews, were consistent with park interpretive facilities in assuring continuity of the national park experience.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 38

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

**Campgrounds**

Campground rehabilitation and construction was the purview of National Park Service landscape architects. It was accomplished in many national parks as an alternative to hotels and motels and to provide an uncommon park experience for visitors. The design of campgrounds in the national parks had its origins with E. P. Meinecke who was a plant pathologist. Working with the Forest Service and the National Park Service in the 1920s and 1930s, Meinecke examined the degradation brought on by visitor use. His findings of unregulated use and its effects resulted in the development of the 1934 report, "A Campground Policy," to regulate this aspect of visitor impact. Included were several design guidelines for campgrounds including one-way loop roads, individual parking in a herringbone pattern, amenities such as a picnic table, a grill, and space to pitch a tent. Campsite containment was accomplished with logs or boulders, vegetation, and introduced native trees to act as screening between campsites.<sup>124</sup>

These guidelines were the inspiration of the Mission 66 program for campground construction, though the area dedicated to camping was expanded, and the individual spaces were enlarged to accommodate more and larger vehicles. Attention to privacy with respect to campgrounds was accomplished by National Park Service landscape architects by providing longer one-way loops with widely separated camp site turnouts constructed around a centralized comfort station on a level site. One new type of campground without parking at the tent site, a "walk-in" site, was created at Rocky Mountain National Park by Landscape Architect Jay O'Shea who took advantage of sites such as rock formations, topography, and trees to enhance privacy. The walk-in site design was dependent on remote parking from the campsites for two or three cars.<sup>125</sup>

Campgrounds were linked to comfort stations and occasionally shower buildings by trails. Campgrounds were often constructed near amphitheatres that featured popular evening interpretive talks which utilized audio visual equipment. In some parks, the campground-accessible interpretive programs were augmented with fireside interpretative programs. Other nearby amenities included ranger station and concessioner-operated camper store facilities that often provided showers for campers and hikers.

The "Mission 66 Progress Report" noted that at the beginning of the program in 1956, there were 575 campgrounds that could serve 12,000 campers. In 1966, there were 29,782 campsites available. Yellowstone National Park projected that the number of campground sites would be increased from 490 to 1,420 to serve up to 6,000 campers. Throughout the National Park Service, new and reconstructed amphitheatres, coordinated interpretive displays, modern comfort stations, and utilities were constructed. In order to manage visitor interpretation of the park in the form of evening entertainment, a reported 82 new campfire circles and amphitheatres were constructed and 16 reconstructed nationwide. The seating capacity was increased to over 41,000. The "Mission 66 Progress Report" noted 742 picnic areas in 1956 and number increased to 12,393 by 1966 at a total cost of \$3,570,902. Reconstruction of picnic areas was reported as \$129,937.<sup>126</sup>

Of road and trail construction, the "Mission 66 Progress Report" documented 1,116 new or rehabilitated interpretive roadside and trailside exhibits. 39 entrance or checking stations were replaced or reconstructed. In "Beach Developments" section, there were 50 marinas, boat launching ramps, and beach facilities constructed. Boat docks, constructed and reconstructed, included 93 as of 1966.<sup>127</sup> An example of programmatically coupled design is the Bridge Bay Marina, at Lake Yellowstone's Bridge Bay, Yellowstone National Park, with its boat slips and ramps fronting the new ranger station and camper store which served the Mission 66 campground behind it.



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 39

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

*Historic Preservation and Interpretation*

The Mission 66 program influenced major strides in the development of national historical parks. 59 historic sites, mostly in the eastern United States, were added to the national park system between 1952 and 1972. This number included 11 sites associated with American presidents. The advancement of historic preservation in the National Park Service to manage historic structures that are the focal point of historical parks was under the purview of architect Charles E. Peterson and historian Roy Appleman of EODC. Together, they developed the ideas for the interpretation of historical sites in concert with Ronald F. Lee's Division of Interpretation in Washington, D. C. Peterson established the professionalism of historic preservation activities at EODC. According to former EODC architect and National Park Service Chief Historical Architect Hugh C. Miller, Peterson hired a staff that set the trends for the National Park Service's Cultural Resource programs after the 1966 National Historic Preservation Act was passed. Peterson's historic preservation program staff included Henry "Hank" Judd, who became the Chief Historic Architect of the National Park Service in the Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation which was established in the Washington Office in 1967 by transferring personnel from Philadelphia.<sup>128</sup> Judd began his career working at Harpers Ferry National Historical Park on many reconstruction and restoration projects. Architect Lee Nelson, who later managed historic preservation technical service programs for the National Park Service, oversaw the preparation of historical studies and Historic Structures Reports for buildings at Colonial National Historical Park. There, he worked on the restoration of the Diggs House. Others, such as Orville Carroll, worked on the 1964-1965 reconstruction of the Appomattox Court House and other restoration projects on historic buildings and moving historic buildings at Appomattox Court House National Historical Park. The court house reconstruction project was designed by architect J. Everett Fauber, Jr. from Lynchburg, Virginia. The court house was to serve as the park's visitor center. At the same time, outbuildings were reconstructed to support the 1949-1950 reconstruction of the Wilmer McLean House where Generals Ulysses S. Grant and Robert E. Lee ended the Civil War. Carroll oversaw the restoration of historic buildings within the historical park. Other professionals hired under Peterson's tenure were James Askins, former director of the National Park Service's historic preservation training center; Gordie Whittington; Archie Frantzen; and Penny Bachelor, who all contributed to the professionalism of National Park Service Cultural Resource activities. Importantly, Peterson and Judd created the "Exhibit Specialist" professional series for crafts persons who worked on historic preservation, restoration, stabilization, and rehabilitation projects. This concept became a cornerstone of the subsequent preservation program of the National Park Service.<sup>129</sup> Following the establishment of the Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation in the Washington Office, "A small historic architecture office was established in the Western Regional Office."<sup>130</sup>

New national historical parks were training grounds for the historic preservation program of the National Park Service. The historic preservation program began during the New Deal with the establishment of the Historic American Buildings Survey, the National Historic Landmark program and the reconstructions of historic and commemorative buildings such as "Wakefield" at George Washington Birthplace National Monument. The Mission 66 program eventually funded dozens of significant historical park developments of increased variety and scope, many of which had been begun before World War II. Much of the program was characterized by the involvement of National Park Service historians, landscape architects, and architects. Scenic preservation techniques aided the development of national historical parks. In order to preserve park resources, a primary historic period of use was designated. Resources were preserved to the established historical date that represented the main historic period of use for the landscapes and the structures in the park.

Interpretation of historic sites through "living history" demonstrations, tour guides, and ranger-led tours occurred at the visitor centers. The location of the visitor center often offered vistas of the historic scene, which was

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 40

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

preferred by interpreters, or may have been located at the periphery and required visitors to walk further. This locational dilemma was demonstrated by the location of the visitor center for Gettysburg National Military Park, Pennsylvania. The visitor center and Cyclorama Building, designed from 1958-1962 by Richard Neutra and Robert Alexander, Los Angeles, California, engendered controversy regarding its being located on an important portion of the battlefield. The visitor center demolition in 2012 represented the changing attitudes regarding visitor centers in historical parks. The preservation of the historical park scene included the reconstruction of buildings to serve as visitor centers, such as at Appomattox Court House National Historical Park. It included the rehabilitation of historic structures into visitor centers, such as at Fort Laramie National Historic Site and at Fort Davis National Historic Site, which was authorized in 1961 as a western historical park. The Commissary at Fort Laramie was adapted to include an interpretive museum and park offices. At Fort Davis, Mission 66 projects, under the direction of WODC historical architect Charles Pope, included restoration of the surviving buildings and rehabilitation of the barracks building into the park's visitor center.

“The Pioneer Yosemite History Center” located at the Wawona area near Yosemite National Park’s south entrance was an unusual historic preservation projects in the western United States. The site, conceived in 1956, was developed primarily in 1962-1964 as a Mission 66 interpretive project. The site was planned as a repository for historic park buildings that were removed from their original sites around the park. The presence of a historic 1857 covered bridge over the South Fork of the Merced River was the impetus for developing the area. The bridge was restored after a 1955 flood. The history center concept soon followed with the reconstruction and restoration of several historic buildings that were dismantled as early as the 1930s in an effort to keep the park “natural.” The history center began under the direction of Park Naturalist Douglass H. Hubbard and expanded to include over 12 historic buildings augmented with various features and visitor service structures constructed during development.

Beyond the parks, city urban renewal programs beginning in the 1950s represented an opportunity for landscape architects, architects, and interpreters. Though results were limited, they were significant. Under Mission 66, National Park Service participation in the New York City Shrines Advisory Board established new or re-designated national parks at Federal Hall, Grant’s Tomb, Hamilton Grange, and Ellis Island, where an “American Museum of Immigration” was planned. Similar participation with the Boston National Historic Sites Commission resulted in the eventual designation of Boston National Historical Park and Minuteman National Historical Park, for which EODC completed a preliminary study before acquisition. In a 1960 memorandum, Chief of Interpretation Ronald F. Lee suggested that the National Park Service’s “contributions to historic preservation and open space protection in urban areas” were becoming “a complementary program to wilderness preservation” and that this was a desirable direction in which the agency should grow. “The perpetuation of nationally recognized historic and cultural values of cities is a worthy objective for the National Park Service,” he reasoned, “since it would broaden the ‘cultural basis’ of the agency.” It would also provide a “service to a tremendous portion of America’s population which may never be privileged to visit a western national park.”<sup>131</sup> Conversely, broad sweeping urban renewal demolition affected National Park Service planners as urban open space was created to showcase particularly historic buildings, such as Independence Hall in Philadelphia, and to create the site for the Gateway Arch of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis, Missouri, which focused on the restored “Old Courthouse.” In both instances, as a consequence of the urban renewal, blocks of historic buildings were removed to create new vistas and expose the primary resources more fully. Such demolitions by a federal agency helped lead to the passing of the 1966 Historic Preservation Act that required independent reviews of such projects to help identify significant resources before they could be demolished.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 41

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Like Mission 66, these preservation activities had precedence in the New Deal legislation, primarily the 1935 Historic Sites Act, which established the Historic American Buildings Survey that continued beyond the Mission 66 program. The National Historic Landmark program, an extension of concepts established in 1935, was reinstated in 1960. The National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings completed 35 major studies and 78 special studies and had investigated some 3,000 historic and archeological sites. The "Mission 66 Progress Report" acknowledged that archeological surveys were accomplished at 282 reservoir areas in 42 states as well as in 60 national parks.

The interpretive program under Ronald F. Lee was significantly expanded during the Mission 66 program. In addition to hiring more interpreters and training them, the "Progress Report" noted a substantial number of new museums and improvements to museums, the introduction of audio-visual equipment in visitor centers and amphitheaters, the construction of interpretive signage and exhibits, and an expanded publication program.<sup>132</sup> Lee's strategy to professionalize the interpretive programs throughout the national parks by moving the programs beyond mere museum construction was analogous to Wirth's decision to use the Park, Parkway, and Recreational-Area Study Act of 1936 as the authority for Mission 66 recreational planning. In both cases, very capable New Deal bureaucrats used the legislative tools to frame the renewed programs and activities of the Mission 66 program. Critics outside the National Park Service continued to point out the need for new legislation that would restructure and broaden federal efforts in archeology and historic preservation. While Wirth was openly antagonistic to 1960s legislation, such as the 1963 Outdoor Recreation Act and the 1964 Wilderness Act, Lee cultivated private sector preservationists and supported the efforts that led to the 1966 National Historic Preservation Act. However, Wirth opposed the early versions of that preservation legislation, since it was implied that the National Park Service would have to take responsibility for inventorying and monitoring historic resources that were only of state or local (not national) significance.<sup>133</sup> But largely as a result of Lee's efforts, the 1966 act placed the administration of a new National Register of Historic Places within the National Park Service. As a result of the 1960s legislation, the National Park Service retained leadership and administration of federal historic preservation programs. However, in 1962, the National Park Service was required to divest from federal recreational planning authority. The new Bureau of Outdoor Recreation took on this responsibility.

***Mid-Course Corrections***

From the late 1950s to the end of the Mission 66 program in 1972, there was an increasing sensitivity to the quality of the environment and the concern for the conservation of scenic land. National responses included the establishment of a wilderness designation and the Wilderness Act and an increase in the size and power of conservation organizations, which continued to express deep concerns that increased visitor use degraded the National Park experience. The Mission 66 program responded by accommodating the increased visitation with a number of physical changes such as roads, parking areas, overnight accommodations, and visitor and employee service facilities. The various stages, from proposal to construction, drew negative responses from a wide range of critics including the conservation organizations. Although constituting a small percentage of the overall number of projects, the criticized projects became high profile due to their opposition, and called other projects' necessity and the appropriateness of design into question.

Conrad Wirth responded, in part, with a review of the Mission 66 program that was already scheduled for 1960. The review began earlier, in 1959, because of the added impetus of the 1958 establishment of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission (ORRRC) with its responsibility to assess recreation needs and recommend actions within three years. Wirth timed his revamped Mission 66 document to occur after the new

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 42

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Kennedy administration took office in 1960 and before the ORRRC report was presented. The review process was performed in a similar manner to the original Mission 66 program proposal in a closed room and in relative secrecy and isolation. Park superintendents reviewed their original material and, instead of revamping their original park prospectus, they worked with their respective regional design offices to create master plans. While the National Park Service was meeting behind closed doors, in marked contrast, ORRRC was hiring outside researchers and consultants, partnering with 20 different federal agencies, completing outreach evaluations of market demand, connecting directly with conservation groups, and holding significant numbers of public meetings.<sup>134</sup>

In addition, ORRRC had engaged state and local park management in the overall needs assessment and planning effort, a role that the National Park Service had undertaken since the 1930s. Wirth's network of state and municipal park executives became very active in 1959, as they became mindful that the ORRRC would make recommendations directly affecting them. In August 1960, at Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton's invitation, officials from the American Institute of Park Executives and the National Conference on State Parks were asked to join the National Park Service to initiate a new park planning organization. Under the combined aegis of the three groups representing three levels of government, the initiative was named "Parks for America."<sup>135</sup> The plans for new park development from the Parks for America initiative required congressional acquisitions, particularly national seashore park proposals. Congress left these projects unfunded. Wirth sought political support for the Parks for America initiative by introducing the program to the new Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall. President Kennedy appointed Udall as Secretary of the Interior, who brought his experience as a congressman with a strong background in resource management decisions. Wirth proposed to Udall that the Parks for America initiative was the second stage of Mission 66 with an emphasis on the acquisition and expansion of new parks. This was a step that recognized that most of the existing park projects were complete.<sup>136</sup> Wirth realized that ORRRC was likely to conclude that America was underserved by the existing inventory, and that new parks would relieve the pressure on existing parks. In addition, new parks could build new structures with modernist architectural style that would not contrast with any existing architecture and therefore not be subject to the same level of criticism.<sup>137</sup>

In the February 1961 issue of *The Atlantic* magazine, criticism of the National Park Service was paramount. Criticism centered on its policies, designs, and the access to larger numbers of people.<sup>138</sup> After communications between Wirth and Udall, the secretary published a response in *The Atlantic* that defended Mission 66. Udall pledged a review of the program and he stated that the Clingman's Dome observation tower at Great Smoky Mountains National Park, the Tioga Road at Yosemite National Park, and the Flamingo Motel in the Everglades National Park were "mistakes."<sup>139</sup> Udall's article followed the presentation of the second stage of the Mission 66 program in April 1961 at the "Mission 66 Frontiers Conference." The emphasis of the conference was on hiring and training staff, increasing interpretation, and expanding the system with new parks.<sup>140</sup> This approach satisfied both the conservation community and assured Udall, with the tide turned, that he could move forward. The contrast in management styles between the insular and older Wirth and the open and younger Francis Sargent of ORRRC in combination with Udall's apologize for a selection of Mission 66 projects resulted in a loss of prestige and power in the National Park Service as well as loss of respect for Udall and the Kennedy Administration. Yet, there was still enough momentum to the Mission 66 program that its expansion plans, founded on the clearly expressed needs contained in the ORRRC report, drew widespread support.

Following the reappraisal and the Mission 66 Frontiers Conference, the Washington and regional offices of the National Park Service began reorganizing. Separate divisions of construction and master planning were added parallel to landscape architecture, architecture, and engineering. Regional directors started to regain authority

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 43

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

they lost under the 1954 reorganization that led to the establishment of WODC and EODC. Authority was lost to an even greater degree, under the Mission 66 program. With influence regained, concession development plans and other projects' site plans and working drawings could be approved in the regional offices after 1961.<sup>141</sup> The National Park Service personnel changes at the beginning of the Kennedy administration was a result of timing more than politics. The New Deal generation was reaching retirement age just as Udall's "New Conservation" arrived, but the National Park Service was adapting. Wirth hoped to accommodate the vision of the new Secretary of the Interior and the upcoming recommendations of the ORRRC's final report.

From the ORRRC report, came the 1963 creation of the Bureau of Recreation (BOR). Wirth would not professionally recover from this transfer of duties. The creation of the BOR further transformed how the National Park Service and the Mission 66 program were to operate in the new decade. Wirth's subsequent inability to fully embrace the BOR caused Secretary Udall to lose confidence in him. When Congress passed the 1963 Outdoor Recreation Act which authorized the Department of the Interior to continue the planning and surveys of the ORRRC, the secretary reassigned these responsibilities to the BOR. The still tiny agency coordinated planning among more than 20 federal agencies and various state and local organizations. Without land management responsibilities, the BOR would have significant influence over where and how new national and state parks were created once the means of funding such acquisitions was established. This potential came to fruition in 1964 when Congress passed the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Act that authorized grants to federal agencies to acquire and develop new parks and recreation areas. The act authorized grants-in-aid to the states (on a 50/50 matching basis) for the same purpose. The funds were to be supplied through a national system of park "user fees," the sale of surplus federal property, and federal gasoline taxes. Under a later amendment, revenues from offshore oil drilling were added for a total authorization of up to \$200 million annually. The LWCF Act created a dedicated fund—analogueous to the fund that financed Interstate Highway construction—for the acquisition of new national and state parks. The act was an unprecedented commitment to directly acquire property for a mass expansion of federal and state park systems. However, Congress and Udall had not made the program part of the Mission 66 program, nor the National Park Service.<sup>142</sup>

***George B. Hartzog, Jr., and the "Road to the Future"***

Conrad Wirth later insisted that his October 1963 retirement was his own idea and done on his schedule. There is no reason to believe he wanted to retire before 1966. In that year, he would be over 65, in his 35th year with the agency, and poised to celebrate the completion of the Mission 66 program and the 50th anniversary of the National Park Service. Less than six months after the creation of the BOR, Udall actively considered who should be the next National Park Service director. In October 1962, Secretary Udall offered George B. Hartzog, Jr. the director position. Hartzog was a National Park Service concessions lawyer and former superintendent of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in Missouri. Intelligent and affable, Hartzog had over 15 years of experience with the National Park Service. Hartzog had never been a member of the agency's directorate, and although as superintendent he supervised much of the Gateway Arch construction in St. Louis, he had no major role in the Mission 66 program. He retired after being informed by Director Wirth that there were no promotional possibilities beyond his position at the memorial.<sup>143</sup> Udall approached Hartzog within months of his departure from the National Park Service about the possibility of returning and suggested that he could be appointed associate director under Wirth. The surprising move meant promoting Hartzog over a number of higher-level candidates with more experience.<sup>144</sup> At the National Park Service's October 1963 "Conference of Challenges" at Yosemite National Park, Wirth's retirement was announced. Hartzog was appointed director in January 1964.<sup>145</sup>

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 44

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Over the next nine years, Hartzog's legislative accomplishments would make him one of the most successful directors in the history of the National Park Service.

From the Yosemite "Conference of Challenges," came the significant, new framework for long-range planning. The 1964 "Road to the Future" report was a summary of the new policies and priorities. It divided the park system into three categories: "natural areas," "historical areas," and "recreational areas."<sup>146</sup> Each of the three park types was defined by objectives such as "to provide for the highest quality and use of national park system." Many key policy statements throughout the plan established continuity with the Mission 66 program: "Parks are preserved for people" and "increased use...should therefore be welcomed." The next general objective, "to conserve and manage for their highest purpose the natural, historical and recreational resources of the national park system," further illustrated continuity with Mission 66 policy but with a fresh emphasis on new ideas. The "Road to the Future" report was based on the continuance of many basic assumptions of Mission 66 policy that included "Conservation through development design" guided by master plans. This would "assure balanced relationships between preservation of the park resources and visitor needs." The third objective of the "Road to the Future" report entailed continued expansion of the national park system. Mission 66 planners had been preparing the necessary plans and legislation for years and simply continued their activities. The final two objectives of the "Road to the Future" report referred to commitments in park interpretation and development of professional staff, both had already been greatly advanced through the Mission 66 program and were continued without radical redirection. Visitor centers would continue to be built and their architectural style would continue to reflect contemporary trends in American design. The basic planning and organizational structure of the agency, as it had been adapted since 1959, would continue intact.<sup>147</sup> The "Road to the Future" report restated and revised the Mission 66 program in order to make consistent with Udall's New Conservation and the broader environmental movement. In some respects, it marked an end to the original Mission 66 program ideals. Wirth's Mission 66 program continued to exist until it officially drew to a close in 1966. With a new director and a new rhetoric of park planning in place by the end of 1964, the Mission 66 program existed mainly as a congressional budgetary entity, as compilations of construction statistics, and in the memories of Wirth and his fellow National Park Service associates.

During his last year as director, Wirth prepared his own "Progress Report" that summarized Mission 66 statistics in 1963. In part, such a report was needed because the format and content of Department of the Interior annual reports changed under Udall to include much less specific information. Wirth took the opportunity to create a complete record of what the Mission 66 program accomplished in the eight years under his direction. 27 new areas were added to the national park system, and 100 visitor centers were built or were under construction. The two new agency training centers held particular significance for Wirth as he looked to the professional preparation of the next generation of rangers and park staff. Other projects of particular note were the "relocations necessary to protect park features from human impact" that took place at Yellowstone and Yosemite National Parks and those that were underway at Mount Rainier and Mesa Verde National Parks. The list of construction accomplishments was long and impressive. Few cast doubt on the efficiency of the Mission 66 program as a design and construction program. Wirth quantified the results of the agency "research program" with similar precision: "45 projects and 77 reports, and the establishment of 15 current research projects partly or wholly funded by the Service." The Historic American Buildings Surveys (HABS), reactivated in 1957, documented over 2,000 structures. The reinvigorated activities of the Historic Sites Survey included plans for a 16-volume series of thematic studies of American history and prehistory.<sup>148</sup>

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 45

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

*Park System Expansion*

The later phase Mission 66 program shifted focus toward park expansion as a way to relieve pressure on existing parks by continuing previous efforts to create new parks. Several new parks were proposed prior to the Mission 66 program, such as Cape Hatteras National Seashore in 1937. Others never moved forward due to a lack of federal funding for land acquisition. In 1934-1935, after National Park Service planning staff conducted extensive studies of America's undeveloped seashores, 12 to 15 new national seashore parks and 30 state seashore parks were proposed. Cape Hatteras was not funded by the federal government; the land purchase costs were shared by the Mellon family and the State of North Carolina. While other proposed seashore parks did not progress due to a lack of federal funding, in the minds of many, including local proponents, the parks were deemed to be of sufficient merit to initiate local funding efforts.

New types of parks used federal land that was transferred from other federal agencies to the National Park Service. Others were jointly managed, such as Lake Mead National Recreational Area, with the Bureau of Reclamation. Beginning with the appropriation of \$16 million for land acquisition in 1961, over the next five years, Congress authorized funds for most of the acquisition of private land (some was donated) that resulted in a total of 54 additional parks. In addition to seashore and reservoir lake parks were recreational areas, national parkways, historical areas, and even several critical natural areas such as Guadalupe Mountains and Canyonlands National Parks. This expansion was in the amount and types of parks under the auspices of the National Park Service.

The 27 additions to the national park system made during the first eight years of Mission 66 include Virgin Islands National Park; Booker T. Washington and Grand Portage National Monuments; Fort Davis, Fort Smith, Golden Spike, and Sagamore Hill National Historic Sites; City of Refuge (Pu`uhonua O Hōnaunau) and Minute Man Missile National Historic Parks; and Arkansas Post, Fort Clatsop (Lewis and Clark), and Lincoln Boyhood National Memorials. No national park expansion loomed larger in the Mission 66 program and "Road to the Future" planning than national seashores and national recreation areas. Three new national seashores—Cape Cod, Padre Island, and Point Reyes—were created, and others were underway. Lake Mead, Glen Canyon, and U.S. Forest Service Flaming Gorge National Recreation Areas embodied how the Mission 66 program expanded the range and purposes of the national park system. Mission 66 planning for national seashores and national recreation areas anticipated the work of the BOR and preempted it to the degree that, by 1963, an expansive scope and vision for these park types had been thoroughly described in National Park Service planning documents.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 46

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

***Parkscape USA Program***

At the official close of the Mission 66 program, *National Geographic* magazine published a long article in July, 1966 about the program that was written by former Director Wirth.<sup>149</sup> The article's focus was on the 50th anniversary of the National Park Service. Meanwhile, Director Hartzog, instead of looking back on the Mission 66 program and its accomplishments, rolled out his new initiative "Parkscape USA," in the same issue of the *National Geographic*. The new initiative was calculated to continue the strong public image—and increase budgets—of the Mission 66 program, while leaving behind earlier controversies. In a series of memoranda and magazine articles, Hartzog outlined his priorities for Parkscape USA, many of which were drawn from the "Road to the Future" report. The program had five major goals: "completing" the park system by 1972; developing "cooperative programs with other agencies;" "utilizing the national park concept" to improve life in American cities; "communicating the values of park conservation;" and developing an international assistance program in anticipation of the second World Conference of National Parks which was scheduled to be held in Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks in 1972.<sup>150</sup> The primary intent was to fulfill previously unmet needs. The plan anticipated continuation of increased funding levels of the Mission 66 program. Hartzog's plan did not generate much excitement with the National Park Service or with the public since the first goal was considered to be completing what had been already started by the Mission 66 program. The outreach goals were interpreted by some as the National Park Service's means to maintain credibility and meaning as the agency broadened its base.

Preparation for the new program was accomplished in March 1966 with the reorganization of EODC, WODC, and the Washington Office of the Assistant Director, Planning and Construction. By July 1966, the three new offices had been reorganized. The eastern and western offices became the Philadelphia and the San Francisco Planning and Service Centers. The service centers were reorganized to include the Office of the Chief, Division of Development Planning and Project Control; Division of Project Design to include landscape architecture, architecture, and engineering; and the Division of Contract Administration & Construction. The Washington Planning and Service Center subsumed the Office of the Assistant Director and included an Administration Office which continued to provide program oversight through the Division of Design Research and Analysis; the Division of Planning & Project Control; the Division of Project Design, including landscape architecture, architecture, and design; and the Division of Contract Administration and Construction. The just added Division of New Area Studies and Master Planning included Cooperative Activities. Small concession offices were established in each eastern and western office. The reorganization of the Washington Office in 1966 extended to the National Capital Office of Design and Construction (NCODC) that was established in January 1962. The old NCODC functioned to coordinate design and construction of all three offices. The new office expanded to include Design Research and Analysis, Development Planning and Project Control, Project Design, Contract Administration and Compliance, and Construction.<sup>151</sup> On July 1, 1968, jurisdiction over park activities in Minnesota, Iowa, and Missouri were transferred from the Philadelphia Service Center to the San Francisco Service Center. This change roughly divided the eastern and western geographic areas based on the Mississippi River.<sup>152</sup>

The Parkscape USA program's primary accomplishments resulted from the completion of the Mission 66 program projects that were underway or planned in 1966. Old and newly authorized Mission 66 parks utilized the same design personnel and others, who had worked during the earlier program. Additionally, parks proposed during the Mission 66 program were added to the system and these required appropriate facilities that were identical to those of older parks. Golden Spike National Historic Site, established in 1965, received a new visitor center in 1968 that was ready for the May 10, 1969, centennial celebration of the completion of the Transcontinental Railroad. To meet the needs of other parks established during the Mission 66 program, facilities



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 47

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

were constructed, such as at Padre Island National Seashore. An elevated “Public Use Building” at Malaquite Beach was completed in 1969 to meet the needs of the park which was authorized in 1962, and finally established in 1968. Curecanti National Recreation Area, established in 1965 around the three impoundment lakes in Colorado, experienced a building boom. The National Park Service developed a village that included a visitor center, concessions and maintenance facilities, employee residences, and a campground all built between 1968 and 1970. Arizona’s Pipe Spring National Monument Visitor Center, planned and constructed in 1972, had the unique distinction of dual use by the National Park Service and the Kaibab Ute Tribe’s concession operation since the monument is on tribal lands. The design reflected, in a modernist style, the historic Mormon ranch operation of the 1870s that included the stonemasonry fort, which was the focal point of the park. Pipe Spring National Monument, established in 1923, received Mission 66 housing and a temporary visitor center in 1958, but the new building of 1972 provided visitor services and park offices. The culmination of Parkscape USA initially focused on the 1972 Yellowstone National Park Centennial with the construction of a new Old Faithful Visitor Center which included both a detached comfort station and auditorium. The visitor center and support facilities, now demolished, were designed in 1969-1970 by WODC architect Pack Hunter and were completed by the 1972 centennial celebration and the “World Conference of National Parks.” The new Yellowstone National Park visitor center represented the progress of American architectural design with its parabolic roof system that lacked the subtlety of modernism of the 1950s and early 1960s but characterized American architecture of the 1970s by displaying new structural systems in higher profiles.

In addition to completing projects and providing services to parks established in the Mission 66 program, more new parks were introduced as part of an emphasis on national trails and national scenic riverways, principally under the Parkscape USA program. The Ozark National Scenic Riverway was established in 1964, giving impetus for Congress to pass the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act in 1968. Subsequently, five new wild and scenic rivers joined the national park system. The National Trail System Act, passed in 1968, included the Appalachian Trail into the national park system. These two types of parks, like the precedent-setting parkways, are linear parks with many jurisdictions and consequent management challenges. The third new type, the urban park, was more in the form of what the National Park Service was comfortable managing; a cohesive single parcel. However, two urban parks established by Congress in 1972, the final year of Mission 66, were split by bodies of water: The Golden Gate National Recreation Area in San Francisco and Marin County and Gateway National Recreation area in the Port of New York and nearby New Jersey. The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 gave Hartzog the opportunity to “expand the National Register of Historic Places to include properties of state and local significance,” thereby becoming “a record of all that merits preservation and a yardstick against which to measure the rightful roles of all concerned in the preservation movement.”<sup>153</sup> However, perhaps because the Parkscape USA program represented the continuation of the Mission 66 program in nearly all respects, it ended in 1972 with little recognition because it was overshadowed by the 100th anniversary celebration of Yellowstone National Park.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 48

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

*Epilogue*

Following the 1972 election and the end of the Mission 66 program, President Richard M. Nixon's second Secretary of the Interior, Rogers C. B. Morton, replaced Director Hartzog with Ronald H. Walker who was a trusted political lieutenant in the White House but had no experience with state or national parks. Walker's position as director lasted two years, and he was followed by a series of National Park Service directors with diverse backgrounds that included being long-term National Park Service employees. Most served relatively short terms and came and went based on the political atmosphere at the Department of the Interior.<sup>154</sup> By the end of Director Hartzog's appointment, new public attitudes and congressional legislation had profoundly changed the federal administration of natural resources and public lands. Environmentalism, as a political movement, greatly influenced Washington. Building on prior legislation—the Wilderness Act, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, the National Historic Preservation Act, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, and the National Trail System Act—Congress passed the Water Pollution Control Act, the Clean Air Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act in 1973. The organizational changes and procedures at the National Park Service required the assessment of environmental impacts for proposed actions. This new requirements altered the agency's management culture.

Changes within the National Park Service culture proved to be one of the most profound reasons for the end of the Mission 66 era in 1972. To further reduce the conflicts between regional offices and to restructure management and personnel into one location, the Western and Eastern service centers in San Francisco and Philadelphia were closed in 1972 and consolidated into one centrally located service center in Denver, Colorado. The architects, landscape architects, engineers, and administration staff from both offices, who wanted to relocate, established the new Denver Service Center teams for regional offices. They immediately began the planning, design, and construction of regional bicentennial projects that were to be ready for the celebration of 1976. Many of the older employees already retired. Some stayed to staff the newly strengthened National Park Service regional offices where each assembled a full team of planning, maintenance, and cultural resource specialists to meet regional park needs that were required by the new legislation. The consolidation and relocation of the new service center to Colorado gave rise to a break in the continuity from the New Deal programs through the Mission 66 and Parkscape USA. The new generation of designers hired in Denver, would lead the National Park Service planning and construction program, including preparations for diverse American Bicentennial projects that celebrated the founding and growth of the nation. Examples of such projects include the reconstruction of the adobe fort at Bent's Old Fort National Historic Site, which was established in 1960, and numerous Philadelphia projects such as a new visitor center and reconstructions of historic properties to provide a full interpretation of 1776 events and people.<sup>155</sup> By 1974, four new regional offices were brought into the national park system by redistricting the original five regions. This reorganization increased the professional services provided directly to parks, which previously was the purview the Western and Eastern Offices from 1954 to 1972. It facilitated long-range planning and major construction projects for the parks through the Denver Service Center.

As the National Park Service changed organizationally, politically, and professionally, Congress continued to increase the size and diversity of the national park system. Over 40 new park areas were established between 1973 and 1980. The 1978 National Parks and Recreation Act authorized 14 additions alone. The vast majority of these new parks were vital and worthwhile enhancements, but critics described process as being driven by congressional politics and not national recreational planning.<sup>156</sup> National Park Service staff was stretched to accommodate and manage an ever larger and more diverse collection of federal reservations and sites that continued to increase. These pressures continue to the present.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 49

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

**ENDNOTES**

<sup>1</sup>“Mission 66 Research, Working Meeting” May 28-29, 2003, Washington, D.C., US Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Park Historic Structures and Cultural Landscapes Program.

<sup>2</sup>Sarah Allaback, *Mission 66 Visitor Centers: The History of a Building Type* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 2000).

<sup>3</sup>Albert H. Good, *Parks and Recreations Structures* (New York: Princeton University Press, 1999 [reprint of 1938 edition]).

<sup>4</sup>Visitor statistics are available from the National Park Service through the agency website. See “www.nps.gov/refdesk.” Also see the appendices of Dwight F. Rettie, *Our National Park System* (Champaign: University of Illinois, 1996).

<sup>5</sup>Vernon L. Hammons, “A Brief Organization History of Office of Design and Construction, National Park Service, 1917-1962,” (Copy located at the National Park Service, Denver Service Center, Technical Information Center, Denver, CO), p. 5.

<sup>6</sup>Rettie, *Our National Park System*, 251-252. It is difficult to compare total expenditures on the National Park System during the New Deal to the cost of Mission 66, but there is no question that New Deal programs represented a greater overall commitment. The Department of Labor’s and the U.S. Army’s adjusted costs of recruiting, housing, and feeding the Civilian Conservation Corps, for example, alone may have exceeded the Mission 66 total. Mission 66 also did not include the massive state park expansions overseen by the National Park Service in the 1930s, nor was it complemented by other federal programs (such as the Public Works Administration, the Resettlement Administration, among others) that greatly augmented National Park Service activity during the New Deal.

<sup>7</sup>Ethan Carr, *Mission 66, Modernism and the National Park Dilemma* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2007).

<sup>8</sup>Conrad L. Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980), 262-274; R. Bryce Workman, *National Park Service Uniforms: The Developing Years, 1932-1970* (Harpers Ferry, West Virginia: National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center, 1998), 31, 33-38; “Mission 66 Progress Report,” March 1966 (National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center Archive).

<sup>9</sup>See Allaback, *Mission 66 Visitor Centers: The History of a Building Type*.

<sup>10</sup>George B. Hartzog, Jr., “To Each National Park Service Employee,” January 2, 1967; “PARKSCAPE U.S.A.,” memorandum, January 3, 1967 (National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center Archive).

<sup>11</sup>Barry Mackintosh, *The National Parks, Shaping the System* ([Washington: Department of the Interior’s National Park Service), 75-78; George B. Hartzog, Jr., “Mission 66 and Parkscape,” *Historic Preservation* 18, no. 4 (August 1966): 140-143; George B. Hartzog, Jr., “Tomorrow in Our National Parks: Parkscape USA,” *National Geographic* 130, no. 1 (July 1966): 48-92; George B. Hartzog, Jr., “Parkscape USA,” *Parks & Recreation* 1, no. 8 (August 1966): 616-20.

<sup>12</sup>In 2000, several Mission 66 visitor centers were designated National Historic Landmarks for their architectural significance (Quarry Visitor Center, Dinosaur National Monument; Wright Brothers National Memorial Visitor Center; Beaver Meadows Visitor Center, Rocky Mountain Park). Others Mission 66 visitor centers have been determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

<sup>13</sup>Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *1946 Annual Report*, 308.

<sup>14</sup>David R. Brower, *For Earth’s Sake: The Life and Times of David Brower* (Salt Lake City: Peregrine Smith Books, 1990), 219-220.

<sup>15</sup>Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *1946 Annual Report*, 307-310.

<sup>16</sup>Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *1946 Annual Report*, 308.

<sup>17</sup>Roy E. Appleman, *A History of the National Park Service Mission 66 Program*, unpublished report, 1958 (National Park Service, Denver Service Center, Technical Information Center). Appleman, a member of the team planning Mission 66, explains that his history was based almost entirely on written notes that took continuously: “[I] kept an informal diary...[and] made notes at the time discussions were in progress and often took down literally verbatim the words spoken.... Almost nothing presented herein is based on unsupported memory” (p. 10). Taking into account his obvious point of view, the account provides an excellent summary by a professional historian who was also a participant in the events described. Wirth relied heavily on the account when writing his memoirs.

<sup>18</sup>Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People*, 237-239; Appleman, *A History of the National Park Service Mission 66 Program*, 4-5.

<sup>19</sup>Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People*, 238-239.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 50

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

<sup>20</sup>Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People*, 239; Appleman, *A History of the National Park Service Mission 66 Program*, 7-8.

<sup>21</sup>Appleman, *A History of the National Park Service Mission 66 Program*, 8-10.

<sup>22</sup>“Informational Memorandum No. 1, Mission 66,” February 18, 1955, (Box A8213, National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center Archive); Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People*, 241-243; Appleman, *A History of the National Park Service Mission 66 Program*, 9-18.

<sup>23</sup>“Informational Memorandum No. 2, Mission 66—Policies and Procedures,” March 17, 1955, (Box A8213, National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center Archive).

<sup>24</sup>Appleman, *A History of the National Park Service Mission 66 Program*, 20.

<sup>25</sup>Appleman, *A History of the National Park Service Mission 66 Program*, 22.

<sup>26</sup>Herma A. Baggley, “Report of the National Park Service Housing Survey,” unpublished report, 1953, (National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center Archive).

<sup>27</sup>Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People*, 244.

<sup>28</sup>“Steering Committee Precepts for Staff Guidance,” unsigned draft [Garrison], March 1955, (Box A8213, National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center Archive).

<sup>29</sup>Lemuel A. Garrison, “Guiding Precepts Mission 66,” draft memorandum, August 29, 1955, (Box A8213, National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center Archive).

<sup>30</sup>Garrison, “Guiding Precepts Mission 66.”

<sup>31</sup>Garrison, “Mission 66,” *National Parks Magazine* 29, no. 122 (July-September 1955): 107-108; Conrad L. Wirth, “Mission 66,” *American Forests* 61, no. 8 (August 1955): 16-17.

<sup>32</sup>Mission 66 planners counted 180 units of the park system in 1955; Dwight Rettie’s recent study suggests there were 194. The discrepancy is apparently the result of how certain “affiliated areas” and national cemeteries were and are counted. Rettie’s figures are used here for the sake of consistency. Rettie, *Our National Park System*, 252-253.

<sup>33</sup>Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People*, 250-251; Appleman, *A History of the National Park Service Mission 66 Program*, 58-63.

<sup>34</sup>“The National Park System,” National Park Service brochure, n.d. [1955]; “MISSION 66 Report,” unpublished report, September 1955 (National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center Archive).

<sup>35</sup>“Statement by Conrad L. Wirth, Public Services Conference,” September 20, 1955 (Box 4, Conrad L. Wirth Collection, University of Wyoming, American Heritage Center).

<sup>36</sup>In 1955, the combined agency budget had been less than \$33 million; with federal highway money, the 1956 total was raised to almost \$49 million. In presenting the cost of Mission 66 in his final report, Wirth took the proposed 1957 budget of about \$66 million (assumed to be a normal or “base” budget), multiplied by ten, and subtracted from the \$787 million estimated total for the 10-year program. The difference, he suggested was the actual increase, or true cost, of Mission 66. The \$787 million figure ended up being used anyway despite this effort to minimize the apparent cost. “Mission 66: To Provide Adequate Protection and Development of the national park system for Human Use,” January 1956, unpublished report, (National Park Service, Denver Service Center Library).

<sup>37</sup>Appleman, *A History of the National Park Service Mission 66 Program*, 97.

<sup>38</sup>Appleman, *A History of the National Park Service Mission 66 Program*, 91-94; William M. Blair, “Saving the Parks,” *The New York Times*, February 12, 1956; “Pioneer Dinner Launches Mission 66,” *National Parks Magazine* 30, no. 125 (April 1956): 59-60; National Park Service, *Our Heritage, A Plan for Its Protection and Use: “MISSION 66”* (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 1956).

<sup>39</sup>“Mission 66,” *The New York Times*, February 26, 1956; Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People*, 262; Appleman, *A History of the National Park Service Mission 66 Program*, 89.

<sup>40</sup>Using Dwight Rettie’s statistical index, combined appropriations per unit of the park system in constant 1990 dollars rose (in round figures) from about \$629,000 in 1929, to \$1.2 million in 1939, to \$410,000 in 1949, to \$1.8 million in 1959, and to \$2 million at the end of Mission 66 in 1966. Appropriations continued to rise after Mission 66 to \$2.2 million per unit of the system in 1973 and \$2.9 million in 1995. Rettie also reports the total number of visits recorded to the park system, however, rose from 127 million to 383 million between 1966 and 1995. Based on these visitation figures, one could argue federal support for the parks has waned. Rettie, *Our National Park System*, 251-253.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 51

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

<sup>41</sup>Several versions of the slide show, sets of numbered slides, and at least one of the audio tapes are conserved at National Park Service's Harpers Ferry Center Archive.

<sup>42</sup>National Park Service, "Mission 66: Questions and Answers," n.d. [1956], (National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center Archive).

<sup>43</sup>Paula S. Reed and Edith B. Wallace, "Jackson Lake Lodge, National Historic Landmark Nomination." This National Historic Landmark nomination form is available through the National Register of Historic Places, National Park Service, Washington, D.C. (<http://www.cr.nps.gov/nhl/designations/samples>). The Jackson Lake Lodge was designated a National Historic Landmark in 2003, in part for its significance as an influential precedent of Modernist architectural design in the parks.

<sup>44</sup>Jack Goodman, "Controversy Over Lodge in the West," *The New York Times*, Sunday, August 7, 1955.

<sup>45</sup>Vernon L. Hammons, "A Brief Organizational History of the Office of Design and Construction, National Park Service, 1917-1962," June 17, 1963, 4-5 (National Park Service, Denver Service Center, Technical Information Center).

<sup>46</sup>Allaback, *Mission 66 Visitor Centers*, 12-14.

<sup>47</sup>Conrad L. Wirth, "Design of Structures," memorandum, February 13, 1956 (Box 6, Conrad L. Wirth Collection, University of Wyoming, American Heritage Center).

<sup>48</sup>These statements were transcribed and distributed to WODC design staff. Conrad L. Wirth, "Excerpt From Telephone Conference Between the Director and Chief, WODC...January 9, 1957" (Box 7, Design & Construction File, RG 79, National Archives). The comments were subsequently read to the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments at their March meeting in Washington, D.C. The Advisory Board was discussing the issue of architectural design quality as a result of criticism, and praise, appearing in different journals. "Summary Minutes, 36<sup>th</sup> Meeting, Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments, March 5, 6, 7, 1957, Washington, D.C." (Yosemite National Park Archives).

<sup>49</sup>Conrad L. Wirth, "Mission 66 in the Headlines," *National Parks Magazine* 32, no. 132 (January 1958): 8-9, 36-37.

<sup>50</sup>Devereux Butcher, "Sunshine and Blizzard," *National Parks Magazine* 31, no. 128 (January 1957): 24-33; Ernest Swift, "Parks—or Resorts?" *National Parks Magazine* 31, no. 131 (October 1957): 147-148.

<sup>51</sup>Emerson Goble, "Architecture (?) for the National Parks," *Architectural Record* 121, no. 1 (January 1957): 173-85.

<sup>52</sup>Wolf Von Eckardt, "The Park Service Dares to Build Well," *The Washington Post*, March 29, 1964: G6.

<sup>53</sup>Robert E. Koehler, "Our Park Service Serves Architecture Well," *AIA Journal* 1 (January 1971): 18-25.

<sup>54</sup>The Quarry, Wright Brothers, and Beaver Meadows visitor centers were all designated National Historic Landmarks in 2001 for their significance in American architecture. See Allaback, *Mission 66 Visitor Centers*.

<sup>55</sup>Allaback, *Mission 66 Visitor Centers*, 228-246.

<sup>56</sup>Conrad Wirth gives a total of 114 new visitor centers during Mission 66. Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People*, 270. The exact definition of what constitutes a new visitor center (as opposed to an addition or a remodeling) makes it difficult to specify an exact number. Allaback's totals reflect what she could confirm through project records at the National Park Service, Denver Service Center, Technical Information Center. See Allaback, *Mission 66 Visitor Centers*, 255-265.

<sup>57</sup>John B. Cabot, "Creative Park Architecture," *Park Practice Guideline*. Department of the Interior, National Park Service (July 1963): 53-55.

<sup>58</sup>John B. Cabot, "Notes Gathered Traveling," October 12, 1956, memorandum (Box 29, RG 79, National Archives, Mid-Atlantic Region).

<sup>59</sup>Allaback, *Mission 66 Visitor Centers*, 24-33.

<sup>60</sup>U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *Visitor Center Planning: Notes on Discussions Held in EODC November 18-22, 1957, and WODC February 4-6, 1958*, unpublished report, n.d. [1958], (National Park Service Denver Service Center Library); Daniel B. Beard, "Report on Visitor Center," January 29, 1960 (National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center Archive).

<sup>61</sup>U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *Visitor Center Planning: Notes on Discussions Held in EODC November 18-22, 1957, and WODC February 4-6, 1958*.

<sup>62</sup>The complex of park buildings at Bandelier National Monument was designated a National Historic Landmark district in 1987 for its significance in American architecture. Laura S. Harrison, *Architecture in the Parks: National Historic Landmark Theme Study* (Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 1986), 355-382.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 52

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

<sup>63</sup>Linda McClelland, *Presenting Nature: The Historic Landscape Design in the National Park Service, 1916-1942*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service Cultural Resources, 1993, 300.

<sup>64</sup>Linda McClelland, *Presenting Nature: The Historic Landscape Design in the National Park Service, 1916-1942*, p. 311.

<sup>65</sup>Rodd L. Wheaton, Interview with Chris Turk, April 11, 2013.

<sup>66</sup>Rodd L. Wheaton, Interview with Jay O'Shea, April 11, 2013.

<sup>67</sup>Ethan Carr, *Mission 66, Modernism and the National Park Dilemma*, 178.

<sup>68</sup>According to a 1973 Park Service account, six Mission 66 visitor centers opened in calendar year 1957, ten in 1958, 19 in 1959, seven in 1960, five in 1961, 11 in 1962, 11 in 1963, nine in 1964, ten in 1965, and seven in 1966. 16 more had contracts let (gone to construction) before 1966 and opened between 1967 and 1969, for a total of 111. "Visitor Centers Completed Under Mission 66," memorandum, n.d. [1973], (Box A8213, National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center Archives). Sarah Allaback lists 110, confirmed through the records of the National Park Service, Denver Service Center, Technical Information Center, with locations and attributions. Allaback, *Mission 66 Visitor Centers*, 255-262. The final Mission 66 "Progress Report" in 1966 listed only 100 "new" visitor centers, probably indicating a discrepancy between new buildings and projects involving substantial additions and alterations to existing buildings. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, "Mission 66 Progress Report, March 1966" (National Park Service, Denver Service Center, Technical Information Center).

<sup>69</sup>"Analysis Visitor Centers Mission 66," memorandum, n.d. [1963], (Box A8123, National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center Archive). All figures are the original, unadjusted costs.

<sup>70</sup>"Statement of Controlling Development Policies," n.d. (Olympic National Park Archives); Irving Brant, *Adventures in Conservation With Franklin D. Roosevelt* (Flagstaff, Arizona: Northland Publishing Co., 1988), 117; Guy Fringer, *Olympic National Park: An Administrative History* (Seattle: National Park Service, 1990), 92.

<sup>71</sup>Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People*, 266-267.

<sup>72</sup>Mesa Verde National Park, "Determination of Significance," Morefield area, n.d.

<sup>73</sup>"Standard Plans for Employee Housing," Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Washington, D.C., 1957.

<sup>74</sup>The final and official decision to use "stock" housing plans in Mission 66 was at the Regional Directors Conference in February 1956. John B. Cabot, "The Design of Park Service Houses," October 19, 1956, memorandum (Box 29, RG 79, National Archives, Mid-Atlantic Region, Philadelphia).

<sup>75</sup>"Standard Plans for Employee Housing," Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Washington, D.C., 1957.

<sup>76</sup>George F. Baggley to John B. Cabot, October 16, 1956, (Box 29, RG 79, National Archives, Mid-Atlantic Region, Philadelphia). Baggley was writing on behalf of his wife, Herma. Also see Polly Welts Kaufman, *National Parks and the Woman's Voice: A History* (Albuquerque, New Mexico: University of New Mexico Press, 2006), 113-117.

<sup>77</sup>John B. Cabot, "The Design of Park Service Houses," October 19, 1956 (RG 79, Box 29, National Archives, Mid-Atlantic Region, Philadelphia).

<sup>78</sup>Editorial Staff, *Sunset Magazine. Sunset Western Ranch Houses* (Menlo Park, CA: Lane Publishing Co., 1946), 97; Daniel P. Gregory, *Cliff May and the Modern Ranch House* (New York: Rizzoli International Publications, 2008).

<sup>79</sup>"Determination of Eligibility, Montezuma Well Mission 66 Houses," draft, Montezuma Well, NM, Verde Valley, AZ, 2011.

<sup>80</sup>Draft National Register of Historic Places Registration Form, "Headquarters Historic District (Boundary Increase No. 1)," October 2006; copy located at Glacier National Park, West Glacier, Montana.

<sup>81</sup>U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, "Standard Plans for Employee Housing," 1957, unpublished report (National Park Service Technical Information Center, Denver).

<sup>82</sup>E. T. Scoyen, "New Standard Plans for Permanent Employee Housing," February 17, 1960, (National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center Archive).

<sup>83</sup>U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, "Standard Plans for Employee Housing," 1957.

<sup>84</sup>"Mission 66 Progress Report," March 1966 (National Park Service, Denver Service Center, Technical Information Center).

<sup>85</sup>Rodd L. Wheaton, National Register of Historic Places nomination, Lake Mead National Recreation Area Boulder Beach Residences, draft; 2012; copy on file with Lake Mead National Recreation Area.

<sup>86</sup>Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People*, 267.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 53

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

<sup>87</sup>In a 1928 amendment to the 1916 act creating the Park Service, the Secretary of the Interior was formally granted the authority to award concession contracts without competitive bidding and to allow concessioners to execute mortgages and issue shares of stock to finance improvements. The policy of "preferential renewal" of contracts (without competitive bidding) was put in writing in a department policy document signed by Ickes in 1933. Preferential renewal was intended to assure the security of private investments without granting actual title to properties. "Briefing Meeting...Concerning Concessioner Activities," memorandum (copy), September 6, 1962 (Box 5, Personal Papers of Conrad L. Wirth, RG 79, National Archives, Mid-Atlantic Region, Philadelphia).

<sup>88</sup>C. Girard Davidson to Julius A. Krug, "Concession Policies of the National Park System," memorandum, November 1, 1948, (Main Interior Library, Washington, D.C.).

<sup>89</sup>"Briefing Meeting...Concerning Concessioner Activities," Memorandum (Copy); John Ise, *Our National Park Policy* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press), 463; Don Hummel, *Stealing The National Parks: The Destruction Of Concessions and Park Access Bellevue*, Washington: Free Enterprise Press), 130-140, 156-161; Mark D. Barringer, *Selling Yellowstone: Capitalism and the Construction of Nature* Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas), 104-106.

<sup>90</sup>U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Public Lands, 80<sup>th</sup> Cong., "Concessions in National Parks," Hearing no. 41, 1948; U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Public Lands, 81<sup>st</sup> Cong., "Concessions in National Parks," Hearing no. 28, 1949.

<sup>91</sup>"Briefing Meeting...Concerning Concessioner Activities," memorandum (copy), September 6, 1962, (Box 5, Personal Papers of Conrad L. Wirth, RG 79, National Archives, Mid-Atlantic Region, Philadelphia); C. Girard Davidson to Julius A. Krug, "Concession Policies of the National Park System," memorandum, November 1, 1948, (Main Interior Library, Washington, D.C.).

<sup>92</sup>William Everhart, *The National Park Service*, (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press), 119; Ise, *National Park Policy*, 615.

<sup>93</sup>"Informational Memorandum No. 3, Mission 66, Progress and Procedures," June 27, 1955, (Box A8213, National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center Archive).

<sup>94</sup>A. C. Stratton to Conrad L. Wirth, "Concessioners' Mortgage Guarantees," memorandum, April 18, 1960 (Box 5, Personal Papers of Conrad L. Wirth, RG 79, National Archives, Mid-Atlantic Region, Philadelphia); Hummel, *Stealing the National Parks*, 182, 185, 192; Barringer, *Selling Yellowstone*, 180; Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, *Outdoor Recreation for America: A Report to the President and to Congress by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962), 164.

<sup>95</sup>Al Runte, *Yosemite: The Embattled Wilderness*, Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press), 187; Shirley Sargent, *Yosemite's Innkeepers: The Story of a Great Park and Its Chief Concessionaires* (Yosemite, California: Ponderosa Press, 2000), 134, 148.

<sup>96</sup>Aubrey L. Haines, *The Yellowstone Story*, vol. 2, (Boulder, Colorado: University of Colorado Press), 375-376. The concessioner's reluctance to enter into his investment obligations was expressed, for example, in a long letter to the park superintendent that June, shortly after the new contract had been signed. W. M. Nichols to Edmund B. Rogers, June 15, 1956, (Box A248, Yellowstone National Park Archives).

<sup>97</sup>By 1957, Wirth and Garrison had backed away from the other initially proposed development, "Firehole Village," that would have replaced the inn and lodge at Old Faithful. "Draft Mission 66 Prospectus Brief," August 28, 1957 (Mission 66 Prospectus Files, National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center Archive).

<sup>98</sup>"Canyon Regional Plan," 1952 Yellowstone National Park Master Plan, (Yellowstone National Park Archives).

<sup>99</sup>See Lon Johnson, "Determination of Eligibility, Canyon Village (Horseshoe Plaza) Historic District," unpublished report, 2000 (Yellowstone National Park Archives).

<sup>100</sup>"Address by Conrad L. Wirth...Canyon Village," prepared remarks, June 25, 1956 (Box 6, Conrad L. Wirth Collection, University of Wyoming, American Heritage Center); "\$31 Million 10-Year Yellowstone Project Set," *The Denver Post*, Monday, June 25, 1956; "U.S. Reveals Program for Yellowstone," *San Francisco Chronicle*, June 27, 1956.

<sup>101</sup>It is also true that by keeping the new Yosemite Village in a relatively compact form in the east end of the valley, views of the west end of the valley (including those from Inspiration and Discovery points) remained unaffected. The site selected for the new village also did not encroach on the historic scenic views of the valley, as shown by later park planners through their analysis of nineteenth and early twentieth-century paintings and photographs (see the "Historic Viewpoint Analysis" of the *Draft Environmental Impact Statement, General Management Plan, Yosemite National Park*, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1978, 102-106). But the central public buildings of Yosemite Village were intended to be seen in the context

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 54

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

of their extraordinary setting. The major public space (“plaza”) of the village was surrounded by the Rustic façades of the museum, administration, and other buildings, with dramatic views of Yosemite Falls, Sentinel Rock, Half Dome, and other features of the surrounding cliff walls in the background.

<sup>102</sup>Robin Smith, “The History of Grant Village,” unpublished report, 1988 (Vertical Files, Yellowstone National Park Archives).

<sup>103</sup>The extensive Mission 66 construction at the south rim of Grand Canyon National Park also included the Albright Training Center complex, the Shrine of the Ages, a new maintenance area, a high school, a clinic, many residences, and significant road and utility development. For a full account see Amanda Zeman, “Grand Canyon Village Mission 66 Planning Effort: National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Nomination Form,” 2003, unpublished report, Grand Canyon National Park.

<sup>104</sup>John Jameson, *The Story of Big Bend National Park* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996), 75-81; Ross A. Maxwell, *Big Bend Country: A History of Big Bend National Park* (Big Bend National Park, Texas: Big Bend Natural History Association, 1985), 69-75.

<sup>105</sup>Bonnie S. Houston, “Determination of Eligibility, Glacier Bay Lodge Complex,” draft, unpublished report, National Park Service, 2005; Theodore Catton, *Land Reborn: A History of Administration and Visitor Use in Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve*, government report, National Park Service, 1995, 264-283.

<sup>106</sup>Rodd L. Wheaton, Interview with John A. Ronscavage, Wheatridge, CO, September 29, 2012.

<sup>107</sup>Rodd L. Wheaton, Interview with Jay O’Shea, April 11, 2013; Rodd L. Wheaton, Interview with Gerhard Tegeder, April 8, 2013.

<sup>108</sup>Rodd L. Wheaton, Interview with Charles Riebe, March 30, 2013.

<sup>109</sup>Ethan Carr, “Mission 66 and Rustication,” CRM Bulletin No. 9, 1959

<sup>110</sup>Ibid.

<sup>111</sup>Rodd L. Wheaton, interview with John A. Ronscavage, September 28, 2012, Wheatridge, CO.

<sup>112</sup>Linda McClelland, *Building the National Parks*. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998, p. 481.

<sup>113</sup>National Park System, U.S. Department of the Interior, “Mission 66 Progress Report,” March 1966.

<sup>114</sup>Timothy Davis, “NPS Park Roads Theme Study DRAFT,” National Park Service, Historic Structures and Cultural Landscapes Program, 2012, pp. 22-23.

<sup>115</sup>McClelland 1998, pp. 471-472.

<sup>116</sup>Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People*, 262.

<sup>117</sup>Ansel Adams, “Tenaya Tragedy,” *Sierra Club Bulletin* 43, no. 9 (November 1958): pp. 1-4; Ansel Adams and David R. Brower, “The Tioga Road and Tenaya Lake: 22 Photographs,” *Sierra Club Bulletin* 43, no. 9 (November 1958).

<sup>118</sup>National Park System, U.S. Department of the Interior, “Mission 66 Progress Report,” March 1966.

<sup>119</sup>Ibid.

<sup>120</sup>National Park System, U.S. Department of the Interior, “Mission 66 Progress Report,” March 1966.

<sup>121</sup>National Park System, U.S. Department of the Interior, *Mission 66 for the National Park System*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1956, pp.86-89.

<sup>122</sup>Communication from Betsy Engle, Cultural Resources Manager, Grand Teton National Park, to Rodd L. Wheaton, October 24, 2011.

<sup>123</sup>Ronald F. Lee, “Comments on the role of interpretation in the National Park Service,” Feb. 16, 1961, Personal Papers of Conrad Wirth (Box 22, RG79, National Archives, Mid-Atlantic Region, Philadelphia).

<sup>124</sup>Linda McClelland, *Presenting Nature: The Historic Landscape Design in the National Park Service, 1916-1942*, 162-163.

<sup>125</sup>Rodd L. Wheaton, Interview with Jay O’Shea, April 11, 2013.

<sup>126</sup>U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park System, “Mission 66 Progress Report,” March 1966.

<sup>127</sup>Ibid.

<sup>128</sup>Vernon L. Hammons, “History Highlights, Office of Design and Construction, National Park Service,” 1969. Copy on file at TIC, Denver Service Center, Denver, CO, p. 6.

<sup>129</sup>Rodd L. Wheaton, Interview with Hugh C. Miller, June 6, 2013.

<sup>130</sup>Hammons, p. 6.



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 55

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

<sup>131</sup>Ronald F. Lee, "The National Park Service and MISSION 66 in Relation to Historic Preservation, Open Spaces, and Urban Renewal," July 28, 1960; "Accomplishments and Future Requirements in the Historical Program of the National Park Service Under MISSION 66," September 14, 1960, (Binder VII, National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center Archive).

<sup>132</sup>National Park System, U.S. Department of the Interior, "Mission 66 Progress Report," March 1966.

<sup>133</sup>James A. Glass, *The Beginnings of a New National Historic Preservation Program, 1957-1969* (Nashville, Tennessee: American Association for State and Local History), 6.

<sup>134</sup>Excerpts from Director's Staff Meeting Minutes, Feb. 11, 1960," transcript; "Meeting February 10, 1960, Concerning Re-Study of the National Park System and Re-Evaluation of MISSION 66," typescript (Box A8213, National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center Archive); "Meeting February 10, 1960, Concerning Re-Study of the National Park System and Re-Evaluation of MISSION 66," typescript (National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center Archive).

<sup>135</sup>"Parks for America, Organizational Meeting," October 31, 1960, minutes (Box 22, Conrad L. Wirth Collection, University of Wyoming, American Heritage Center).

<sup>136</sup>Rockefeller initially contacted Wirth regarding the creation of Virgin Islands National Park in 1955, after seeing a park proposal for areas prepared by the Park Service in 1939. His interest in Caneel Bay as the site of his resort development, however, was what had originally brought him to the area. Wirth, *Parks, Politics, and the People*, 52-53.

<sup>137</sup>Conrad L. Wirth, "A Report on MISSION 66—Its Accomplishments—Its Future," September 1960, (Box 27, Conrad L. Wirth Collection, University of Wyoming, American Heritage Center).

<sup>138</sup>Devereux Butcher, "Resorts or Wilderness?" and Clark C. Van Fleet, "Nature out of Balance," *The Atlantic* ("Our National Parks in Jeopardy"), February 1961, pp 45-53.

<sup>139</sup>Stewart Udall, "National Parks for the Future," *The Atlantic*, June 1961, pp 81-84.

<sup>140</sup>"Mission 66 Reappraised," editorial, *National Parks Magazine* 35, no. 163 (April 1961): inside front cover.

<sup>141</sup>Master plans and plans for historic structures were still reviewed in Washington. "Interview with A. Clark Stratton," March 1, 1962, conducted by S. Herbert Evison, transcript, p. 22, (National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center Archive).

<sup>142</sup>Fitch and Shanklin, *The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation*, 86-89. For the text of the LWCF Act, see Lary Dilsaver, ed., *America's National Park System: The Critical Documents* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers), 287-297.

<sup>143</sup>George B. Hartzog, Jr., *Battling for the National Parks* (Mount Kisco, New York: Moyer Bell, Ltd., 1988), 71-78; "An Analysis of the MISSION 66 Program Made by C. L. Wirth at a Meeting at the Grand Canyon in 1961," May 27, 1974 (Box 33, Conrad L. Wirth Collection, University of Wyoming, American Heritage Center); Eivend T. Scoyen, "Remarks... Conference of Challenges," October 18, 1963 (Box 26, Conrad L. Wirth Collection, University of Wyoming, American Heritage Center); Conrad L. Wirth to Stewart L. Udall, October 18, 1963 (Personal Papers of Conrad L. Wirth, RG 79, National Archives); Author interview with George B. Hartzog, Jr. (by telephone), December 14, 2005.

<sup>144</sup>Hartzog, *Battling for the National Parks*, 72, 90.

<sup>145</sup>Ibid.

<sup>146</sup>The division of the park system into three park types was made official Park Service policy with the adoption of Hartzog's park system plan of 1972. Hartzog credited the original concept to a suggestion by Robert Coates; but different versions of the idea dated back to the 1930s. Hartzog, *Battling for the National Parks*, 102.

<sup>147</sup>"The Road to the Future: Long Range Objectives, Goals and Guidelines for the National Park Service, Department of the Interior," 1964, government report (Personal Papers of Conrad L. Wirth, RG 79, National Archives).

<sup>148</sup>"Mission 66 Progress Report," October 1963 (National Park Service, Denver Service Center, Technical Information Center).

<sup>149</sup>Conrad L. Wirth, "Today in our National Parks, The Mission Called 66," *National Geographic*, July 1966, 6-47.

<sup>150</sup>George B. Hartzog, Jr., "To Each National Park Service Employee," January 2, 1967; "PARKSCAPE U.S.A.," memorandum, January 3, 1967 (National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center Archive).

<sup>151</sup>Vernon L. Hammons. "History Highlights, Office of Design and Construction, National Park Service," p. 5.

<sup>152</sup>Vernon L. Hammons, "History Highlights, Office of Design and Construction, National Park Service."

<sup>153</sup>Barry Mackintosh, *The National Parks, Shaping the System* ([Washington: Department of the Interior's National Park Service), 75-78; George B. Hartzog, Jr., "Mission 66 and Parkscape," *Historic Preservation* 18, no. 4 (August 1966): 140-143; George B. Hartzog, Jr., "Tomorrow in Our National Parks: Parkscape USA," *National Geographic* 130, no. 1 (July 1966): 48-92; George B. Hartzog, Jr., "Parkscape USA," *Parks & Recreation* 1, no. 8 (August 1966): 616-20.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number  E  Page  56

----- Name of Property -----
----- County and State -----
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66 ERA RESOURCES -----
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

<sup>154</sup>Hartzog, *Battling for the National Parks*, 239-248.

<sup>155</sup>As recalled by R. L. Wheaton.

<sup>156</sup>Mackintosh, *The National Park System*, 86-100. The story of the Alaskan parks (the national monuments declared by Carter in 1978 and the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980) is a history in itself and is not considered here.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 57

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

**1945-1972 DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY TYPES AND GUIDELINES FOR  
DETERMINING NATIONAL REGISTER ELIGIBILITY**

***LIST OF POTENTIAL PROPERTY TYPES:***

1. VISITOR CENTER
2. ADMINISTRATION BUILDINGS
  - ADMINISTRATION BUILDINGS
  - MAINTENANCE AND UTILITY BUILDINGS
  - RANGER STATIONS
3. PARK EMPLOYEE HOUSING
4. OTHER PROPERTY TYPES
  - COMFORT STATIONS
  - PUBLIC-USE DISTRICTS, CAMPGROUNDS, AND DAY-USE AREAS
  - INTERPRETIVE SERVICE STRUCTURES, ENTRANCE SIGNS AND STATIONS, AND WAYSIDE EXHIBIT SHELTERS
  - SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY BUILDINGS
5. CONCESSION BUILDINGS, PARK LODGES, AND COMMERCIAL AREAS
  - CONCESSION BUILDING DISTRICTS
6. PARTNERSHIP BUILDINGS: PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES (HOSPITALS AND CLINICS) AND U.S. POSTAL SERVICE
7. PARK ROADS, TRAILS, AND PARKWAYS
8. MISSION 66 HISTORIC DISTRICTS AND PARK-WIDE HISTORIC DISTRICTS
  - HISTORIC DISTRICTS
  - PARK-WIDE HISTORIC DISTRICTS

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 58

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

**PERIOD OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

***1945-1972***

The Mission 66 era extends from 1945 at the end of World War II, through the Mission 66 program from 1956-1966, and ended with the construction program, Parkscape USA, from 1967-1972. The Mission 66 program was conceived and planned in 1955 and began in 1956. The conditions, concerns, and modernist design trends that precipitated and shaped the program began in 1945 after the end of World War II. The lifting of travel restrictions and gasoline rationing immediately caused what Newton Drury described as “the dilemma of our parks.” Visitation soared and Congress refrained from increasing park budgets. Important precedents for Mission 66 planning occurred in the late 1930s and early 1940s with the rise of the Modern Movement style that became known as “Park Service Modern.” However, following the end of the war, the lifting of wartime construction prohibitions and the introduction of wartime construction materials make the appropriate date for the beginning of the period of significance for Mission 66-era development 1945.

Director Conrad Wirth conceived the Mission 66 program in 1955 as a national ten-year initiative from 1956 to 1966. The goal of the initiative was to upgrade most parks by systematically constructing new facilities and roads and by increasing park staff to meet new needs. Mission 66 was implemented through increases in regular annual appropriations. Many early Mission 66 projects were planned after 1945, and these projects received increased funding in 1956 to finish design and go to construction as quickly as possible. Mission 66 was characterized by the construction of over 100 visitor centers, which became hallmarks of the program. In addition, other properties were constructed, including administrative areas (maintenance buildings, employee housing, and new concessions in the parks) as well as roads, parking lots, and nature trails.

Mission 66’s end, scheduled for the 50th anniversary of the National Park Service in 1966, proved anticlimactic. Conrad Wirth’s successor, George Hartzog, was not eager to celebrate the accomplishments of a program that was identified with the previous administration and had become a source of controversy over the use of the Modern Movement style and new development in natural parks. Hartzog initiated his own development program in 1966 that allowed for the completion of unfinished construction projects and provided new facilities for parks brought into the National Park System during the Mission 66 era. Modeled on the previous program, Hartzog’s new program, Parkscape USA, anticipated another important anniversary, the centennial of Yellowstone National Park in 1972. By that year, when Hartzog retired, the federal administration of natural resources had been profoundly changed by new public attitudes and congressional legislation. The environmental movement gained political influence, and a flurry of new laws, permanently changed administrative and political contexts for national park management. Congress passed the Wilderness Preservation System Act in 1964, and between 1965 and 1973, it passed the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act. The position of the National Park Service in the new political and legal order was altered by the change of administration and reorganization of the National Park Service as Hartzog retired. By 1972, a new era began in the planning, management, and development of the National Park System with the closure of the Western and Eastern Offices of Design and Construction (established in 1954 by Director Wirth) and the shift of personnel to the centrally located planning and design office, the Denver Service Center. Therefore, 1972 is the appropriate date for the end of the period of significance for the Mission 66 era. Subsequently, National Park Service emphasis shifted toward the nation’s Bicentennial celebration that began in 1976.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 59

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

*National Register Criteria:*

**Criterion Consideration A**

To be considered eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, Mission 66 era property types should be considered under Criterion A as potentially significant examples of the changing visions for national park planning and development during the period of significance.

**Criterion Consideration C**

These property types should also be considered under Criterion C as potentially significant for their association with the design precepts and construction techniques of the Modern Movement style. The style became known as "Park Service Modern" and was practiced by National Park Service architects, landscape architects, planners, and historians during the Mission 66 era.

**Criterion Consideration B**

It would be highly unlikely for a property, such as a visitor center, to be listed under Criterion B because establishing association with an architect, landscape architect, or engineer's productive life, primary residence, or place of work is improbable.

**Criterion Consideration G**

A property achieving significance within the past 50 years is eligible if it is of exceptional importance and if it meets the following tests for listing on the National Register under the Multiple Property Listing, "National Park Service Mission 66 Resources."

Examples of properties that meet Criterion G according to National Register Bulletin 16A:

A property that is less than 50 years old

A property that has significance in a period less than 50 years before the nomination

A property that has non-contiguous periods of significance, one of which is less than 50 years before the nomination

A property that is more than 50 years old and had no significance until a period less than 50 years before the nomination

Examples of properties that DO NOT need to meet Criterion G:

A resource whose construction began over 50 years ago but whose completion overlaps the 50-year period by a few years or less

A resource that is significant for its plan or design, which is more than 50 years old, but the actual completion of the project overlaps the 50-year period by a few years

A historic district in which a few properties are newer than 50 years old, but the majority of properties and the most important period of significance are greater than 50 years old

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 60

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Applying Criterion G:

Eligibility for Exceptional Importance

The phrase “exceptional importance” may be applied to the extraordinary importance of an event or to an entire category of resources so fragile that survivors of any age are unusual.

A property less than 50 years old may qualify as exceptional if the entire category of the resource is fragile and may deteriorate before it reaches 50 years. A property that, by its nature, can last more than 50 years cannot be considered exceptionally important.

The phrase “exceptional importance” does not require that the property be of national significance. It is a measure of a property’s importance within the appropriate historic context, whether the scale of that context is local, state, or national.

Historical Perspective

A property that has achieved significance within the past 50 years can be evaluated only when sufficient historical perspective exists to determine that the property is exceptionally important and considers both the historic context and the specific property’s role in that context.

National Park Service Mission 66 Resources Context

Properties built during the Mission 66-era, from 1945 to 1972, and built in the Modern Movement style or Park Service Modern style, can now be evaluated and listed in the National Register prior to reaching 50 years of age. The contextual documentation concerning the individual properties establishes their significance within the historical and architectural context of the type and style.

As post-World War II properties, Mission 66 era properties must be identified and evaluated to determine which, in an area, could be judged within the broad historical context that expresses exceptional importance of the property relative to similar properties in the community, state, or nation.

A property, including buildings, structures, and landscape features, should be one of the important precedents of the pre-Mission 66 period (1945-1956) or one originally planned and built as part of the Mission 66 program (1956-1966). The property’s period of significance should fall within the years 1945-1966 or represent an exceptionally significant example from the Parkscape USA program (1967-1972), particularly when a national park was authorized in the Mission 66 era and developed during the latter program.

A property should possess substantial physical integrity to the period of significance of 1945-1972. This should be considered a higher standard for integrity than that described for a National Register listing of significant resources that have achieved 50 years of age. Sufficient features should be intact in order to relate the property to the Modern Movement style in terms of massing, spatial relationships, proportion,

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 61

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

pattern of windows, texture of materials, and ornamentation common to “Park Service Modern.” Characteristics critical in defining the property’s artistic merit or exemplary modern design should not be altered. Essential features that should be present for a property to represent its period of significance include the historic façade and entry, important primary spaces inside or around the property, and other important interior spaces that define the particular property’s historic character and use. An addition will not disqualify a property if it is compatible with the original property, if it does not oppose the original design intent and if it does not obscure the qualities that contribute to the property’s significance.

A property should possess exceptional importance in one or more of the following ways:

- This property is an outstanding example of the Modern Movement style, or “Park Service Modern” style, preferably published in contemporary architectural journals or the recipient of design awards.
- The property is the subject of subsequent scholarly evaluations.
- The property is the work of a regionally, nationally, or internationally recognized architect or architectural firm that was working for the National Park Service. Notable architects are defined as those who received high recognition as leaders in their fields and have received critical acclaim for numerous projects over a period of years in major architectural publications. The work of still-practicing architects is generally not considered to be eligible because the body of their work is yet to be completed and, therefore, cannot be holistically assessed for historical significance.
- The property demonstrates distinctive programming, planning, or design features that affected the evolution of the property type. The property may have gained special recognition by Mission 66 planners and designers as an important stylistic example or functional prototype for the Mission 66 and Parkscape USA programs.
- The property is an essential part of an overall Mission 66-era park development plan that had extraordinary importance in the history and development of an individual park. The property may be part of a larger Mission 66 development area, which may be a National Register-eligible historic district.
- All properties should exhibit historic integrity including references to location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. These must be integrated into the property, particularly if Criterion C, Architecture, is being considered for significance.

**Less than 50-Year-Old Properties in Historic Districts**

Properties that have achieved significance within the past 50 years can be eligible for the National Register if they are an integral part of a district that qualifies for National Register listing. This is demonstrated by documenting that the property dates from within the district’s defined period of significance and that it is associated with one or more of the district’s defined areas of significance.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 62

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Properties less than 50 years old may be an integral part of a district when there is sufficient perspective to consider the properties as historic. For this type of property to be considered historic, all of the following points must apply:

- The district's period of significance is justified as a discrete period with a defined beginning and end.
- The character of the district's historic resources is clearly defined and assessed.
- The specific resources in the district demonstrate the date from that discrete era.
- The majority of district properties are over 50 years old.

In these instances, it is not necessary to prove exceptional importance of either the district itself or the less-than-50-year-old properties. Exceptional importance still must be demonstrated for a district where the majority of properties or the major Period of significance is less than 50 years old, and for less-than-50-year-old properties, that are nominated individually.

**Requirement to Meet Criterion G, Regardless of Age**

Properties that are less than 50 years old and are not exceptionally important will not automatically qualify for the National Register once they are 50 years old. In order to be listed in the National Register, all properties, regardless of age, must meet the criteria for evaluation.

***Level of Significance and Other Considerations***

All properties must be considered for level of significance at the local, state or national level. National significance pertains to those properties that are of unique national importance regardless of use. With regard to Mission 66 resources, for example, four visitor centers have been identified to be of national significance based on their architectural design and the significance of their architects. These properties have been listed as National Historic Landmarks and are detailed in Sarah Allaback's study: *Mission 66 Visitor Centers, The History of a Building Type*, published by the Government Printing Office for the National Park Service in 2000. Other significant examples may include administration facilities, housing complexes, and landscapes and, in particular, may meet statewide significance. Most properties, if eligible for nomination, will meet local significance.

As with all Mission 66 properties, National Register Criteria A and C apply. Criterion A would apply because the properties are associated with events (the Mission 66 program as part of the development of the National Park System) that made significant contributions to the broad patterns of our history. Criterion C would apply because the properties embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction; represent the work of a master; or possess high artistic values. Eligibility under Criterion A relates to significance in one or several of the following areas: community planning and development (park), conservation, ethnic heritage, entertainment/recreation, politics/government, and social history. Eligibility under Criterion C relates to significance in one or several of the following areas: architecture, landscape architecture, and community planning and development.

Some Mission 66-era properties in the National Park Service historic district nominations of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) may have been considered to be "non-contributing" when pre-World War II resources were evaluated for significance. For these historic districts, it will be necessary to amend the original park



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 63

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

nomination to list Mission 66 resources. Addendum could include a single significant structure within the original historic district or expand the original boundaries of the earlier nomination to include a significant Mission 66 district that follows the historic continuity of use.

It is recommended that the original design and construction drawings for individual properties be reviewed for information regarding site plans, original floor plans and elevations that will help with assessing integrity and the designer, whether marked "standard" or if a named designer was involved. "Standard" refers to National Park Service standard plans, such as the "Standard Plans for Employee Housing." Identifying a designer either through initials or a name allows for comparison with the designer's other projects as well as his or her significance within the Eastern or Western Offices of Design and Construction or a private architect or architectural firm that was under contract with the National Park Service. Preliminary construction, and "as built" drawings can be accessed through the Denver Service Center, Technical Information Center (TIC), Denver, CO, by requesting a specific park's list of documents and drawings. Documents and drawings can be provided electronically or as hard copies. Completion Reports for individual properties are also useful. These reports were a standard Mission 66 requirement following construction and were used for accounting purposes. Not all survived, as many were purged from the TIC files in the late 1980s along with building specifications. Some reports can be found in designated park file repositories. The Completion Reports generally list the costs of the project, the contractors involved and any special circumstances encountered during construction. The reports frequently include construction photographs. Secondary sources for information can come from superintendents' monthly and annual reports and park correspondence with the central offices.

***DESCRIPTIONS OF ASSOCIATED PROPERTY TYPES AND GUIDELINES FOR DETERMINING NATIONAL REGISTER ELIGIBILITY:***

**1. VISITOR CENTER**

The visitor center has been defined as a property type in Sarah Allaback's study, *Mission 66 Visitor Centers*, which suggests guidelines for determining National Register eligibility. The visitor center property should be assessed as a building or as part of a district that includes associated properties, structures, and landscape characteristics. Associated structures may include amphitheaters, comfort stations, nature trails, parking lots, and roads. In some cases, a visitor center district may include maintenance yards or residential units if they are directly associated by proximity with the visitor center and contribute to a historic district.

The following paragraphs are drawn from Sarah Allaback's study:

Mission 66 planners coined the term "visitor center" to describe a new building type they developed to serve the vastly increased numbers of people (and their cars) who began visiting the national parks following World War II. The visitor center combined old and new building programs, and it was the centerpiece of a new era in planning for visitor services in American national parks. The influence of the visitor center idea was profound. New visitor centers (and the planning ideas behind them) were used in the development or redevelopment of scores of state parks in the United States, as well as nascent national park systems in Europe, Africa, and elsewhere. The original, finite group of Mission 66 visitor

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 64

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

centers therefore became prototypes for a new approach to park planning all over the world.

The visitor center typically is a centralized facility that includes multiple visitor and administrative functions within a single architectural floor plan or compound. The use of the word “center” indicated the planners desire to centralize park interpretive and museum displays, new types of interpretive presentations, park administrative offices, restrooms, and various other visitor facilities. Like the contemporary “shopping center,” the visitor centers made it possible for people to park their cars at a central point, and have access to a range of services or attractions. The visitor center facilitated and concentrated public activities, and helped prevent more random, destructive patterns of use.

The more significant examples of visitor center design contributed to the evolution of the museum, as a building type, as had earlier national park museums of the 1920s and 1930s. Some visitor center activities and programs, such as administrative offices and museum displays, had been featured in “park village” developments since the early 1920s, although usually in separate buildings. Other program elements, such as interpretive displays, slide shows, and films, were being developed at the time by National Park Service interpretive planners and museum staff. The term “interpretation” replaced “education” at the National Park Service in the late 1940s, and the new approach was extremely influential on the development of the floor plans, spatial processions, and functional spaces of Mission 66 visitor centers. Theater spaces for new slide shows and 16 mm films soon became standard requirements, as did space for interpretive displays, which either replaced or complemented the more familiar exhibit cases of older park museums. The “information” desk (as opposed to interpretive or museum displays) became an essential and central feature of the new facility, and emphasized rapid and efficient dissemination of practical information related to park attractions, visitor safety, and convenience.

The procession (or sequence of spaces) through a visitor center was a particularly important aspect of its design. Increased numbers of visitors required attention to circulation and visitor “flow.” Contemporary modern architectural design stressed procession as an aspect of planning new properties. In Mission 66 visitor centers, the spatial procession through the facility often included wide entrances and exits, ramps and inclined planes, an open lobby, easy access to exhibit and auditorium areas, and significant views of natural features or historic sites (either from a terrace or through a window wall) to facilitate interpretive talks.

The siting of visitor centers was determined by new considerations in park master planning that involved the circulation of unprecedented numbers of peoples and cars. The visitor center was an integral part of a new approach to park planning. The new properties were typically sited in relation to the overall circulation plan of the park, in order to efficiently intercept visitor flow at critical points. The criteria for siting Mission 66 visitor centers therefore differed from the criteria for siting and designing the park villages and museums of the prewar era. In larger parks, new visitor centers were often sited at park entrances, or on park roads “en route” to major destinations in the park. In other cases, visitor centers were sited at a major destination or attraction within the park. In some cultural parks, visitor centers were sited as close as possible to the landscape or other resource to be interpreted. This implied a certain amount of encroachment on the park landscape, but it was felt that this provided the most powerful means of interpreting a site that otherwise might remain obscure or less than fully appreciated by park visitors.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 65

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Although visitor centers typically were sited in relationship to the park's automotive circulation plan, designers explored the potential for visitors to use nearby trails and outdoor spaces once they were out of their cars. Outdoor amphitheaters, roof terraces, and other exterior features all served as functional parts of the visitor center complex. Many restrooms were designed as separate buildings adjacent to the visitor center, or at least with separate outdoor entrances. Nearby parking lots and site development were integral to the overall procession into and through the building. Ramps often replaced stairs into and out of the building, and window walls helped break down the division between site and interior space. Short interpretive trails ("nature trails") were developed to provide an outdoor experience near the visitor center, and outdoor picnic and sitting areas were common as well.

The Mission 66 visitor center remains today as the most architecturally significant expression of the planning and design practices developed by the National Park Service during the Mission 66 era.

**Guidelines for Determination of National Register Eligibility for Visitor Centers**

Sarah Allaback's *Mission 66 Visitor Centers* study provides the following guidelines for determining the National Register eligibility of National Park Service visitor centers:

In all cases, National Register Criteria A and C may apply. Criterion A would apply because the property is associated with events (the Mission 66 program as part of the development of the National Park System) that made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. Criterion C would apply because the property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction; represents the work of a master; or possesses high artistic values. Eligibility under Criterion A relates to significance in one or several of the following areas: Community Planning and Development (park), Conservation, Ethnic Heritage, Entertainment/Recreation, Politics/Government, and Social History. Eligibility under Criterion C relates to significance in one or several of the following areas: Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Community Planning and Development (park).

To be considered eligible for listing in the NRHP, 50-year-old Mission 66 visitor centers should possess the following characteristics:

- The visitor center should be one of the important precedents of the Mission 66 program (1945-1956), be one of the visitor centers originally planned and built as part of the Mission 66 program (1956-1966), or as part of the Parkscape USA program (1966-1972). The property's period of significance should fall within the years 1945-1972.
- The visitor center should retain most or all of the physical characteristics described in the description of the property type. The visitor center should be a centralized facility that includes multiple visitor and administrative functions within a single architectural floor plan or compound. Programming elements should include interpretive displays, space for slide shows and films, visitor contact, restrooms, and other services. The visitor center should be intended to serve the public by interpreting scenery, natural resources, and cultural sites, and should be a major point of visitor arrival, orientation, and service.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 66

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

- The visitor center should possess physical integrity to the period of significance. The National Register requires that the integrity of a property be evident through historic qualities including location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. Examples of alterations or remodeling that may impair the historical integrity of a visitor center include, but are not limited to:
  - The addition of a new façade, new entrance wing, or other major exterior alterations that transforms the outward appearance of the building.
  - Complete alteration of entrance and sequence through building, due to the addition of new building wings, entrances, or other major alterations.
  - New roof structure that is nonreversible and completely alters the exterior appearance of the building, such as a pitched, raised-seam metal roof replacing the original flat roof.
  - Extensive interior remodeling that alters definition of interior spaces, function of spaces, and sequence through spaces as well as original materials.
- The visitor center should embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction that represent high artistic values. Specifically, the visitor center should be a successful reflection of the principles of “Park Service Modern” style. These characteristics include the following:
  - The building is sited in relation to an overall plan of “visitor flow” in the park, either near the park entrance, en route to a major park destination, or at a park destination.
  - The building design emphasizes plan organization (the design of the floor plans). Floor plan organization allowed segregation of public areas from administrative areas, and also emphasizes efficient “visitor flow” through the building. A central lobby space is often the arrival point, with trails or other park destinations accessed as the visitor moves through the building.
  - The building’s program centralizes numerous park services, including information, interpretation, restrooms and administrative offices.
  - The building makes use of the formal vocabulary and materials of contemporary modern architecture (1945-1972), including flat roofs as well as other types of roofs, window walls (and unorthodox fenestration), exposed structural support systems, concrete and concrete block construction.
  - Overlapping functional spaces (free plans) are evident in floor plan. Public areas are on one level, or split levels, segregated from administrative areas.
  - Integration of interior and exterior public spaces, often are separated by windows, window walls, glass doors, or wooden doors with windows.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 67

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Entrances, exits, and other doorways are wide, providing easy movement for crowds. Often, entrances are often sheltered by porches, ramadas, arcades, etc. Restrooms are nearby with separate outdoor entrances.

The building emphasizes visitor experience of spatial procession. This sequence of spaces features ramps and significant views of park landscapes either from terraces or through large windows.

Siting of the visitor center is near landscapes or attractions to be interpreted, sometimes allowing for interpretive programs to be extended into the visitor center itself.

The building's elevations create a mostly low-profile, horizontal effect.

The building "harmonizes" with its setting through horizontality of massing, color and texture of materials. Use of textured concrete, concrete block, and stone veneers in facades often give building generally rough exterior texture. Exterior colors chosen to harmonize with natural context.

The building footprint is L-shaped, rectangular around a central courtyard, or a variation on these configurations.

Naturalistic planting is used to partially screen buildings, utility areas, and parking, as well as to repair areas disturbed in construction. Planter boxes are used to define entrances.

Outdoor spaces and site work, including parking lots, paths, amphitheaters, terraces, and patios incorporated into visitor center complex.

- For any property achieving significance within the last 50 years, National Register "Criterion Consideration G" requires that the property must be of "exceptional importance" to be considered eligible for registration. To meet this requirement and be eligible for registration, a Mission 66 visitor center less than 50 years old should possess all the characteristics described above, and in addition, the following requirements should be met:
- The visitor center should be one of the important precedents of the Mission 66 program (1945-1956), or one originally planned and built as part of the Mission 66 program (1956-1966). The property's period of significance should fall within the years 1945-1966.
- The visitor center should possess substantial physical integrity to the period of significance, 1945-1966. This should be considered a higher standard for integrity than that described for National Register listing of significant resources that have achieved 50 years of age. Sufficient features should be intact to relate the property to the modern movement in terms of massing, spatial relationships, proportion, pattern of windows, texture of materials, and ornamentation. Characteristics critical in defining the building's artistic merit or exemplary modern design should not be altered. Essential

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 68

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

features that should be present for a property to represent its significance include the historic main facade and entry, important public spaces inside the visitor center, and other important interior spaces that define the particular building's historic character and use as a visitor center. An addition will not disqualify a resource, if it is compatible with the original building and not opposed to the intention of the original design, and if it does not obscure the qualities for which the property is significant.

- o The visitor center should possess exceptional importance in one or more of the following ways:

As an outstanding example of "Park Service Modern" style, as defined above, preferably one published in contemporary architectural journals or the recipient of design awards. The building may also be the subject of subsequent scholarly evaluations.

As the work of a regionally, nationally or internationally recognized architect or architectural firm, working for the National Park Service. Such a work must be recognized as an outstanding example of Park Service Modern design through evidence of awards and honors, critical acclaim by the press, and scholarly evaluation. Notable architects are defined as those who received high recognition as leaders in their fields and have received critical acclaim for numerous projects over a period of years in major architectural publications. The work of still-practicing architects is generally not considered eligible because the body of their work is yet to be completed and, therefore, cannot be holistically assessed for historical significance.

For its demonstration of distinctive programming, planning, or design features that affected the evolution of the visitor center as a property type nationally, regionally, or internationally. The building may have gained special recognition by Mission 66 planners and designers as an important stylistic example or functional prototype for the Mission 66 and Parkscape USA programs. It may have served as a stylistic example or functional prototype for visitor center design in state parks, or in other settings, such as arboretums, municipal parks, etc.

As an essential part of an overall Mission 66 park development plan that had extraordinary importance in the history and development of an individual park. The property may be part of a larger Mission 66 development area, which may be a National Register-eligible historic district.

For association with events and activities that have made an outstanding contribution to the history of local communities or native groups. This may include the incorporation of programmed space for craft production, demonstrations, and other activities. It may also include aspects of the inspiration for the design, such as the Mesa Verde (Farview) Visitor Center, inspired by kiva design.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 69

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

**2. ADMINISTRATIVE BUILDINGS (OR ADMINISTRATIVE DISTRICT)**

*Administration Buildings*

Most Mission 66 park administrative services were part of a visitor center building or complex. However, a few separate office buildings were constructed independently and were located in developed areas dedicated to park support services. Included are special-use administrative buildings such as the Interpretive Design Center at Harpers Ferry, built from 1966-1970. Typically, park administration buildings were built in large parks where one or more visitor centers were located away from the primary administrative area. Mission 66 administration buildings exhibit established elements of modern design (1945-1972) such as extensive window walls, flat or shallow roof forms and an integration of interior and exterior spaces through covered walkways, courtyards, and integrated planters. Building materials include slender round steel columns, concrete masonry units, concrete, and unpainted vertical wood siding.

An administration building is a building type closely related to the visitor center and may include smaller visitor contact areas and public facilities. Many of the same guidelines published for determining the eligibility of visitor centers (Allaback, *Mission 66 Visitor Centers*, 2000) apply for this property type. Most administration buildings will be assessed as part of a Mission 66 visitor center complex or administrative district. An administrative district may include official buildings of various kinds that do not have a primary public function, such as maintenance facilities, shops, garages, special use structures, storage, and offices and other support facilities, like ranger stations, training facilities, and landscape characteristics.

**Guidelines for Determination of National Register Eligibility for Mission 66 Administration Buildings**

Registration requirements for a significant administration building follow those for visitor centers but with some changes to reflect the primary purposes of the buildings which do not involve public contact.

To be considered eligible for listing in the NRHP, Mission 66 administration buildings should fall within the period of significance, 1945-1972, and possess the following characteristics:

- An administration building should possess physical integrity to the period of significance. Examples of alterations or remodeling that may impair the historical integrity of an administrative building include, but are not limited to the following:

The addition of a new façade, new entrance wing, or other major exterior alterations that transform the outward appearance of the building.

Complete alteration of entrance and sequence through building due to the addition of new building wings, entrances, or other major alterations.

New roof structure that is nonreversible and completely alters the exterior appearance of the building, such as a pitched, raised-seam metal roof replacing the original flat roof.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 70

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Extensive interior remodeling that alters the definition of interior spaces, function of spaces, and sequence through spaces.

- The administration building should embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction that represent high artistic values. Specifically, the administration building should be a successful reflection of the principles of the Modern Movement, or “Park Service Modern,” style. These characteristics include the following:

The building design emphasizes plan organization showing that the organization allowed segregation of public areas from administrative areas.

The building’s design centralizes numerous park services, including administrative offices, meeting and training rooms, and sometimes minor public contact facilities such as contact desk, interpretive displays, and restrooms.

The building makes use of the formal vocabulary and materials of contemporary modern architecture (1945-1972), including flat roofs as well as other types of roofs, window walls and other unorthodox fenestration, exposed structural support systems, concrete, and concrete block construction. In some instances, vertical wood siding is used.

Interior and exterior public spaces are integrated and are often separated by windows, window walls, glass doors, or wooden doors with windows.

Entrances are often sheltered by porches, ramadas, arcades, etc. Circulation may use exterior corridors.

The building’s elevations create a mostly low-profile, horizontal effect.

The building “harmonizes” with its setting through horizontality of massing, color, and texture of materials. Use of textured concrete, wood boards, concrete block, and stone veneers in façades often give buildings a generally rough exterior texture. Exterior colors are chosen to harmonize with natural context.

Naturalistic and managed plantings are used to partially screen building, utility areas, and parking lots, as well as to repair areas disturbed in construction. Planter boxes are often used to define entrances.

Outdoor spaces and site work, including parking lots, paths, and patios, often are incorporated into the administration building complex and are usually defined by the site plans for construction projects.



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 71

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

The administration building should possess significance in one or more of the following ways:

- As an outstanding example of the Modern Movement, or “Park Service Modern” style, preferably one published in contemporary architectural journals or the recipient of design awards. The building may also be the subject of subsequent scholarly evaluations.
- As the work of a regionally, nationally, or internationally recognized architect or architectural firm working for the National Park Service. Notable architects are defined as those who received high recognition as leaders in their fields and have received critical acclaim for numerous projects over a period of years in major architectural publications. The work of still-practicing architects is generally not considered eligible because the body of their work is yet to be completed and, therefore, cannot be holistically assessed for historical significance.
- For its demonstration of distinctive programming, planning, or design features that affected the evolution of the administration building type. The building may have gained special recognition by Mission 66 planners and designers as an important stylistic example or functional prototype for the Mission 66 and Parkscape USA programs.
- As an essential part of an overall Mission 66 park development plan that had extraordinary importance in the history and development of an individual park. The building may be part of a larger Mission 66 development area, which may be a National Register-eligible historic district.

***Maintenance and Utility Buildings***

Improving the ability to maintain and service park infrastructure throughout the National Park System was one of the identified goals of the Mission 66 program. More maintenance and utility buildings were needed to achieve this goal. The maintenance areas provided centralized locations for maintenance vehicles and equipment, storage, and mechanical facilities as well as maintenance yards for the storage of materials. Maintenance buildings were frequently a major component of pre-World War II construction. The location usually established a park’s headquarters area. Typically, maintenance areas were placed out of public view and were frequently located near employee residential areas.

One of the common forms for maintenance buildings included a large equipment storage area/bays equipped with a shop, storage areas combined with employee-use areas that included a restroom, a tool room, and an office or offices. The rectangular buildings were typically constructed of concrete masonry units and topped by a flat roof or gabled roof with visible overhangs. Often, fenestration included steel-framed windows with awning-type sash and pedestrian doorways. Exposed roof structural systems at both the interior and exterior were not uncommon.

Maintenance buildings were an integral part of Mission 66 planning. The network of maintenance areas in large parks provided efficient and effective juxtapositions between maintenance crews and the resources. Mission 66 maintenance buildings reflect the principles of modern architectural design and construction.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 72

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

**Guidelines for Determination of National Register Eligibility for Mission 66 Maintenance Buildings**

Registration requirements for a significant maintenance building follow those for an administration building since the primary purposes of the building does not involve public contact.

To be considered eligible for listing in the NRHP, Mission 66 maintenance buildings should possess the following characteristics:

- A maintenance building should fall within the period of significance from 1945-1972.
- A maintenance building should possess physical integrity to the period of significance. Examples of alterations or remodeling that may impair the historical integrity of a maintenance building include but are not limited to the following:
- The addition of new façade features, additions, or other major exterior alterations that transforms the outward appearance of the building.
- New roof structure that is nonreversible and completely alters the exterior appearance of the building, such as a pitched, raised-seam metal roof replacing the original flat roof.
- Extensive interior remodeling that alters the definition of interior spaces, function of spaces, and sequence through spaces.
- The maintenance building should embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction that represent artistic value as a successful reflection of the principles of the Modern Movement, or “Park Service Modern,” style. These characteristics include following:

Building design emphasizes organizational planning reflecting the spatial use.

Building makes use of the formal vocabulary and materials of contemporary modern architecture (1945-1972), including flat roofs, as well as other types of roofs, industrial windows, exposed structural systems, and concrete and concrete block construction.

The building’s elevations create a mostly low-profile, horizontal effect.

The building relates with its setting through horizontality of massing, color, and texture of materials.

Outdoor spaces reflect the building’s function and services.

Maintenance yard enclosures should be considered as part of the building.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 73

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

***Ranger Stations***

Ranger stations constructed during the Mission 66 era often functioned as secondary visitor centers, and, are related to the visitor center property type. Ranger stations were sited for easy automobile access. They were the initial point of visitor contact and orientation at secondary entry points or secondary developed areas, which were at destination points within a park such as at campgrounds. Ranger stations served an important role by providing visitor information, services, and orientation as well as providing official offices and a law enforcement presence in often-distant areas of a park.

Mission 66 ranger stations were designed with one or more ranger offices and a small interior open area used for map display, park information, and interpretive material. The two functions were typically separated. Comfort stations, accessible from the exterior, were often part of Mission 66 ranger stations as were small maintenance facilities. Ranger stations were built in context with services including concessions that served campgrounds.

The typical low-profile ranger stations exhibit a range of established elements of modern design architectural form, vocabulary, and detailing. Roof lines are often flat or shallow, although exaggerated contemporary modern roof forms were used on occasion. Common exterior wall materials include concrete masonry units or other modular masonry units that were manufactured with a colored additive that allowed the blocks to more easily blend into the natural colors of the surrounding landscape. Fenestration is dimensionally large in the public portion of the building and often spanned from floor to ceiling. In some instances, storefront systems were used. Low planters, integrated into the overall building form, serve as extensions of the exterior building walls and formally connected the building to the immediate designed landscape. Material connections between interior and exterior spaces enhanced the view through large windows and glazed doors.

The use of structural systems as design elements often further refined the modern aesthetic of these Mission 66 ranger stations and reflected a deliberate expression of modern architecture that gave the usually small structures a pavilion-like form. Unlike the planning principles for the larger-scale primary visitor centers that dictated the use of concrete construction and prefabricated components, the smaller-scale ranger stations were often designed using wood frame construction. Nevertheless, designers chose to construct these buildings with modern materials in modern ways.

**Guidelines for Determination of National Register Eligibility for Mission 66 Ranger Stations**

Most Mission 66 ranger stations will be assessed as contributing resources in a district rather than assessed as individually significant properties.

To be considered eligible for listing in the NRHP, Mission 66 ranger stations should possess the following characteristics:

- The ranger station should be one of the ranger stations originally planned and built as part of the pre-Mission 66 program (1945-1956), one originally planned and built as part of the Mission 66 program (1956-1966), or one built during the Parkscape USA program (1967-1972).

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 74

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

- The ranger station should retain most or all of the physical characteristics specified in the description of the property type (above).
- The ranger station should possess physical integrity to the period of significance. The National Register requires that the integrity of a property be evident through historic qualities including location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. Examples of alterations or remodeling that may impair the historical integrity of a ranger station include but are not limited to the following:

Major exterior alterations that transform the outward appearance of the building.

Changes to fenestration pattern.

New roof structure that is nonreversible and completely alters the exterior appearance of the building, such as a pitched, raised-seam metal roof replacing the original flat roof.

Associated circulation paths, landscape elements, and/or spatial relationships that have been significantly altered.

- The ranger station should embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction. Specifically, the ranger station should be a successful reflection of the principles of the Modern Movement, or “Park Service Modern,” style whose design characteristics include but are not limited to the following:

The building is sited in relation to an overall plan of “visitor flow” in the park’s developed area with easy automobile access.

The ranger station served as a point of visitor orientation and arrival to serve the public and provide an official presence in the area.

The ranger station is sited near a destination point or attraction.

The design of the building makes use of the formal vocabulary and material of contemporary modern architecture (1945-1972). Use of window walls, glass doors, and floor-to-ceiling windows for views between interior and exterior public spaces should be present.

Functional programming elements should include a ranger office or other administrative area, public display interpretation area, and restrooms if not located elsewhere in a park area.

Building’s elevations create a mostly low-profile, horizontal effect. Some buildings may have exaggerated modern roof forms.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 75

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

**3. PARK EMPLOYEE HOUSING**

Employee housing was identified as an acute problem and high priority in the Mission 66 program and, as such, constituted a crucial component of planned park development. New employee housing was inexpensively built within maximum costs set by Congress. Efficiency was achieved through the use of standardized plans and through the economies of scale achieved by packaging multiple construction projects into coordinated schedules sometimes augmented through prefabricated construction of wall panels and roof structures.

Standard housing designs were issued throughout most of the Mission 66 era and were combined into "Standard Plans for Employee Housing." (A copy can be obtained through the Denver Service Center, Technical Information Service.) Several of the standard designs were adapted from prototypes developed after World War II for new park housing built 1945-1955. The published standards and policies established minimum and maximum net floor areas for one-, two-, three-, and four-bedroom houses, duplexes, and multiple unit apartment buildings. The designs provided a basic layout and form for dwelling each type to be constructed. Modifications to the standard housing designs occurred throughout the period of significance, but standard plans retained low rectangular, horizontal forms similar in appearance to contemporary style housing outside of parks. Most ranch house single-family units and some multiplex "family-type" housing units had carports or enclosed garages. Materials and construction techniques varied to some degree and were determined, in part, by the prevailing standards, available materials, and contractor expertise in the local area. Some of the Mission 66 standard residences were wood frame with wooden lap or composite siding or stucco exterior finish meeting the choice of the park's superintendent. In other locations, the residences were constructed with masonry bearing walls. Depending upon location and the desires of the park superintendent, basements were provided; however, most were built over a crawl space foundation that supported a building shell. The interiors subsequently were completed. Though shingled, gabled roofs were standard, some had built-up flat roofs.

Mission 66 residences, constructed according to the standard designs, consisted of a combined living and dining area, a kitchen, bedrooms, and one, one-and-a-half, or three-quarter bathrooms on one level. These spaces were distributed in a rectangular plan with the living spaces located to one side of the entry and the private sleeping areas located to the other side. A standard fenestration pattern included wooden- or aluminum-framed picture windows with operable side lights in the living room and smaller yet still oversized framed windows in the bedrooms. The front entry was normally demarcated with an entry stoop, recess, or other modest treatment. The backyard, typically accessible through a rear door, allowed passage from the living, dining, or kitchen area to the rear outdoor area.

The associated landscape for individual residences usually consisted of a driveway and a walkway leading from the driveway to the front door. In some instances, low masonry retaining walls further defined the property edge. Small concrete paved patios could be part of the planned construction as well as natural and managed landscape features. Generally, the site plan for residential development did not include a planting plan but focused on the siting of the houses within the context of street layout and driveway locations.

Variations in housing exist throughout the park system, although nonstandard housing built during the Mission 66 era exhibit many characteristics similar to the standard housing designs. The common use of concrete masonry units, wood frame construction, slab-on-grade or crawl space foundations, flat or shallow gabled roof forms, large

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 76

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

windows, simple plans with an open living/dining area, connected garages and carports, and other elements of established modern residential vocabulary unite the standard and nonstandard dwelling units as discernible from the earlier Rustic style of housing found in the parks. All Mission 66 housing reflects the expressed goals of the program to provide “modern living quarters” for National Park Service employees.

The overall layout of housing areas expressed another element of modernity in the design of employee residential units. The curvilinear residential roads and cul-de-sacs lined with residences replicated patterns of everyday suburban developments and suggested that the living conditions in the park had been elevated to modern standards. Each residence addressed the street with a short connecting driveway or apron that led to the garage or carport. Typically, access to the house was along the driveway instead of directly from the street. Mission 66 guidelines directed that new employee housing built in the parks would be located out of public view in a planned residential community. These areas were usually accessed via a spur road with an entry located beyond the main visitor access into the developed area. Standard residential planning often included curvilinear streets, loops, and cul-de-sacs popular in suburban housing developments outside the parks. In some instances among the street layout, a central common space provided the opportunity for children’s playgrounds or other functions.

**Guidelines for Determination of National Register Eligibility for Mission 66 Residential Districts**

To be considered eligible for listing in the NRHP, Mission 66 residential districts should fall within the period of significance, 1945-1972 and meet one or more of the following categories to be considered eligible:

- Houses that were built after 1945 and/or were prototypes for establishing standard plans during the Mission 66 era.
- Houses are part of unique planning that includes curvilinear streets and siting to provide for residential privacy and open space.
- Houses are part of or adjacent to a previously existing designated historic district listed on the NRHP.
- Individual or groups of houses have a unique design beyond the standard designs published by the National Park Service starting in 1956.
- Houses are part of a larger significant development plan in a park that was established during the Mission 66 era and completed during the Parkscape USA program.

Housing should possess physical integrity to the period of significance. Examples of alterations or remodeling that may impair the historical integrity of a house or housing include but are not limited to the following:

- Additions or other major exterior alterations that transform the outward appearance of the building.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 77

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

- New roof structure that is nonreversible and completely alters the exterior appearance of the building, such as a pitched, raised-seam metal roof replacing the original flat roof.
- Extensive interior remodeling that alters the definition of interior spaces, function of spaces, and sequence through spaces.

Housing should embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction that represent artistic values. Specifically, housing should be a successful reflection of the principles of the Modern Movement, or “Park Service Modern,” style. These characteristics include the following:

- Building makes use of the formal vocabulary and materials of contemporary modern architecture (1945-1972), including flat roofs as well as other types of roofs, fenestration, frame and concrete block construction, type of window openings, and appropriate exterior wall cladding. Integration of interior and exterior public spaces, often separated by windows, window walls, glass doors, or wooden doors with windows should be present.
- Building’s elevations create a mostly low-profile, horizontal effect.
- Outdoor spaces and site work, including driveway, walkways, and patios, often incorporated into housing construction should be present.

#### **4. OTHER PROPERTY TYPES**

##### ***Comfort Stations***

Improving facilities in the National Parks to the level of modern, mid-century standards was a significant aspect of the Mission 66 program. One of the key components of this goal was the modernization and construction of new toilet facilities that were usually part of visitor center construction for the convenience of park staff and visitors. Often, the euphemistically named “comfort station” was a stand-alone structure at key points along park roads where visitors might stop to partake in some form of interpretation, such as by amphitheatres and campgrounds, and in day-use areas such as picnic grounds. Comfort stations were also built in conjunction with pre-World War II structures to provide updated toilet facilities and replace earlier Rustic-style comfort stations. Mission 66 comfort stations are emblematic of the goal to provide modernized sanitary structures in convenient locations within developed areas or elsewhere in the parks. As such, they stand as a visible expression of modernized sanitation systems.

The standard designed comfort station, built during the Mission 66 era, consists of two separate rooms, one for men and one for women, with entrances at opposite ends of the building. A shared externally accessible plumbing chase separates the two restroom areas and provides for limited janitorial storage. Some of the Mission 66 comfort stations were designed with an external privacy screen and others with an interior privacy panel

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 78

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

located immediately inside the restroom. The small, low-rise buildings were designed with a continuous ribbon of windows located just below the eaves of the flat or low-pitched gabled roofs. Standardized plans included the ridge of the gabled roof extending to form a point as an overhang above the end doorways. While this fenestration pattern was typical, the types of windows placed in the openings often differ from park to park and include jalousie windows, hoppers, and awning windows. The low-roof forms that top the structures were typically designed with deep overhangs, and the ridgeline often extended beyond the eaves to form raked verges at the gable ends. The extended eaves and ribbon windows give these buildings a decidedly horizontal appearance. The exteriors of the comfort stations were finished in materials used in the construction of other buildings in a developed area or park but most often were constructed of concrete block laid in running bond or stack bond. The interiors featured concrete floors and tiled walls with metal partitions.

Comfort stations were conveniently located in dedicated, visible, and easily accessible locations. Most of the comfort stations were surrounded by an asphalt apron accessible via pedestrian pathways that led to the building from the parking area. All would be associated with larger historic districts.

The simple and often repeated designs of Mission 66 comfort stations made them easily recognizable throughout the National Park System. Some comfort stations deviated from the standard plans but remained well within the overall type.

**Guidelines for Determination of National Register Eligibility for Mission 66 Comfort Stations within Historic Districts.**

To be considered eligible for listing in the NRHP, Mission 66 comfort stations should fall within the period of significance from 1945-1972, possess the following characteristics, and meet one or more of the following categories to be considered eligible:

- Comfort stations that were built after 1945 and/or were prototypes for establishing standard plans during the historic period.
- Comfort stations are usually part of larger significant development districts from Mission 66 or Parkscape USA programs.
- Comfort stations are part of or adjacent to a previously existing designated historic district listed on the NRHP.
- Comfort stations that have a unique design beyond the standard designs published by the National Park Service.



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 79

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

- Comfort stations should possess physical integrity to the period of significance. Examples of alterations or remodeling that may impair the historical integrity of a house or housing include but are not limited to the following:

Additions or other major exterior alterations that transform the outward appearance of the building and significant changes to its built landscape features.

New roof structure that is nonreversible and completely alters the exterior appearance of the building, such as a pitched, raised-seam metal roof replacing the original flat roof.

- Comfort stations should embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction that represent artistic values. Specifically, comfort stations should be a successful reflection of the principles of the Modern Movement, or "Park Service Modern," style. These characteristics include the following:

Building makes use of the formal vocabulary and materials of contemporary modern architecture (1945-1972), including flat roofs as well as other types of roofs, fenestration, frame and concrete block construction, type of window openings, and appropriate exterior wall cladding.

Building's elevations create a mostly low-profile, horizontal effect.

Outdoor spaces and site work, including driveway, parking, and walkways incorporated into the planning and construction should be present.

The building may be part of a larger Mission 66 development area. As an essential part of an overall Mission 66 park development plan which had extraordinary importance in the history and development of an individual park, it may be part a National Register-eligible historic district.

***Public Use Districts, Campgrounds, and Day-Use Areas***

A Mission 66 campground or public use district may be established to include a range of Mission 66 facilities in a limited area of a park. The public use district would be smaller than a parkwide district but should encompass a major developed area with a range of representative facilities that embody the goals of the Mission 66 program. The district should retain overall historical integrity.

A public use district is intended to allow the listing of a significant developed area within a larger park. The larger park would not have to have been developed primarily under Mission 66. The Mission 66 development within the district would not have to represent the most significant era of the park's development history.

The Mission 66 public use district may feature contributing resources such as lodges, camp stores and other concessioner services, campgrounds, ranger stations, comfort stations and shower buildings, roads and trails, and miscellaneous structures, including amphitheatres and attendant audio visual equipment structures. In many instances, the amphitheatres were reworked to replace rustic log seating with modern benches. Although the public use district would constitute a single, significant developed area, it would typically have a smaller range of

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 80

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

these contributing features.

Scores of new campgrounds and day-use areas were built throughout the National Park System under the Mission 66 program, and many older campgrounds were rehabilitated based on modern design standards. Between 1956 and 1966, some 17,782 campsites were added, which more than doubled the system's capacity.

Modifications to prewar campground plans were instituted during the Mission 66 era to reflect the more frequent use of trailers and recreational vehicles in the parks by mid-century. Like earlier campgrounds, Mission 66 campgrounds were confined developed areas within attractive natural settings, near park attractions, and connected by vehicular circulation systems and hiking trails. Campground layouts were similarly organized with one-way loop roads providing internal circulation. The longer parking spurs, which were a standard length of 25 feet, created larger spaces for parking, and the increased number of campsites within a developed area. This reflected the goal of accommodating the maximum number of campers with larger vehicles in a more convenient way.

Pre-World War II campground plans often laid out individual sites on opposite sides of a campground road, creating a herringbone pattern. Mission 66 campground design similarly alternated individual campsites on opposite sides of the road. However, Mission 66 campground design generally incorporated a greater number of larger individual sites within a single developed area. This design altered the overall herringbone pattern into a loop or successive loops, that allowed for ease in parking on a pull-in or mini-loop, and provided a new grill and picnic table at each site.

Existing vegetation within the campground was protected and preserved during construction as much as possible, and in areas where little vegetation existed, trees and shrubs were planted to provide privacy and shade. The Mission 66 program provided the funds to introduce potable water, sewer systems, and electricity to new comfort stations. These comfort stations often replaced pit toilets in existing campgrounds. The comfort stations were generally located in a centralized area within each camping loop. In some cases, shower buildings were incorporated into the plans, but more often, new shower facilities were constructed as a concession in developed areas. Utility infrastructure served to provide trailer campers with electrical and water connections. Site furnishings and small-scale features, such as planting beds, signboards, and walkways are other characteristics of modern campground design practiced during the Mission 66 era. Large-scale features such as paved roads may have been included as well.

In some cases, older campgrounds were converted to day-use areas. This conversion involved similar redevelopment of campground loop geometry and replacement of site furniture and comfort stations to serve the picnic areas. New day-use areas were an essential aspect of the Mission 66 strategy for the redevelopment of national parks. These included picnic tables and other site furniture, and new outdoor interpretive displays. In general, layout and plan geometry reflected many of the same concerns as contemporary campgrounds in regard to the increased size and number of motor vehicles.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 81

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

**Guidelines for Determination of National Register Eligibility for Mission 66 Public Use Historic Districts**

A campground or public use facility should fall within the period of significance from 1945-1972.

To be considered eligible for listing in the NRHP, Mission 66 public use districts should possess the following characteristics:

- Mission 66 campground and public use districts contain a range of contributing buildings, structures, and cultural landscape features that encompass the goals of the construction program.
- Importance to the overall history of camping in a park and demonstrates integrated campground and day-use area planning including the entrance road and its signage, the camp tender's station if one exists, the looped road system, and the individual parking details at each site, such as a pull-in or a mini-loop layout.
- The campground or day-use area reflects the new concepts of providing more privacy for the users and contributes to the integrity of the development through its landscape features and constructed components.
- Trail access, if it exists, leads to one or more comfort stations, an amphitheater for evening programs, and for hiking to nearby scenic areas. This characteristic represents the part of the site planning for campgrounds and day-use areas that indicates a relationship to other park facilities.
- Furnishings at an individual campsite or day-use site may be important, though it is most likely that the furnishings have been updated to provide metal-framed picnic tables and new grills.

***Interpretive Service Structures: Entrance Signs and Stations and Wayside Exhibit Shelters***

Park entrance signs announced the park and were an integral part of the visitor experience. In order to allow for visitors to photograph themselves adjacent to the entrance sign, there was usually a small parking pullout from the main entrance road. Though the individual signs varied, the standard was a masonry base supporting a wooden sign with routed lettering and the ubiquitous National Park Service "arrowhead" logo. Variations included the use of logs or natural stone panels depending on the geographic location of the park. Design innovations were usually limited to angular sides on the signage surfaces that related to the modern style of the "Atomic Age." A significant sign and its associated landscape features that are isolated from a developed area could be nominated individually.

Entrance stations were generally the first park building that visitors encountered as they arrived in the park to pay their entrance fees and receive interpretive information. Mission 66 entrance stations continued the pre-World War II tradition of providing an arrival feature whether it was a single structure that vehicles passed through or small individual structures at each entrance lane. New considerations, such as larger vehicles and larger volumes of traffic, required new circulation approaches. As a result, the landscape features associated with an entrance station are important contributing features. It was also important for the design to provide National Park Service staff and concession personnel a bypass around the usual visitor queues for fast entrance into the park.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 82

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

If a park selected smaller individual structures at the entrance and departure lanes, the small one- or two-person structures were generally fully glazed to provide a full view in all directions. Often, a small ranger station was nearby to provide additional services to visitors and to provide a place for staff to congregate when not on duty. The ranger station concept required parking for visitors and park staff. Another approach was to connect the entrance stations to a visitor center if the visitor center is was constructed at the park entrance. More typically, the entrance stations were located a short distance from entrance visitor centers further along the main park road. This organization allowed for vehicles to queue without blocking the entrance into the visitor center parking area. A trail generally connected the entrance station to the nearby visitor center.

Wayside shelters were incorporated into park-wide planning to provide sunscreens for visitors at key natural areas in a park and to protect certain cultural resources such as archeological sites designated for interpretation to visitors. Interpretation was a major function of a wayside shelter whether to detail natural or cultural resources. Designers considered various, innovative designs of wayside shelters as ways to form pavilions. Roofs supported on cantilevered, fanned Glu-Lam wooden beams and steel-supported rectangular pavilions are examples of other variations of this design. The purpose of the exhibits and cost limitations were reflected in kiosk designs where a simple shade structure was built over interpretive panels. Thus, wayside exhibits could be some of the most innovative buildings in a park or the simplest.

**Guidelines for Determination of National Register Eligibility for Mission 66 Interpretive Service Structures**

To be considered eligible for listing in the NRHP, Mission 66 interpretive service structures should fall within the period of significance from 1945-1972, possess the following characteristics and meet one or more of the following categories to be considered eligible:

- Service structures that are part of larger significant development districts from Mission 66 or Parkscape USA programs.
- Service structures that are part of or adjacent to a previously existing designated historic district listed on the NRHP.
- Service structures that have a unique design beyond the standard designs published by the National Park Service or were intended as prototypes.

Interpretive service structures should possess physical integrity to the period of significance. Examples of alterations or remodeling that may impair the historical integrity include but are not limited to the following:

- Additions or other major exterior alterations that transform the outward appearance of the building or sign.
- New roof structure that is nonreversible and completely alters the exterior appearance of the building, such as a pitched, raised-seam metal roof replacing the original flat roof.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 83

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Interpretative service structures should embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction that represent artistic values. Specifically, interpretive structures should be successful reflections of the principles of the Modern Movement, or “Park Service Modern,” style. These characteristics include the following:

- Building makes use of the formal vocabulary and materials of contemporary Modern Movement style architecture (1945-1972), including flat roofs as well as other types of roofs, expansive fenestration, frame and concrete block construction, and use of appropriate exterior wall cladding.
- The elevations typically reflect a mostly low-profile, horizontal effect, though roofs were sometimes designed as the predominant feature of the entrance station.
- Outdoor spaces and site work, including parking areas and walkways, are incorporated into the planning and construction.

***Schools and Community Buildings***

Park schools for elementary grades built during the Mission 66 era are usually located in or near a residential developed area. Park schools were an integral part of the program mission to accommodate National Park Service employees in residential communities that were too far for easy commuting to nearby schools. These educational buildings served as local neighborhood schools in and adjacent to these employee communities.

Typically, the schools embodied the principles of modern school architecture and contained three or more classrooms. In some parks, there are community buildings with large open interior spaces, associated restrooms, and kitchens that could function as gymnasiums and auditoriums for schools and provide space for residential communities to congregate. In some cases, these structures were located in the vicinity of visitor service areas so they could be used for audio-visual centers for interpretation and other special public events. Schools were located in residential areas that would include residences for teachers.

The Mission 66 era provided training centers for the use by National Park Service employees to meet the new training requirements of park management such as ranger services and fire protection. The National Park Service established the Mather Training Center in Harpers Ferry within the former Storer College complex. There, the buildings were adaptively restored to provide classrooms and dormitories. At Grand Canyon National Park, the National Park Service constructed a modern facility designed by Cecil Doty that included a multi-classroom building and a group of two-story apartment buildings to house the trainees. Both locations, unique in their planning and construction, are listed on the NRHP.

Schools and community centers are fairly rare in parks. Many of these schools have been closed due to efficient bussing to nearby communities and redistribution of employees into nearby communities, making park-located schools redundant. The closure of park housing in many parks reduced the demand for the schools, and their conversion to other uses may affect their significance.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 84

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

**Guidelines for Determination of National Register Eligibility for Mission 66 Schools and Community Buildings**

To be considered eligible for listing in the NRHP, Mission 66 schools and community centers should fall within the period of significance from 1945-1972, possess the following characteristics and meet one or more of the following categories to be considered eligible:

- Schools and community buildings that are part of larger significant development districts from Mission 66 or Parkscape USA programs, particularly as they relate to residential areas.
- Schools and community buildings that are part of or adjacent to a previously designated historic district listed on the NRHP.

Schools and community buildings should possess physical integrity to the period of significance. Examples of alterations or remodeling that may impair the historical integrity include but are not limited to the following:

- Additions or other major exterior alterations that transform the outward appearance of the building.
- New roof structure that is nonreversible and completely alters the exterior appearance of the building, such as a pitched, raised-seam metal roof replacing the original flat roof.

Schools and community buildings should embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction that represent artistic values. Specifically, schools and community buildings should be a successful reflection of the principles of the Modern Movement, or "Park Service Modern," style. These characteristics include the following:

- Building makes use of the formal vocabulary and materials of contemporary modern architecture (1945-1972), including flat roofs as well as other types of roofs, fenestration, frame and concrete block construction, type of window openings, and the use of appropriate exterior wall cladding.
- The elevations should reflect a mostly low-profile, horizontal effect.
- Outdoor spaces and site work, including parking areas and walkways, are incorporated into the planning and construction.
- The relationship with nearby residential districts enhances the community.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 85

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

**5. CONCESSION BUILDINGS, PARK LODGES, AND COMMERCIAL AREAS**

Mission 66 construction was funded mainly, but not exclusively, by appropriations. Many national park concession contracts, which were renegotiated under Mission 66, required concessioners to make large capital investments. Between 1956 and 1966, park concessioners invested \$33 million in new overnight accommodations, restaurants, gas stations, and park stores. Concessioner investments had great impacts on public perceptions of Mission 66 because they resulted in some of the highest profile, earliest Mission 66 construction projects. Concessioners hired their own architects and could initiate work quickly once they secured financing. The National Park Service usually provided the infrastructure. Concession facilities were used heavily by the public and strongly affected early perceptions of Mission 66. Almost all overnight Mission 66 accommodations—the “motel type” park lodges with a central building and outlying guest rooms—were built through the investment of private capital.

Mission 66 “park lodges” sought to provide the “motel type” accommodations that the National Park Service believed the public wanted. More convenient for automotive tourism, and featuring modern utilities and conveniences, new park lodges would be large enough to meet increased demand. Older hotels—not yet considered historic resources in their own right—were to be demolished as they were replaced. In some cases, they would not be replaced at all; “gateway towns” would provide needed overnight accommodations. But in larger or more remote parks, new concessioner investments were sought to replace existing overnight accommodations or augment the capacity.

Mission 66 lodges are typically composed of a complex of buildings separated by function and organized around a central registration with dining and a gift shop. Motel-type guest units disperse away from the main complex, though attached units were sometimes integrated with the primary buildings. Architecture of lodge buildings is typically in the Modern Movement style, with patterned wooden sheathing, large windows, and, in several cases, asymmetrical roofs with beams extending to the ground. Motel units vary in style with gabled and flat roofs and could be prefabricated units built offsite and moved onto their individual sites in the park.

Construction of retail buildings often followed earlier, pre-World War II National Park Service types by having a gift store, a grocery store, and a fast food dispensing area. Usually, public restrooms were included in the design where a store was constructed at an important park feature. Large parks with substantial developed areas could include full service supermarkets and banks that provided services to park employees and visitors. In some locations, separate restaurant or cafe buildings were built independent of lodge buildings. The retail stores followed modern design principles and were often constructed with naturalistic features to blend with the environment or a park area’s predominant style, such as a modern interpretation of the Pueblo or Pueblo revival style. While retail buildings were often associated with larger developments that included overnight concession buildings where there might be several other retail outlets, the retail buildings were usually constructed in secondary developed areas such as campgrounds. In these locations, the concessioners maintained service buildings, in conjunction with camper stores, for providing public shower rooms and ice houses for campers. Some concession areas included concession employee dormitories that were often rehabilitated older buildings. New Mission 66 concessioner constructions for employee accommodations were very limited and were often very utilitarian in design.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 86

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

In some areas, the camper store was combined with National Park Service functions such as a ranger station to provide a presence at the area. Marinas on lakes and reservoirs were an integral part of some parks' activities. Marinas were constructed to provide boat slips and ramps to put boats into the water. A nearby ranger station oversaw the marina and sold fishing licenses or monitored boaters' activities. Frequently, the National Park Service provided patrol services to monitor the lake for illegal activities and maintained permanent slips for patrol boats.

Concessioner activities extended to the construction of gas and service stations that met standard design conventions for retail buildings and service bays. Generally, a canopy extended over the gas pumps and drive lanes sheltering the entrance to the retail space. Together, the service bays extended as a wing. Because of the inherent danger of volatile fuels, gas stations were built away from its associated developed area and at a major intersection of park roads. Construction was often of concrete block with gabled roofs, though some had flat roofs. To accommodate larger vehicles, the buildings were often higher, which altered design proportions. Typically, the buildings were utilitarian with little architectural detail.

Planning for concessions included extensive roadways and parking areas to access all the functions that could include overnight accommodations, retail outlets, and restaurants. Depending on the primary or secondary location, a visitor center or a ranger station may have been located within the complex, as well as a post office. Circulation was a major design consideration for the main area and adjacent motel unit areas. Pedestrian sidewalks and trails connected the individual functions.

**Guidelines for Determination of National Register Eligibility for Mission 66 Concession Buildings, Park Lodges and Commercial Areas**

Registration requirements for significant concession buildings, park lodges and commercial areas follow those for visitor centers and visitor center districts with some changes to reflect the fact that the primary purposes of the buildings were to accommodate visitors for overnight stays in the parks and provide other goods and other services.

To be considered eligible for listing in the NRHP, Mission 66 concession buildings, park lodges, and commercial areas should fall within and possess physical integrity from the period of significance, 1945-1972, and should embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction that represent high artistic values.

Specifically, the concession building should be a successful reflection of the principles of the Modern Movement, or "Park Service Modern," style. These characteristics include the following:

- A lodge building design emphasizes plan organization showing that the organization allowed for segregation of public areas that include registration, dining and retail.
- A lodge building relates to its subordinate motel units directly or through circulation.
- Motel units reflect the character of the lodge building.



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 87

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

- A retail building's program or layout centralizes services, including sales areas, administration, storage, and other public areas such as restrooms.
- The concession building makes use of the formal vocabulary and materials of contemporary modern architecture (1945-1972), including flat roofs as well as other types of roofs, window walls and other unorthodox fenestration, exposed steel supports, and concrete and concrete block construction. In some instances, vertical wood siding is used as well.
- Interior and exterior public spaces are integrated.
- Entrances are often sheltered by porches, ramadas, or arcades where circulation may access exterior corridors.
- Building's elevations create a mostly low-profile, horizontal effect.
- Building "harmonizes" with its setting through horizontality of massing, color, and texture of materials. Use of textured concrete, wood boards, concrete block, and stone veneers in façades often give the building a generally rough exterior texture. Exterior colors harmonize with the natural context.
- Naturalistic planting are used to partially screen building, utility areas, and parking areas, and to repair areas disturbed in construction. Planter boxes often are used to define entrances.
- Outdoor spaces and site work, including parking lots, sidewalks, and patios are often incorporated into the concession building complex and enhance the interaction between other buildings.

A concession building should possess substantial physical integrity to the period of significance from 1945-1972 in one or more of the following ways:

- Sufficient features should be intact to relate the building to the Modern Movement in terms of massing, spatial relationships, proportion, pattern of windows, texture of materials, and ornamentation.
- Characteristics critical in defining the building's artistic merit or exemplary modern design should not be altered.
- Essential features that should be present to represent significance a property's include the historic façade and entry, important public spaces inside or around the building, and other important interior spaces that define the particular building's historic character and use.
- An addition will not disqualify a property, if the addition is compatible with the original building and not opposed to the intention of the original design and if the addition does not obscure the qualities that contribute to the building's significance.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 88

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

A concession building should possess significance in one or more of the following ways:

- As an outstanding example of the Modern Movement, or “Park Service Modern,” style, preferably one published in contemporary architectural journals or the recipient of design awards. The building may also be the subject of subsequent scholarly evaluations.
- As the creation of a regionally, nationally, or internationally recognized architect or architectural firm working for the National Park Service. Notable architects are defined as those who received high recognition as leaders in their fields and have received critical acclaim for numerous projects over a period of years in major architectural publications. The work of still-practicing architects is generally not considered eligible because the body of their work is yet to be completed and, therefore, cannot be holistically assessed for historical significance.
- For its demonstration of distinctive programming, planning, or design features that affected the evolution of the concession building type. The building may have gained special recognition by Mission 66 planners and designers as an important stylistic example or functional prototype for the Mission 66 or Parkscape USA programs.
- As an essential part of an overall Mission 66 park development plan that had extraordinary importance in the history and development of an individual park. The building may be part of a larger Mission 66 development area, which may be a National Register-eligible historic district.

Examples of alterations or remodeling that may impair the historical integrity of a concession building include but are not limited to the following:

- The addition of a new façade, new entrance wing, or other major exterior alterations that transform the outward appearance of the building.
- Complete alteration of the entrance and sequence through the building due to the addition of new building wings, entrances, or other major alterations.
- New roof structure that is nonreversible and completely alters the exterior appearance of the building, such as a pitched, raised-seam metal roof replacing the original flat roof.
- Extensive interior remodeling that alters the definition of interior spaces, function of spaces, and sequence through spaces.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 89

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

**6. PARTNERSHIP BUILDINGS: PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES (HOSPITALS AND CLINICS), AND U.S. POSTAL SERVICE**

Partnership buildings generally consist of structures built for the Public Health Service and the U.S. Postal Service. In certain large parks where there was limited access to medical facilities, the Public Health Service built hospitals and clinics in developed areas. The buildings provided an emergency room, some patient rooms, and attendant service areas such as consulting spaces, laboratories, and storage areas. Nurses quarters were constructed near the health facilities. Generally, such facilities have been phased by the use of air transport to nearby towns and cities that have more comprehensive medical facilities.

Typically, the hospitals and clinics were one-story buildings with flat or low-pitched gabled roofs. They were built from frame and masonry depending on their visibility requirements in a developed area. The facilities required parking areas, emergency arrival facilities, and access to their housing areas.

Post offices were built in developed areas of many large parks and were frequently located within concession developments that catered to the public. However, they were also constructed to provide park employees with post office boxes to receive mail. Visitors and park employees could post mail and purchase stamps.

Typically, a post office had a public and employee space. The architecture was most often a small rectangular frame building with a gabled roof. Façades were glazed to give the buildings a modern appearance.

**Guidelines for Determination of National Register Eligibility for Mission 66 Partnership Buildings**

To be considered eligible for listing in the NRHP, Mission 66 partnership buildings should possess the following characteristics and partnership buildings should fall within the period of significance from 1945-1972 and meet one or more of the following categories to be considered eligible:

- Partnership buildings that are part of larger significant development districts from Mission 66 or Parkscape USA programs.
- Partnership buildings that are part of or adjacent to a previously existing designated historic district listed on the NRHP.
- Partnership buildings that have a unique design beyond the standard designs published by the partnership agencies or were intended as prototypes.

Partnership buildings should possess physical integrity to the period of significance. Examples of alterations or remodeling that may impair the historical integrity include but are not limited to the following:

- Additions or other major exterior alterations that transform the outward appearance of the building.
- New roof structure that is nonreversible and completely alters the exterior appearance of the building, such as a pitched, raised-seam metal roof replacing an original flat roof.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
**National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number  F  Page  90

----- Name of Property -----
----- County and State -----
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66 ERA RESOURCES -----
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Partnership buildings should embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction that represent artistic values. Specifically, partnership buildings should be a successful reflection of the principles of the Modern Movement, or “Park Service Modern,” style. These characteristics include the following:

- Building makes use of the formal vocabulary and materials of contemporary modern architecture (1945-1972), including flat roofs as well as other types of roofs, fenestration, frame and concrete block construction, type of window openings, and appropriate exterior wall cladding.
- Building elevations should reflect a mostly low-profile, horizontal effect.
- Outdoor spaces and site work, including parking areas, and walkways, are incorporated into the planning and construction.

**7. PARK ROADS, TRAILS, AND PARKWAYS**

Mission 66 park road design and construction policy remained committed to building roads that minimized visual impacts while maximizing the automotive visitor’s experience with park scenery and historic landscapes. Roads indicated that visitors were somewhere special. Fully aware that park road projects were the most controversial of all proposed park development, agency landscape architects and engineers continued to devise landscape protection strategies even as park roads became wider, faster, and capable of much higher capacities.

Retaining walls were used to reduce the height and extent of cut-and-fill slopes, and new bridges and tunnels reduced scarring in mountainous terrain. Frequently, stone masonry guardrails continued the tradition of earlier pre-World-War II construction activities. Other ways of integrating the roads into their natural settings included using road surfaces and materials whose colors harmonized with the general character of the landscape and adding stone masonry abutments to bridges. Park road design standards, based on national trends, dictated that major two-way park roads should be built with a roadway width of 22 feet with three-foot paved shoulders (maximum). Minor two-way park roads featured 20-foot widths. One-way park roads, such as campground roads, were 12 feet wide with no more than two-foot shoulders. A maximum 7% grade was appropriate for all types of park roads, although grades as high as 10% were viable options for short sections. Ditches and slopes and immediate roadside settings called for special protection to prevent erosion and minimize the scars from construction. In some cases, the ditches and slopes were masonry lined. The use of vegetation to blend ditches and shoulders to the adjacent landscape was a standard practice. Cut-and-fill slopes were rounded, warped at the end for a natural transition, and seeded, fertilized, and mulched to repair roadside construction scars.

Mission 66 roads represent the most visible, expensive, and often controversial aspects of the Mission 66 program. Entirely new roads, the complete relocation of existing roads, and the reconstruction of old roads to include wider driving lanes and realignments to flatten grades and widen curves, were planned, designed, and built in response to the higher traffic volumes and changing patterns of park visitation in the postwar era. The changes were criticized because these very improvements were what conservationists preferred to not happen. The conservationists wanted to leave the roads in a primitive state to reduce visitor impacts and heighten the aspect of being in nature.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 91

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Although most Mission 66 road building involved reconstructing existing roads where the main function often was to bypass congested areas, park roadway modernization under the Mission 66 program extended to almost every park in the system. Rebuilt roads are the most widespread and representative built environments in today's parks that reflect a significant transformation of the nature, frequency, and increasing volumes of automotive recreational travel occurring throughout the United States. Some new roads were constructed to reflect the changing demographics and urban growth that required a more direct route from cities and eliminated single points of entry into a park. Large portions of the National Park Service annual budget allocations during the Mission 66 period were committed to road construction and reconstruction. These budget appropriations reflect the priority that road projects assumed in the overall Mission 66 program.

As the Mission 66 program advanced toward its mid-point, critics assailed the program's road building projects. Articles published in conservation organization magazines charged the Mission 66 program with making roads too wide and fast. Higher speed limits (set at a maximum of 45 mph), wider curves, flattened grades, and longer tangents contributed to the perception that Mission 66 roads were built like contemporary interstate highways instead of park roads. By the end of the program, in 1966, some 1,570 miles of park roads had been reconstructed, and approximately 1,197 miles of new roads had been built throughout the system.

Parking lots were modified to provide better access at key sites to accommodate larger vehicles and to provide organization, more spaces, and larger spaces. Parking areas and turnouts were constructed at important areas so visitors could view scenic vistas and interpretive signage. New parking lots are associated with visitor center construction to accommodate traffic at these key structures and as important adjunct resources of the visitor centers, particularly where landscape architects provided designs for ease of parking, entrance walkways, and revegetation of the construction areas. In many instances, vegetation was used to interpret a park's natural theme and relate directly to the overall interpretive plan for the park. In older parks, many pre-World War II parking lots were renovated to the modern standards of the Mission 66 era, and many were expanded to meet the increased visitor traffic at park facilities, particularly visitor centers.

Trails were frequently improved during the Mission 66 era. These improvements enhanced access from the visitor centers or trailhead parking areas to pre-World War II trails. These earlier trail systems were upgraded to repair trail surfaces, adjust drainage, and reduce further erosion. Typically, trails from visitor centers were paved to provide ease of access to important nearby park features. Rehabilitation of existing trail systems and establishment of new trails permitted the installation of interpretive signage relating to the natural or cultural sites that the trails served.

Parkways meeting modern highway standards of the Mission 66 era were constructed to connect important natural and cultural parks and historic sites. These parkways were funded through the 1954 Federal Highway Act which provided over \$32 million over three years. The funds were used to finish parkways. By 1957, parkway construction was a major activity particularly in the eastern United States. However, by 1959, parkway construction waned, and new proposals were deferred as it was thought that the National Park Service should not be in the business of constructing and managing parkways.

Generally, parkways were designed as connected highways with higher speed standards. They are characterized

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 92

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

by straight centerlines and wide, gentle curves to assure an effortless driving experience. An important attribute, whether the parkway had two lanes or more, was to give the driver a sense of passing through the wilderness without being encumbered by modern development. Therefore, the landscape features along the road were important to screen the surrounding area from the road while providing vista or interpretive points if appropriate. Some parkways, based on pre-World War II examples, were carefully designed to integrate into the landscape and enhance the visitor experience.

While evaluating circulation corridors, it is important to consider how they integrate with the landscape features. In nearly all instances, the identification of corridor significance, and potential cultural landscape features should be considered in terms of vegetation, both natural and designed; views and vistas; linear spatial organization with developed park areas; associated structures; and natural and designed drainage systems. Research that includes original construction drawings should assist the determination of the extent of "vista clearing" or the restoration of panoramic views in various locations on the parkway. Conversely, keeping the roadways fully landscaped along their perimeters should be similarly documented.

**Guidelines for Determination of National Register Eligibility for Mission 66 era Circulation Corridors**

To be considered eligible for listing in the NRHP, Mission 66 circulation corridors should fall within the period of significance from 1945-1972 to be considered eligible. Registration requirements for significant Mission 66 roads, trails, and parkways should be viewed in terms of a park-wide road survey and subsequent nomination of all or parts of the corridors, if warranted, and should reflect the following considerations:

- Mission 66 construction most often affected the integrity of earlier pre-World War II roads, which needs to be taken into consideration when nominating corridors with a wide range of dates through all construction periods.
- Mission 66 construction generally did not enhance older roads but strove to bring them up to standards for modern vehicle speeds and maneuvering.
- Upgrading involved widening road beds, constructing new bridges, calculating even cut and fill grades, adding retaining walls and guardrails and fixing landscaping construction scars.
- Redesigned bypass roads and new access to developed areas, which resulted in the rehabilitation of older roads and required entirely new segments of Mission 66-designed roadways.
- Survival of the centerline of a road is a main determining feature in assessing roads. In most cases, the centerline from earlier pre-War War II roads may be retained even though the roadway was widened.

The following quantity and quality considerations of associated structures may aid to determine a Mission 66 road corridor's significance:

- These structures include new bridges, retaining walls, and guardrails. Interpretive turnouts at important locations and new entrance features into a park may be of significance.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 93

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

- In some instances, these features may be more associated with other developments such as visitor centers, entrance stations, and overlooks.
- Bridges are important features of Mission 66 road corridors and may have engineering significance particularly where they span deep and wide gorges or other natural features. In some instances, Mission 66 bridges made an attempt to relate to existing historic bridges by the adding natural materials such as stone masonry at the abutments.

Widening pre-Mission 66 roads, or providing new wider roadbeds and turnouts, often resulted in the construction of a variety of retaining walls and sub-surface road foundations, of which the following characteristics should be considered:

- These associated features may have some engineering significance. The use of materials, such as a modern concrete and steel bridge deck coupled with stone masonry abutments, may have significance.
- The bypassing of park-developed areas often meant new approaches to engineering and construction that, in some instances, included overpasses with entrance and exit ramps.
- Some pre-Mission 66 roads were straightened to reduce the number of curves and allow higher vehicle speeds. As part of the process, there may be new cuts and fills to flatten roads and provide better sight lines.
- Mission 66 road corridor construction necessitated decisions regarding guardrails. Some reconstruction and new construction included stone masonry guardrails that matched older stone masonry. Other roads continued using log guardrails to maintain a rustic feeling along the corridors. Many of the solutions have been abandoned in favor of metal guardrails that meet the Federal Highway Administration's crash test requirements, which may affect integrity.
- Roads should also be evaluated for how pre-Mission 66 features were incorporated into new construction. For example, some roads were maintained with slight turns to provide drivers with a visual cue to a natural or historical feature of importance. These areas, like turnouts along the road corridors, were often interpreted.

Registration requirements for Mission 66 trails are generally part of a larger nomination, such as a visitor center and its immediate surroundings. In parks that were authorized during the Mission 66 era, trail construction was part of the larger development efforts that usually took place during the Parkscape USA program. The following characteristics should be considered:

- Construction attributes of trails are the primary feature that may warrant nomination. These attributes could include concrete paving, sometimes with tinted concrete, edged in stone masonry. Similar stone masonry may define cuts and fills in the form of retaining walls and foundation bases.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 94

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

- Pedestrian bridges may contribute to a trail's significance for providing a means to cross a water source and for its engineering design.
- In some cases, pre-World War II trails were realigned and trail material changed, but if the original alignment remains, that can contribute to integrity.
- Trails were often set with interpretive panels designed for placement at key vistas or to detail natural or cultural resources.
- Trails may include seating furniture at various points to provide for the comfort of visitors.
- Vegetation was an important component to provide not only shade but ground cover and may be important to the significance of trails. How a trail was integrated into native vegetation also could be considered in evaluating a pedestrian corridor.
- Parkways are part of larger transportation corridors and should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis with special attention paid to structures and landscape features. The ideas behind the construction of a parkway may establish significance regarding its purpose of connecting parks, connecting parks to natural and historic sites, or providing a scenic drive along river corridors that became additions to the National Park Service. The registration requirements cited above relate to parkways.

## 8. MISSION 66 HISTORIC DISTRICTS AND PARK-WIDE HISTORIC DISTRICTS

### *Historic Districts*

Except for visitor centers; some administration, maintenance; and concession buildings, and prototype residences, most Mission 66 resources should be considered as contributing within historic districts. Guidelines for nominating individual buildings are well established. However, the reality is that most Mission 66 resources are not individually eligible for listing in the National Register. The Section F guidelines are primarily for use in determining significance of individual components that potentially compose a historic district whether the district is a designated park area or a park-wide survey. Under certain circumstances depending on the quality of the adjacent resources and their context, it may be desirable to consider the eligibility of a historic district rather than considering a visitor center, maintenance building, or a concession building as a single nomination. A historic district would encompass adjacent development directly associated with the individual building. For example, a significant visitor center would be eligible by itself based on its architectural qualities, historical significance, and integrity, and it has adjacent subordinate buildings that together form a complex with architectural and landscape cohesion. In this scenario, the whole complex could be considered a historic district. However, the subordinate buildings and structures that have little or no architectural significance and do not meet Criterion Consideration G would not be included as part of the historic district.



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 95

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Typically, a visitor center was sited in relationship to a park's automotive circulation plan and parking lots. Designers explored the potential for visitors to use nearby trails and outdoor spaces once they were out of their cars. Entry plazas, courtyards, covered walkways, terraces, and other exterior landscape features such as amphitheaters, picnic areas, and interpretive features frequently served as functional parts of the visitor center complex. A detached comfort station was often designed adjacent to the visitor center and formed outdoor plazas, though, in some instances, the comfort station was designed as part of the visitor center and had a separate outdoor entrance. Visitor parking lots and their attendant connections to entrance roads were integral to the overall procession toward and into the visitor center and its immediate landscape features. Ramps often replaced stairs into and out of the building, and window walls helped to break down the division between site development and interior space and provided views to nearby natural and historic features that could also be considered part of the historic district. Short interpretive trails ("nature trails") were often developed to provide an outdoor experience near the visitor center and also led to outdoor seating areas, picnic areas, additional interpretive areas, and concession facilities. Service walkways and trails led to more remote employee residential and maintenance areas as well as entrance stations. Typically, for all historic districts, cultural landscape characteristics, including circulation, spatial organization, topography, vegetation, and views, should also be identified and evaluated for their ability to contribute to the significance of a district. The integrity of the components should be considered significant if they help to determine that a complex retains historical characteristics where an individual building might not otherwise meet the integrity requirements as defined in "National Register Bulletin 16A, How to Complete the National Register Registration Form."

Administration buildings may be considered for single listing, but more often they form the basis for administrative historic districts where visitor centers are remotely located in their parks. Features directly associated with Mission 66 administration buildings may include nearby maintenance buildings and yards and residential areas. Similar cultural landscape characteristics, including circulation patterns separating visitor from employee roads and parking areas, spatial organization, topography, vegetation, and views, need to be identified and evaluated for their ability to contribute to the significance of an administration building district. Individual components, such as landscape features and support buildings, of an administrative historic district may enhance the overall integrity of such a district where key buildings have integrity issues.

Maintenance and utility buildings, which seldom have individual architectural or historical significance, were isolated from other park development areas due to the inherent functions that could be considered unsightly, such as storage and maintenance of park vehicles from auto fleets and trucks to oversize snow removal equipment; shops; storage of building, road, and hazardous materials; and infrastructure for water and sewer systems. Thus, maintenance yards and storage "bone yards" were located away from public views. These areas were often combined with pre-World War II buildings and structures, established away from a park's headquarters area and employee residential areas, and screened by vegetation, fencing, or both. In larger parks, secondary maintenance areas, such that might be found near a minor park entrance, were located in places to facilitate the nearby residing workforce.

Maintenance yards include single buildings or a series of individual buildings with interactive use that accommodated the variety of functions related to the preservation of equipment and building materials. Though individual maintenance or utility buildings were common in smaller parks, like larger complexes of maintenance buildings, all were constructed with yards. The spaces were large enough to accommodate large vehicles with

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 96

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

large turning radii. Maintenance buildings usually consist of large equipment storage areas with garage bays for maintenance of park vehicles. Whether individual buildings or part of quadrangle complex, the spaces were equipped as shops for mechanical, plumbing, and carpentry work with requisite storage facilities. Maintenance buildings included separate areas for employee use areas including restrooms, tool storage and maintenance staff offices. Larger complexes included detached structures for flammable materials, pump houses, and additional storage buildings. Maintenance yard enclosures and circulation into and out of the maintenance areas were part of the complex and also had the relationships to the park administrative areas and visitor centers. Typically, the landscape features of the maintenance district quadrangle, which could be open at any side, included paved building access, driveways, and parking areas which provided for vehicles and staff at a utilitarian level. Vegetation, if planted or existing in forested areas, was limited to screening the maintenance functions from other park functions.

Residential areas in parks were as simple as three or four connected units with attached carports and parking facilities. Prototype residential construction of the Mission 66 era may form a small historic district and be treated as a separate listing. More often, residential districts were characterized by the development of roadways that were based on historical suburban developments outside the park boundaries. The residential roads were frequently curvilinear and usually connected the individual houses, duplexes, triplexes, and apartment buildings to other park areas to facilitate employee connectivity. The street system should be evaluated to develop the history of the planning and establish a relationship to residential developments outside of the park. Residential units connected to the road systems by driveways and parking areas accommodating apartment buildings. To be considered eligible, a residential historic district should have cohesiveness of design and construction reflecting that the original comprehensive design was realized. Siting and landscaping played a major role to assure privacy of the residents, particularly for rear patios. In heavily forested areas, individual sites were often carved out of the vegetation to create privacy, and the centers of large blocks were planned for various recreational activities. In many instances, individual houses were sited at angles to provide privacy between residences. Lawn areas were often included even in arid climates, and yard enclosures were frequently used to define individual residential properties. Evaluation of a residential district should be based on the completeness of the original residential concept and the relationship of streets and roads whether they are responsive to earlier residential areas or reflect a complete independent plan that relates to modern suburban development. Component of residential districts should include the use of standard designs, responsiveness to privacy, and landscape features, including plant materials, enclosures, and connections to other park development areas. Similar considerations need to be part of potential historic districts that include ranger station complexes, day-use facilities such as picnic areas and interpretive areas, campgrounds, and overlook developments. It is possible that Mission 66 resources within established historic districts may require addendums to existing historic district nominations to reflect the historical significance of newer construction.

In most circumstances, rather than considering a single concession building alone, it may be necessary to consider a concession building's eligibility as part of a larger concession district. Associated features with Mission 66 concession buildings may include the entire gamut of services from lodges, motel units, retail buildings, gas and service stations, and other services operated not only by the partnership organization and the National Park Service as well. Cultural landscape characteristics, including circulation and parking, spatial organization, topography, vegetation, and views, should also be identified and evaluated for their ability to contribute to the significance of a concessions historic district. A concessions district may be considered significant if its

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 97

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

components in the concession complex or district retain historical integrity and would not otherwise be included individually in a National Register determination of eligibility.

A concessions historic district was usually constructed in or near National Park Service development and could be considered part of a larger development district that includes a wide range of properties. The nomination of a Mission 66 concession district should take into consideration its relationship with the adjacent National Park Service development as it may be integral if all were built during the historic period. However, it may be necessary to provide an addendum for an existing pre-World War II historic district to include Mission 66 concession buildings and development within the previously nominated district. This addendum would replace "non-contributing" status or would result in expanding the nominated district with new boundaries to include the Mission 66 resources.

***Park-wide Historic Districts***

A Mission 66 park-wide district may be established in cases where most or all of a park was developed under the Mission 66 or Parkscape USA program, and is clearly the most important phase of the park's development history. The park-wide district should include a range of facilities and developed areas typical of Mission 66 development, and it should constitute a significant embodiment of the goals of the Mission 66 program. The park-wide district should include most of the developed areas of a given park, and that park should figure prominently in the history of the Mission 66 era, such as being established between 1956 and 1966 and then developed in the subsequent Parkscape USA years. Such a district should also retain overall integrity of its Mission 66 program of development.

A Mission 66 park-wide district would encompass most of the developed areas of a park that were developed entirely, or mostly, during the Mission 66 era. This type of district would only be appropriate in a park that represents, overall, a significant embodiment of the Mission 66 ideals of national park planning and development. Therefore, the park-wide district would include a range of facilities and developed areas; all of which should retain good overall integrity. A park-wide district would only be appropriate in a park that figured prominently in the history of Mission 66 still conveys a cohesive, holistic sense of Mission 66 planning and design.

Examples of resources included in a park-wide district could contain visitor centers, administration buildings, park lodges, stores and other concessioner services, maintenance and utility buildings, residential units, park schools, campgrounds, ranger stations, comfort stations, roads, trails, and other miscellaneous structures. Cultural landscape characteristics, including circulation, spatial organization, topography, vegetation, and views should also be identified and evaluated for their ability to contribute to the significance of a Mission 66 park-wide district.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 98

----- Name of Property
----- County and State
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66 ERA RESOURCES
----- Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

**Guidelines for Determination of National Register Eligibility for Mission 66 Historic Districts**

As in the case of other Mission 66 property types, National Register Criteria A, C, and G may apply for Mission 66 historic districts. Criterion B rarely applies.

To be considered eligible for listing in the National Register, a Mission 66 historic district should possess the following characteristics:

- A representative range of potentially contributing buildings, structures, and cultural landscape characteristics would be included in the district.
- These contributing resources also would have to retain overall historical integrity embodied by their historic architecture and significance.
- In addition, a park-wide district would only be appropriate in a park that was planned and developed mostly or entirely through the Mission 66 program. The Mission 66 development in the park should represent the most significant period in the park's development history. The development contained within the historic district should together constitute a significant embodiment of Mission 66 national park planning and design ideals. The park should have figured prominently in the history of Mission 66.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number   G   Page   99  

National Park Service Mission 66 Era Resources

Section G. Geographical Data

The National Park Service Mission 66 resources are located nationwide in the national parks designated through 1972. For reference, parks that potentially may have Mission 66 resources are listed below by their dates of establishment.

**Parks through World War II:**

Yellowstone National Park, 1872, Wyoming  
Sequoia National Park, 1890, California  
Yosemite National Park, 1890, California  
Mount Rainier National Park, 1899, Washington  
Crater Lake National Park, 1902, Oregon  
Wind Cave National Park, 1903, South Dakota  
Mesa Verde National Park, 1906, Colorado  
Devils Tower National Monument, 1906, Wyoming  
El Morro National Monument, 1906, New Mexico  
Montezuma Castle National Monument, 1906, Arizona  
Petrified Forest National Monument, 1906, Arizona (now Petrified Forest National Park)  
Chaco Canyon National Monument, 1907, New Mexico (now Chaco Culture National Historical Park)  
Muir Woods National Monument, 1908, California  
Natural Bridges National Monument, 1908, Utah  
Tumacacori National Monument, 1908, Arizona (now Tumacacori National Historical Park)  
Navajo National Monument, 1909, Arizona  
Gran Quivira National Monument, 1909, New Mexico (now Salinas Pueblo Missions National Monument)  
Sitka National Monument, 1910, Alaska  
Glacier National Park, 1910, Montana  
Rainbow Bridge National Monument, 1910, Utah  
Pinnacles National Monument, 1910, California  
Colorado National Monument, 1911, Colorado  
Rocky Mountain National Park, 1915, Colorado  
Dinosaur National Monument, 1915, Colorado and Utah  
Sieur de Monts National Monument, 1916, Maine (now Acadia National Park)  
Hawaii National Park, 1916, Hawaii (now Haleakala National Park and Hawaii Volcanoes National Park)  
Capulin Volcano National Monument, 1916, New Mexico  
Lassen Volcanic National Park, 1916, California  
Mount McKinley National Park, 1917, Alaska (now Denali National Park)  
Zion National Park, 1918, Utah  
Casa Grande National Monument, 1918, Arizona  
Katmai National Monument, 1918, Alaska (now Katmai National Park)

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number   G   Page  100 

Grand Canyon National Park, 1919, Arizona  
Scotts Bluff National Monument, 1919, Nebraska  
Yucca House National Monument, 1919, Colorado (undeveloped)  
Aztec Ruin National Monument, 1923, New Mexico (now Aztec Ruins National Monument)  
Hovenweep National Monument, 1923, Colorado and Utah  
Pipe Spring National Monument, 1923, Arizona  
Carlsbad Cave National Monument, 1923, New Mexico (now Carlsbad Caverns National Park)  
Craters of the Moon National Monument, 1924, Idaho  
Utah National Park, 1924, Utah (now Bryce Canyon National Park)  
Wupatki National Monument, 1924, Arizona  
Glacier Bay National Monument, 1925, Alaska (now Glacier Bay National Park)  
Lava Beds National Monument, 1924, California  
Great Smoky Mountains National Park, 1926, North Carolina and Tennessee  
Shenandoah National Park, 1926, Virginia  
Mammoth Cave National Park, 1926, Kentucky  
Grand Teton National Park, 1929, Wyoming  
Badlands National Monument, 1929, South Dakota (now Badlands National Park)  
Arches National Monument, 1929, Utah  
George Washington Birthplace National Monument, 1930, Virginia  
Colonial National Monument, 1930, Virginia (now Colonial National Historical Park)  
Canyon de Chelly National Monument, 1931, Arizona  
Isle Royale National Park, 1931, Michigan  
Bandelier National Monument, 1932, New Mexico  
Great Sand Dunes National Monument, 1932, Colorado (now Great Sand Dunes National Park)  
White Sands National Monument, 1933, New Mexico  
Death Valley National Monument, 1933, California and Nevada (now Death Valley National Park)  
Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument, 1933, Colorado (now Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park)  
Morristown National Historical Park, 1933, New Jersey

**Parks added to the National Park Service in 1933 through reorganization:**

National Capital Parks, National Mall, White House, Washington, DC  
Ford's Theatre National Historical Park, Washington, DC  
Rock Creek Park, Washington, DC  
Potomac Park, Washington, DC  
Mount Vernon Memorial Highway, Virginia (now park of the George Washington Memorial Parkway)  
George Washington Memorial Parkway, DC, Maryland, Virginia  
Washington Monument, DC  
Statue of Liberty, New York

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number   G   Page  101 

Lincoln Memorial, DC  
Cabrillo National Monument, California  
Abraham Lincoln National Park, Kentucky (now Abraham Lincoln National Historical Site)  
Mount Rushmore National Memorial, South Dakota  
Kill Devil Hill Monument, North Carolina (now Wright Brothers National Memorial)  
George Rogers Clark Memorial, Indiana (now George Rogers Clark National Historical Park)  
Theodore Roosevelt Island, DC  
Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, Georgia and Tennessee  
Antietam National Battlefield, Maryland  
Shiloh National Military Park, Tennessee  
Gettysburg National Military Park, Pennsylvania  
Vicksburg National Military Park, Mississippi  
Chalmette Monument and Grounds, Louisiana (now Jean Lafitte National Historical Park)  
Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield, Georgia  
Guilford Courthouse National Military Park, North Carolina  
Moores Creek National Battlefield, North Carolina  
Petersburg National Battlefield, Virginia  
Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania County Battlefields Memorial National Military Park, Virginia  
Stones River National Battlefield, Tennessee  
Fort Donelson National Battlefield, Tennessee  
Brices Cross Roads National Battlefield, Mississippi  
Tupelo National Battlefield, Mississippi  
Cowpens National Battlefield, South Carolina  
Appomattox Battlefield Site, Virginia (now Appomattox Court House National Historical Park)  
Fort Necessity National Battlefield, Pennsylvania  
Kings Mountain National Military Park, South Carolina  
Big Hole National Battlefield, Montana  
Mound City Group National Monument, Ohio (now Hopewell Culture National Historical Park)  
Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, Florida  
Fort Matanzas National Monument, Florida  
Fort Pulaski National Monument, Georgia  
Meriwether Lewis National Monument, Tennessee (now Natchez Trace Parkway)  
Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine, Maryland  
Lee Mansion, Virginia (now Arlington House, the Robert E. Lee Memorial)  
Fort Washington Park, Maryland  
Gila Cliff Dwellings National Monument, New Mexico  
Tonto National Monument, Arizona  
Jewel Cave National Monument, South Dakota  
Oregon Caves National Monument, Oregon  
Devils Postpile National Monument, California  
Walnut Canyon National Monument, Arizona  
Lehman Caves National Monument, Nevada (now Great Basin National Park)

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number   G   Page  102 

Chiricahua National Monument, Arizona  
Sunset Crater National Monument, Arizona (now Sunset Crater Volcano National Monument)  
Saguaro National Monument, Arizona (now Saguaro National Park)  
Blue Ridge Parkway, 1933, North Carolina and Virginia  
Cedar Breaks National Monument, 1933, Utah  
Everglades National Park, 1934, Florida  
Ocmulgee National Monument, 1934, Georgia  
Natchez Trace Parkway, 1934, Mississippi, Alabama, and Tennessee  
Monocacy National Battlefield, 1934, Maryland  
Thomas Jefferson Memorial, 1934, DC  
Fort Jefferson National Monument, 1935, Florida (now Dry Tortugas National Park)  
Big Bend National Park, 1935, Texas  
Fort Stanwix National Monument, 1935, New York  
Andrew Johnson National Monument, 1935, Tennessee (now Andrew Johnson National Historical Site)  
Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, 1935, Missouri  
Richmond National Battlefield Park, 1936, Virginia  
Homestead National Monument of America, 1936, Nebraska  
Fort Frederica National Monument, 1936, Georgia  
Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial, 1936, Ohio  
Whitman National Monument, 1936, Oregon (now Whitman Mission National Historical Site)  
Joshua Tree National Monument, 1936, California, (now Joshua Tree National Park)  
Boulder Dam Recreation Area, 1936, Nevada and Arizona, (now Lake Mead National Recreation Area)  
Bull Run Recreational Demonstration Area, 1936, Virginia (now Manassas National Battlefield Park)  
Catoctin Recreational Demonstration Area, 1936, Maryland (now Catoctin Mountain Park)  
Chopawamsic Recreational Demonstration Area, 1936, Virginia (now Prince William Forest Park)  
Zion National Monument, 1937, Utah (now Zion National Park)  
Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument, 1937, Arizona  
Capitol Reef National Monument, 1937, Utah (now Capitol Reef National Park)  
Cape Hatteras National Seashore, 1937, North Carolina  
Pipestone National Monument, 1937, Minnesota  
Salem Maritime National Historical Site, 1938, Massachusetts  
Channel Islands National Monument, 1938, California (now Channel Islands National Park)  
Saratoga National Historical Park, 1938, New York  
Olympic National Park, 1938, Washington  
Fort Laramie National Historic Site, 1938, Wyoming  
Hopewell Furnace National Historic Site, 1938, Pennsylvania  
Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, 1938, DC, Maryland, and West Virginia  
Federal Hall National Memorial, 1939, New York  
Philadelphia Custom House National Historic Site, 1939, Pennsylvania (now Independence National Historical Park)  
Tuzigoot National Monument, 1939, Arizona  
Kings Canyon National Park, 1940, California



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number   G   Page  103 

Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, 1940, Kentucky, Virginia, and Tennessee  
National Cemetery of Custer's Battlefield Reservation, 1940, Montana (now little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument)  
Fort Washington Park, 1940, Maryland  
Vanderbilt Mansion National Historic Site, 1940, New York  
Fort Raleigh National Historic Site, 1941, North Carolina  
George Washington Carver National Monument, 1943, Missouri  
Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site, 1944, New York  
Harpers Ferry National Monument National Historical Park, 1944, Maryland and West Virginia

**Parks from the post-World War II era:**

Castle Clinton National Monument, 1946, New York  
Adams National Historical Park, 1946, Massachusetts  
Coulee Dam National Recreation Area, 1946, Washington (now Lake Roosevelt National Recreational Area)  
Theodore Roosevelt National Park, 1947, North Dakota  
Desoto National Memorial, 1948, Florida  
Fort Sumter National Monument, 1948, South Carolina  
Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, 1948, Washington  
Hampton National Historic Site, 1948, Maryland  
Independence National Historical Park, 1948, Pennsylvania  
San Juan National Historic Site, 1949, Puerto Rico  
Saint Croix Island National Monument, 1949, Maine  
Suitland Parkway, 1949, DC and Maryland  
Effigy Mounds National Monument, 1949, Iowa  
Baltimore-Washington Parkway, 1950, Maryland  
Greenbelt Park, 1950, Maryland  
Grand Teton National Park, 1950, Wyoming  
Fort Caroline National Memorial, 1950, Florida  
Virgin Islands National Historic Site, 1952, Virgin Islands (now Christiansted National Historical Site)  
Coronado National Memorial, 1952, Arizona  
Fort Union National Monument, 1954, New Mexico  
City of Refuge National Historical Park, 1955, Hawaii (now Pu'uhonua o Honaunau National Historical Park)  
Edison National Historic Site, 1955, New Jersey

**Parks established during the Mission 66 program:**

Booker T. Washington National Monument, 1956, Virginia  
Pea Ridge National Military Park, 1956, Arkansas  
Horseshoe Bend National Military Park, 1956, Alabama  
Virgin Islands National Park, 1956, Virgin Islands  
Glen Canyon National Recreational Area, 1958, Arizona and Utah

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number   G   Page  104 

Fort Clatsop National Memorial, 1958, Oregon (now Lewis and Clark National Historical Park)  
General Grant National Memorial, 1958, New York  
Grand Portage National Historical Park, 1958, Minnesota  
Minute Man National Historical Park, 1959, Massachusetts  
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial, 1959, DC  
Wilson's Creek National Battlefield, 1960, Missouri  
Bent's Old Fort National Historic Site, 1960, Colorado  
Arkansas Post National Memorial, 1960, Arkansas  
Russell Cave National Monument, 1961, Alabama  
Cape Cod National Seashore, 1961, Massachusetts  
Fort Davis National Historic Site, 1961, Texas  
Fort Smith National Historic Site, 1961, Arkansas  
Piscataway Park, 1961, Maryland  
Buck Island Reef National Monument, 1961, Virgin Islands  
Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial, 1962, Indiana  
Hamilton Grange National Memorial, 1962, New York  
Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area, 1962, California  
Sagamore Hill National Historic Site, 1962, New York  
Theodore Roosevelt Birthplace National Historic Site, 1962, New York  
Frederick Douglass National Historic Site, 1962, DC  
Point Reyes National Seashore, 1962, California  
Padre Island National Seashore, 1962, Texas  
Ozark National scenic Riverways, 1964, Missouri  
Fort Bowie National Historic Site, 1964, Arizona  
Allegheny Portage Railroad National Historic Site, 1964, Pennsylvania  
Fort Learned National Historic Site, 1964, Kansas  
John Muir National Historic Site, 1964, California  
Johnstown Flood National Memorial, 1964, Pennsylvania  
Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site, 1964, New Hampshire  
Fire Island National Seashore, 1964, New York  
Canyon Lands National Park, 1964, Utah  
Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area, 1964, Wyoming and Montana  
Arbuckle National Recreation Area, 1965, Oklahoma (now Chickasaw National Recreation Area)  
Curecanti National Recreation Area, 1965, Colorado  
Lake Meredith National Recreation Area, 1965, Texas  
Nez Perce National Historical Park, 1965, Idaho  
Agate fossil Beds National Monument, 1965, Nebraska  
Pecos National Monument, 1965, New Mexico (now Pecos National Historical Park)  
Golden Spike National Historic Site, 1965, Utah  
Herbert Hoover National Historic Site, 1965, Iowa  
Hubbell Trading Post National Historic Site, 1965, Arizona  
Alibates Flint Quarries National Monument, 1965, Texas

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number   G   Page  105 

Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, 1965, Pennsylvania and New Jersey  
Assateague Island National Seashore, 1965, Maryland and Virginia  
Roger Williams National Memorial, 1965, Rhode Island  
Amistad National Recreation Area, 1965, Texas  
Cape Lookout National Seashore, 1966, North Carolina  
Fort Union trading Post National Historic Site, 1966, Montana and North Dakota  
Chamizal National Memorial, 1966, Texas  
George Rogers Clark National Historical Park, 1966, Indiana  
San Juan Island National Historical Park, 1966, Washington  
Guadalupe Mountains National Park, 1966, Texas  
Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, 1966, Michigan  
Wolf Trap Farm Park for the Performing Arts, 1966, Virginia  
Theodore Roosevelt Inaugural National Historic Site, 1966, New York  
Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, 1966, Indiana

**Parks established during the Parkscape USA program:**

John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Historic Site, 1967, Massachusetts  
Eisenhower National Historic Site, 1967, Pennsylvania  
Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site, 1968, Massachusetts  
Appalachian National Scenic Trail, 1968, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, Tennessee, North Carolina, Georgia  
Lake Chelan National Recreation Area, 1968, Washington  
North Cascades National Park, 1968, Washington  
Redwood National Park, 1968, California  
Ross Lake National Recreation Area, 1968, Washington  
Saint Croix National Scenic River, 1968, Minnesota and Wisconsin  
Carl Sandburg Home National Historical Site, 1968, North Carolina  
Biscayne National Monument, 1968, Florida  
Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument, 1969, Colorado  
Lyndon B. Johnson National Historical Park, 1969, Texas  
William Howard Taft National Historic Site, 1969, Ohio  
Apostle Islands National Lakeshore, 1970, Wisconsin  
Andersonville National Historic Site, 1970, Georgia  
Fort Point National Historic Site, 1970, California  
Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, 1970, Michigan  
Gulf Islands National Seashore, 1971, Florida and Mississippi  
Voyageurs National Park, 1971, Minnesota  
Lincoln Home National Historical Site, 1971, Illinois  
Buffalo National River, 1972, Arkansas  
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, 1972, DC  
Pu'ukohola Heiau National Historic Site, 1972, Hawaii

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

----- Name of Property -----
----- County and State -----
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66 ERA RESOURCES -----
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number   G   Page  106 

---

- Grant-Kohrs Ranch National Historic Site, 1972, Montana
- John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Memorial Parkway, 1972, Wyoming
- Longfellow National Historic Site, 1972, Massachusetts
- Hohokam Pima National Monument, 1972, Arizona
- Thaddeus Kosciuszko National Memorial, 1972, Pennsylvania
- Cumberland Island National Seashore, 1972, Georgia
- Fossil Butte National Monument, 1972, Wyoming
- Gateway National Recreational Area, 1972, New York and New Jersey
- Golden Gate National Recreational Area, 1972, California

Source: Harpers Ferry Center. *The National Parks: Shaping the System*. Washington, DC: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center, 2005.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number  H  Page  107

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

**H. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods**

Pacific West Region (PWR) Architectural Historian Dr. Elaine Jackson-Retondo and Historian Len Warner began working on a regional Mission 66 Multiple Property Documentation Form (MPD) starting in late 2002 - early 2003. A partial draft of the regional MPD was completed in August 2004. Simultaneously, then PWR Associate Regional Director for Cultural Resources Stephanie Toothman discovered that there was a project to develop a nationwide Mission 66 MPD. Under the direction of Chief Historical Architect Randall J. Biallas, the Washington Office had hired Historical Landscape Architect Ethan Carr to develop a similar MPD document in concert with his research and authoring of a manuscript that ultimately led to the publication of his book, *Mission 66, Modernism and the National Park Dilemma*, published in 2007. Between the PWR and the Washington Office in 2004, it was determined to collaborate on a nationwide MPD rather than proceed along parallel efforts.

The identification and evaluation of Mission 66 resources is based on research of the period of National Park Service architecture and construction from 1945 through the Mission 66 program to the end of the Parkscape USA program in 1972. The dates of significance were first announced by Ethan Carr at the Mission 66 Research Working Meeting May 28 - 29, 2003. The meeting was organized by Chief Historical Architect Randall J. Biallas and included participation by representatives from all of the National Park Service regions. Ethan Carr announced in a session entitled, "Mission 66 Era (1945-1973), Contextual Essay and Multiple Property Documentation," that a joint MPD form was to be completed in concert with Elaine Jackson-Retondo and Len Warner of the PWR. Ethan Carr provided an outline for the proposed project that included a Part I, "Statement of Significance," and a Part II, "Associated Property Types." In late 2004, Ethan Carr joined Elaine Jackson-Retondo and Len Warner and worked in collaboration, with Ethan Carr giving permission to use his manuscript. Len Warner left the National Park Service in 2005. A draft of the nationwide MPD was issued in early 2006. This collaboration between the PWR and the Washington Office led to the completion of the draft nationwide MPD in January 2006.

Primary research was undertaken at various National Park Service archives and at the Denver Service Center, Technical Information Center (TIC), Denver, Colorado. TIC is where Ethan Carr was detailed to work for a time to track documentation under the direction of Randall J. Biallas. At TIC, drawings were reviewed, architects and designers were identified, and the design trends of the Western and Eastern Offices of Design and Construction were evaluated. The identified building types that were characteristic of the Mission 66 era were intended to expand the parks' ability to meet the needs of the automobile age and the greatly increased numbers of visitors. The wealth of information still held by TIC has greatly enhanced the research for this document by all parties involved in its preparation. Unfortunately, most of the specifications and all of the completion reports, for the buildings in the Intermountain Region (IMR), were destroyed by the Denver Service Center in the 1980s, leaving a large gap in the records.

The research used publications, such as the aforementioned manuscript that Ethan Carr prepared for the National Park Service and ultimately privately published by the University of Massachusetts as *Mission 66: Modernism and the National Park Dilemma*. In addition, the 2000 National Park Service publication of Sarah Allaback's *Mission 66 Visitor Centers, The History of a Building Type* provided groundbreaking research on Mission 66 and visitor centers. Both studies were key to the initial version of this MPD, with Ethan Carr contributing substantially to the text that was begun as a regional context written by Architectural Historian Elaine Jackson-

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number   H   Page  108 

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66  
ERA RESOURCES

-----  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Retondo, PhD, based on her intimate knowledge of the Mission 66 resources in the PWR. Throughout the preparation of the original draft and subsequent versions, many other published sources were used from Conrad Wirth's *Parks, Politics, and People* to internal National Park Service publications including "Standard Plans for Employee Housing" and various reports on the progress of the Mission 66 program drawn from the National Park Service files. Personnel within and outside of the National Park Service, who have keen personal interests in the history of the Mission 66, prepared many history sources that were used in the preparation of this document.

After the 2006 introduction of the document, it was not finalized, and it languished. In 2010, the PWR, under the direction of David Louter, currently PWR Assistant Regional Director of Cultural Resources, and Sande McDermott, then IMR Assistant Regional Director of Cultural Resources, decided to issue a contract to complete the MPD to expedite the nomination process of Mission 66 resources throughout the nation. The funding source was from the Washington Office History Program's National Register Initiative. A contract was let to the Collaborative, Inc. (TCI), of Boulder, Colorado, to edit, complete additional research, and finalize the 2006 document. As well, the firm was required to complete three National Register forms to demonstrate how the new MPD was to be used in the future. In fulfillment of the latter requirement, forms were prepared for the pre-Mission 66 program residences at Zion National Park, the expansion of the West Glacier Historic District at Glacier National Park to include the three periods of Mission 66 housing, and the three non-standard houses at Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Boulder Beach. The contract was monitored by the IMR, initially by then Associate Regional Director, Sande McDermott, on behalf of the PWR. Sam Tamburro, NPS Historian and IMR project manager for the Mission 66 MPD project, served as the Contracting Officer's Technical Representative.

Working for TCI, Editor and Contributing Author, Architectural Historian Rodd L. Wheaton drew on his personal knowledge and experience from having worked with Mission 66 resources during his tenure as a cultural resource leader in the IMR of the National Park Service. He has nominated many Mission 66 buildings to the National Register of Historic Places since the 1980s and developed a protocol for preventing demolition of Mission 66 buildings in the 1990s as Associate Regional Director for Cultural Resources and Partnerships. After retirement in 2004, he has continued to nominate Mission 66 properties to the National Register for various parks in IMR based on his expertise in architecture of the Modern Movement style.

Because of Architectural Historian Wheaton's intimate knowledge of the Mission 66 era and his long association with the National Park Service since 1972, he has located and interviewed many people who worked in the Western and Eastern Offices of Design and Construction in various capacities to gain a thorough understanding of the various professional roles of architects and landscape architects during the Mission 66 era. These interviews examined the contributions of the Eastern and Western Offices of Design and Construction, which augmented the history of the era and expanded its scope of the document to nationwide. The interviews assisted in developing biographies of the designers and architects. Mr. Wheaton visited Mission 66 sites throughout his career and post-career to personally view extant structures and has used that knowledge to further expand on the history and design details of Mission 66 construction. John D. Feinberg of TCI provided additional contributions and inspiration based on his expertise in landscape architecture, land planning, and architectural history that were invaluable in editing the original 2006 document, redrafting several sections, and performing field research.

This Mission 66 Multiple Property Documentation, having gone through two major National Park Service reviews that substantially strengthened particularly the discussions on landscape architecture, is a composite of

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

Section number   H   Page  109 

----- Name of Property -----
----- County and State -----
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE MISSION 66 ERA RESOURCES -----
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

the research of many people who have a sincere interest in assuring that the Mission 66 era is fully recognized as the most significant construction program of the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century for the National Park Service. The Mission 66 era of the National Park Service produced some of the finest federal government-sponsored Modern Movement style architecture and associated natural landscaping in the United States. The features were designed by a significant cadre of architects, landscape architects, engineers, and planners that resulted in both the enhancement of the American public's experience when visiting a national park and the comfort and capabilities of park employees.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

-----  
National Park Service Mission 66 Era Resources  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number   1   Page  110 

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Adams, Ansel. 1958. Yosemite—1958: Compromise in Action. *National Parks Magazine* 32, no. 135 (October ), 166-90.
- Allaback, Sarah. *Mission 66 Visitor Centers: The History of a Building Type*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 2000.
- Audience Research, Inc. *A Survey of the Public Concerning National Parks*. Unpublished report. Princeton, New Jersey, 1955.
- Baldwin, William C. 1996. Wherry and Capehart: Army Family Housing Privatization Programs in the 1950s. *Engineer* (April): 42-44.
- Barringer, Mark Daniel. *Selling Yellowstone: Capitalism and the Construction of Nature*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2002.
- Bartlett, Richard A. *Yellowstone: A Wilderness Besieged*. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1985.
- Bayliss, Dudley C. 1937. Parkway Development Under the National Park Service. *Parks & Recreation* (February 20): 255-99.
- Bellavia, Regina M. *Cultural Landscape Report for Jefferson National Expansion Memorial, St. Louis, Missouri*. Omaha, Nebraska: Government Printing Office, 1996.
- Belshaw, Mike and Ed Peplow, Jr. *Historic Resource Study: Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Nevada*. Denver: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, n.d.
- Bishop, M. Guy. 1998. Mission 66 in the National Parks of Southern California and the Southwest. *Southern California Quarterly* 80 (Fall): 293-314.
- Bradley, Harold C. 1950. Yosemite's Problem Road. *Pacific Discovery* (January): 3-8.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and David R. Brower. 1949. Roads in National Parks. *Sierra Club Bulletin* 34, no. 6 (June): 31-54.
- Brooks, Paul. 1961. The Pressure of Numbers. *The Atlantic* 207, no. 2 (February): 54-56.
- Brower, David R. *For Earth's Sake: The Life and Times of David Brower*. Salt Lake City: Peregrine Smith Books, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1958. Mission 65 Is Proposed By Reviewer of Park Service's Brochure on Wilderness. *National Parks Magazine* 32, no. 132 (January): 3-6, 45-48.
- Brown, Sharon A. *Administrative History: Jefferson National Expansion Memorial Historic Site*. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1984.
- Brown, William E. *Denali: Symbol of the Alaskan Wild*. Denali National Park: Denali Natural History Association, 1993.
- Butcher, Devereux. 1952. For a Return to Harmony in Park Architecture. *National Parks Magazine* 26, no. 111 (October): 150-157.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1961. Resorts or Wilderness? *The Atlantic* 207, no. 2 (February): 45-51.
- Carnes, William G. 1951. Landscape Architecture in the National Park Service. *Landscape Architecture* 41, no. 4 (July): 145-50.
- Carr, Ethan. *Wilderness by Design: Landscape Architecture and the National Park Service*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Elaine Jackson-Retondo, and Len Warner. 2006. "National Park Service Mission 66 Resources: National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Nomination Form," Draft, January 2006.
- Catton, Theodore. *Wonderland: An Administrative History of Mount Rainier National Park*. Seattle: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1996.
- Cohen, Michael P. *The History of the Sierra Club, 1892-1970*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1988.
- Colby, William E. 1948. Yosemite's Fatal Beauty. *Sierra Club Bulletin* 33, no. 3 (March): 79-108.



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

-----  
National Park Service Mission 66 Era Resources  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number 1 Page 111

- Culpin, Mary Shivers. *For the Benefit and Enjoyment of the People, A History of Concession Development in Yellowstone National Park, 1872-1966*. National Park Service, Yellowstone Center for Resources, YCR-CR-2003-01, Yellowstone National Park, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The History of the Construction of the Road System in Yellowstone National Park, 1872-1966*. Selections from the Division of Cultural Resources, Rocky Mountain Region, No. 5. Denver: Government Printing Office, 1994.
- Davis, Timothy, Todd A. Croteau, and Christopher H. Marston. *America's National Park Roads and Parkways: Drawings From the Historic American Engineering Record*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2012. "NPS Park Roads Theme Study (Chapter 7: Mission 66 and Its Discontents), DRAFT" National Park Service, Historic Structures and Cultural Landscapes Program, 2012.
- DeVoto, Bernard. 1953. Let's Close the National Parks. *Harper's Magazine* 207, no. 1241 (October): 49-52.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1950. Shall We Let Them Ruin Our National Parks? *The Saturday Evening Post* 223, no. 4 (July): 17-19; 42-46.
- Dilsaver, Lary M. *America's National Park System: The Critical Documents*. Lanham Way, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and William C. Tweed. *Challenge of the Big Trees: A Resource History of Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks*. Three Rivers, California: Sequoia Natural History Association, Inc., 1990.
- Douglas, Marjory Stoneman. *The Everglades: River of Grass*. New York: Rinehart & Company, Inc., 1947.
- Drury, Newton B. 1949. The Dilemma of Our Parks. *American Forests* 55, no. 6 (June): 6-11, 38-39.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The National Parks in Wartime—A Review of the Year. In: *American Planning and Civic Annual*, Harlean James, ed., Washington, D.C.: American Planning and Civic Association, 1942.
- Everhart, William C. *The National Park Service*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1983.
- Fitch, Edwin M. and John F. Shanklin. *The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970.
- Flader, Susan L. *Thinking Like a Mountain: Aldo Leopold and the Evolution of an Ecological Attitude Toward Deer, Wolves, and Forests*. Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri Press, 1974.
- Foresta, Ronald A. *America's National Parks and Their Keepers*. Washington, D.C.: Resources for the Future, Inc., 1984.
- Frome, Michael. *Greenspeak: Fifty Years of Environmental Muckraking and Advocacy*. Knoxville, Tennessee: University of Tennessee Press, 2002.
- Garrison, Lemuel A. *The Making of a Ranger: Forty Years with the National Parks*. An Institute of the American West Book. Salt Lake City: Howe Brothers, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1955. Mission 66. *National Parks Magazine* 29, no. 122 (July): 107-8.
- Gilstrap, Max K. 1956. Our National Parks: A Heritage Worth Saving. *The Christian Science Monitor* (January-May).
- Glass, James A. *The Beginnings of a National Historic Preservation Program, 1957 to 1959*. Nashville, Tennessee: American Association for State and Local History, 1990.
- Goble, Emerson. 1957. Architecture (?) for the National Parks. *Architectural Record* 121, no. 1 (January): 173-85.
- Greene, Linda Wedel. *Yosemite: The Park and Its Resources*. 3 vols. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1987.
- Gregory, Daniel P. *Cliff May and the Modern Ranch House*. New York: Rizzoli International, 2008.
- Greiff, Constance M. *Independence: The Creation of a National Park*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987.
- Haines, Aubrey L. *The Yellowstone Story*. 2 vols. Boulder, Colorado: Yellowstone Library and Museum Association in cooperation with Colorado Associated University Press, 1977.
- Hammons, Vernon L. *A Brief Organizational History of the Office of Design and Construction, National Park Service, 1917-1962*. Unpublished report. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, n.d.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

-----  
National Park Service Mission 66 Era Resources  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number 1 Page 112

- \_\_\_\_\_. "History Highlights, Office of Design and Construction, National Park Service," 1969. Copy on file at TIC, Denver Service Center, Denver, CO.
- Harpers Ferry Center. *The National Parks: Shaping the System*. Washington, DC: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center, 2005.
- Harrison, Laura Soulliere. *Architecture in the Parks: National Historic Landmark Theme Study*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1986.
- Hartzog, George B., Jr. *Battling for the National Parks*. Mount Kisco, New York: Moyer Bell, Ltd., 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1966. Mission 66 and Parkscape. *Historic Preservation* 18, no. 4 (August): 140-143.
- Hummel, Don. *Stealing the National Parks: The Destruction of Concessions and Public Access*. Bellevue, Washington: Free Enterprise Press, 1987.
- Ise, John. *Our National Park Policy: A Critical History*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1961.
- Lee, Ronald F. *Family Tree of the National Park System*. Philadelphia: Eastern National Park and Monument Association, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Public Use of the National Park System: 1872-2000*. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1968.
- Leopold, Aldo. *A Sand County Almanac, With Essays on Conservation From Round River*. [1949] New York: Ballantine Books, 1966.
- Lien, Carsten. *Olympic Battleground: The Power Politics of Timber Preservation*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1991.
- Mackintosh, Barry. *Interpretation in the National Park Service*. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The National Parks: Shaping the System*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Visitor Fees in the National Park System: A Legislative and Administrative History*. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1983.
- Madrid, Christine L. *The Mission 66 Visitor Centers: Early Modern Architecture in the National Park Service, 1956-1976*. Master of Architectural History Thesis, University of Virginia, 1998.
- McClelland, Linda Flint. *Presenting Nature: The Historic Landscape Design of the National Park Service, 1916 to 1942*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Building the National Parks*. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Miles, John C. *Guardians of the Parks: A History of the National Parks and Conservation Association*. Washington, D.C.: National Parks and Conservation Association, 1995.
- Mission 66 Research, Working Meeting" May 28-29, 2003, Washington, D.C., US Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Park Historic Structures and Cultural Landscapes Program.
- Monroe, Jonathan Searle. *Architecture in the National Parks: Cecil Doty and Mission 66*. Master of Architecture Thesis, University of Washington, 1986.
- Nash, Roderick. *Wilderness and the American Mind*. [1967] 3rd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982.
- Neel, Susan Rhoades. *Irreconcilable Differences: Reclamation, Preservation, and the Origins of the Echo Park Controversy*. Ph.D. Diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 1990.
- Noll, William N. *Mission 66: The National Park Service Program for the Revitalization of America's National Parks, 1955-1966*. Master of Arts Thesis, Kansas State University, 1997.
- Olsen, Russ. *Administrative History: Organizational Structures of the National Park Service 1917-1985*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1985.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

-----  
Name of Property

-----  
County and State

-----  
National Park Service Mission 66 Era Resources  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)  
-----

Section number 1 Page 113

- Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. *Outdoor Recreation for America: A Report to the President and to Congress by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962.
- Rettie, Dwight F. *Our National Park System: Caring for America's Greatest Natural and Historic Treasures*. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1995.
- Richardson, Elmo. *Dams, Parks and Politics*. Lexington, Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 1973.
- Ridenour, James M. *The National Parks Compromised: Pork Barrel Politics and America's Treasures*. Merrillville, Indiana: ICS Books, 1994.
- Rothman, Hal. *America's National Monuments: The Politics of Preservation*. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas by arrangement with the University of Illinois Press, 1989.
- Runte, Alfred. *National Parks: The American Experience*. [1979] Second Edition, Revised. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1987.
- Sellars, Richard West. *Preserving Nature in the National Parks: A History*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Simo, Melanie. *100 Years of Landscape Architecture: Some Patterns of a Century*. Washington, D.C.: ASLA Press, 1999.
- Stagner, Howard R. *The National Park Wilderness*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1957.
- Tilden, Freeman. *The National Parks: What They Mean to You and Me*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1951.
- Tolson, Hillory A. *Historic Listing of National Park Service Officials*. [1964], revised as 75th Anniversary Edition by Harold P. Danz. Denver: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Laws Relating to the National Park Service, the National Parks and Monuments*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1933.
- U.S. Department of the Interior. *Annual Reports of the Department of the Interior*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service. *EODC Handbook*. Government report. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Mission 66 for the National Park System*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Mission 66 in Action*. Brochure. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, n.d. [ca. 1957].
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Mission 66 Progress Report*. Government report. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Mission 66 Progress Report*. Government report. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Mission 66: Questions and Answers*. Brochure. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Mission 66 Report*. Unpublished report. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1955.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The National Park Service: 1916-1966*. Brochure. Washington D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Our Heritage, A Plan for Its Protection and Use: Mission 66*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Our Vanishing Shoreline*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, n.d. [1957].
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Parks for America: A Study of Park and Related Resources in the Fifty States, and a Preliminary Plan*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
**Continuation Sheet**

.....  
Name of Property

.....  
County and State

.....  
National Park Service Mission 66 Era Resources  
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Section number   1   Page  114 

- ..... *Report of the National Park Service Mission 66 Frontiers Conference*. Unpublished report. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1961.
- ..... *Standard Plans for Employee Housing*. Unpublished report. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, n.d. [1957].
- ..... *That the Past Shall Live*. Washington, D.C., n.d. [1959].
- ..... *Visitor Center Planning: Notes on Discussions Held in EODC November 18-22, 1957, and WODC February 4-6, 1958*. Unpublished report. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, n.d. [1958].
- ..... *Your Mission 66 and the National Parks: A Passport to Adventure*. Brochure. Washington, D.C.: Phillips Petroleum Company, n.d.
- Udall, Stewart L. *The Quiet Crisis*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.
- Vint, Thomas C. 1946. National Park Service Master Plans. *Planning and Civic Comment* (April/June).
- Winks, Robin W. *Laurance S. Rockefeller: Catalyst for Conservation*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 1997.
- Wirth, Conrad L. An Adequate National Park System for 300 Million People. In: *American Planning and Civic Annual*, Harlean James, ed., Washington, D.C.: American Planning and Civic Association, 1955.
- ..... 1958. Mission 66 in the Headlines. *National Parks Magazine* 32, no. 132 (January): 8-9, 36-38.
- ..... *Parks, Politics, and the People*. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980.
- ..... and Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr. *A Survey of the Recreational Resources of the Colorado River Basin*. [1946] Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1950.
- ..... and Howard Stagner. *Mission 66 Revisited*. Unpublished report. Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1976.
- Workman, Bryce R. *National Park Service Uniforms: The Developing Years, 1932-1970*. Harpers Ferry, West Virginia: National Park Service, Harpers Ferry Center, 1998.
- Zube, Ervin H., Joseph H. Crystal, and James F. Palmer. *Visitor Center Design Evaluation*. Unpublished report. Denver: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1976.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES  
EVALUATION/RETURN SHEET

REQUESTED ACTION: COVER DOCUMENTATION

MULTIPLE National Park Service Mission 66 Era Resources MPS  
NAME:

STATE & COUNTY: NATIONWIDE, Multiple Counties

DATE RECEIVED: 08/14/15

DATE OF PENDING LIST:

DATE OF 16<sup>th</sup> DAY:

DATE OF 45<sup>th</sup> DAY:

09/30/15

REFERENCE NUMBER: 64501248

REASONS FOR REVIEW:

APPEAL: N DATA PROBLEM: N LANDSCAPE: N LESS THAN 50 YEARS: N  
OTHER: N PDIL N PERIOD: N PROGRAM UNAPPROVED: N  
REQUEST: Y SAMPLE: N SLR DRAFT: N NATIONAL: N

COMMENT WAIVER: N

ACCEPT  RETURN  REJECT 9/30/2015 DATE

ABSTRACT/SUMMARY COMMENTS:

RECOM./CRITEREA

REVIEWER [Signature]

DISCIPLINE History

TELEPHONE 202-354-2003

DATE 9/30/2015

DOCUMENTATION see attsched comments Y/N

If a nomination is returned to the nominating authority, the nomination is no longer under consideration by the NPS.



United States Department of the Interior  
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE  
INTERMOUNTAIN REGION  
History Program  
P.O. Box 728, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505-0728



H-32

August 12, 2015

To: Associate Director, Cultural Resources (WASO-3128)  
Attention: Chief Historian, Park History (WASO-2261)  
From: Historic Preservation Programs Manager, Intermountain Regional Office

Subject: Approval of the National Register of Historic Places Nomination Multiple Property Documentation Form for National Park Service Mission 66 Era Resources

The Intermountain Region has contracted for the completion of a National Register of Historic Places Nomination Multiple Property Documentation Form for National Park Service Mission 66 Era Resources.

The nomination has undergone regional office(s) and WASO Park History Office review. The nomination provides a comprehensive historical context for the National Park Service's Mission 66 Era and National Register, Mission 66 Associated Property Types registration requirements for nominating Mission 66 resources in National Park Service units.

I support and recommend the listing of the National Register of Historic Places Nomination Multiple Property Documentation Form for National Park Service Mission 66 Era Resources on the National Register of Historic Places.

Should you have any questions, please call me at 505-988-6847.

Sam Tamburro  
Historic Preservation Program Manager, Intermountain Regional Office

Enclosures



# United States Department of the Interior

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE  
1849 C Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20240

**RECEIVED 2280**

**AUG 14 2015**

**Nat. Register of Historic Places  
National Park Service**

August 13, 2015

## Memorandum

To: Acting Keeper of the National Register of Historic Places

From: Deputy Federal Preservation Officer, National Park Service *Richard A. Smith*

Subject: National Park Service Mission 66 Era Resources Multiple Property  
Submission Cover Document

I am forwarding MPS cover documentation for National Park Service Mission 66 Era Resources. This cover document provides a comprehensive, nationwide historic context for nominating Mission 66 resources in National Park Service units. The document was completed through a contract with the Intermountain Region, and the Park History Program has reviewed the document. We have found the cover document to establish a framework for evaluation of individual properties in the period 1945-1972, which includes the Parkscape USA construction program of 1967-1972, under Criteria A, B, and C, and Criterion Consideration G.