NPS Form 10-900
(Rev. 8-86)

OMB No. 1024-0018

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Registration Form

RECEIVED
MAR 28 1991
NATIONAL REGISTER

This form is for use in nominating or requesting determinations of eligibility for individual properties or districts. See instructions in *Guidelines for Completing National Register Forms* (National Register Bulletin 16). Complete each item by marking "x" in the appropriate box or by entering the requested information. If an item does not apply to the property being documented, enter "N/A" for "not applicable." For functions, styles, materials, and areas of significance, enter only the categories and subcategories listed in the instructions. For additional space use continuation sheets (Form 10-900a). Type all entries.

1. Name of Property

historic name: Baltimore-Washington Parkway

other names/site number: n/a

2. Location

street & number: D.C. border near the Anacostia River, northeast to just below Jessup Road (MD 175) [ ] not for publication [x] vicinity

city, town:

state: Maryland code: MD county: Prince Georges code: 033 zip code:
Anne Arundel code: 003

3. Classification

Ownership of Property	Category of Property	Number of Resources within Property	
		Contributing	Noncontributing
[ ] private	[ ] building(s)		buildings
[ ] public-local	[x] district		sites
[ ] public-State	[ ] site	ca.125	4 structures
[x] public-Federal	[ ] structure		objects
	[ ] object	ca.125	4 Total

Name of related multiple property listing:
Parkways of the National Capital Region, 1913-1965

Number of contributing resources previously listed in the National Register 0

4. State/Federal Agency Certification

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

Edward Bacon — March 22, 1991

Signature of certifying official — Date

Chief Historian

State or Federal agency and bureau

In my opinion, the property [ ] meets [ ] does not meet the National Register criteria. [ ] See continuation sheet.

Signature of commenting or other official — Date

State or Federal agency and bureau

5. National Park Service Certification

I, hereby, certify that this property is:

[x] entered in the National Register. [ ] See continuation sheet. — Patrick Andrus — 5/9/91

[ ] determined eligible for the National Register. [ ] See continuation sheet.

[ ] determined not eligible for the National Register.

[ ] removed from the National Register.

[ ] other, (explain:) _____

for Signature of the Keeper — Date of Action

4. STATE/FEDERAL AGENCY CERTIFICATION

In my opinion, the property meets the National Register criteria.

Signature of commenting or other official — Date 1/19/91

State Historic Preservation Officer
State or Federal agency and bureau

6. Function or Use

Historic Functions (enter categories from instructions)	Current Functions (enter categories from instructions)
TRANSPORTATION/vehicle-road related	TRANSPORTATION/vehicle-road related
" /parkway	" /parkway

7. Description

Architectural Classification (enter categories from instructions)	Materials (enter categories from instructions)
OTHER/parkways	foundation
" /NPS landscape architecture	walls
	roof
	other steel, asphalt/concrete, stone native vegetation

Describe present and historic physical appearance.

SUMMARY DESCRIPTION

The federal portion of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway is coterminus with its historic right-of-way boundaries: extending northeast from the eastern border of the District of Columbia near the Anacostia River, through Prince Georges County and Anne Arundel County, Maryland, encompassing 1,353 acres. The nineteen-mile federally owned and maintained section of the parkway terminates just below Jessup Road (MD 175) at the Baltimore City line. The irregular right-of-way is 400 to 800 feet wide, and contains the dual-lane roadway, a variable-width median of 15 to 200 feet, a flanking buffer of natural forest and cultivated native vegetation, scores of culverts, and twenty-two bridges. The terrain is composed of generally forested, gentle hills with modest vistas but no outstanding scenic features. Although promoted since the early twentieth century, construction was not initiated by the federal Bureau of Public Roads until 1942, with most development occurring from 1950-54. Its design as a defense highway and alternative commuter route thus blends foundling parkway characteristics of landscape architecture and materials with post-war economies, so that stylistically it represents the end of a fifty-year continuum of parkway construction. The historic district includes inestimable contributing elements of landscape architecture and approximately 125 contributing structures, including eighteen bridges and numerous culverts with decorated headwalls.

DEVELOPMENT AND HISTORY

One of the earliest proposals for treatment of the land through which the Baltimore-Washington Parkway is routed came from Charles Ellicott, who would continue to influence regional development for decades to come. In American Forestry magazine (1910), he recommends the

[X] See continuation sheet

creation of a National Capital Forest "beginning at the bounding line of the District of Columbia at Bladensburg and extending northeast nearly twenty miles until it crosses the Patuxent River. . . ," and extending east toward Annapolis for a total of about 100,000 acres. This vast young forest of "hardwood and pine," should be the object of applied forestry and rehabilitation, as it contained "a variety of species difficult to find in any other area of equal size."[1]

More than a decade later, he expanded and refined the vision to include control of the natural topography with reforestation and reclamation, provisions for an arboretum, and "plans for boulevards or parkways passing thru (sic) or along the sides of the proposed reservation, connecting Washington, Baltimore and Annapolis, also other roads, bridle paths and trails." This system would consist of portions of existing roads, and link up with park arrangements in Baltimore and Washington.[2]

The region through which the parkway would eventually be constructed was "gently rolling in character, the highest elevation but a little over 300 feet above sea level," and containing numerous streams and a good deal of marshy land.[3]

In the 1920s, the first substantial discussion of a "boulevard" or parkway between Baltimore and Washington addressed three much-publicized needs: to alleviate the traffic congestion on U.S. Route 1/Baltimore-Washington Boulevard, "a byword for unsightly signs and constructions"; construction of "a protected parkway figuring as the local link of the great eastern North-South highway through the two cities"; and the establishment of a ceremonial approach into Washington.[4] (In the next decade, additional criteria would arise, such as establishing access to suburban-based federal facilities, and creating a defense/military thoroughfare.) Many interested parties voiced an opinion: the Baltimore-based Manufacturer's Record and local newspapers, the American Society of Landscape Architects, and government agencies--D.C.'s Office of Public Buildings and Public Parks (OPB&PP, which merged with the National Park Service in 1933), the Commission on Fine Arts, and the Maryland State Roads Commission.

---

[1] William M. Ellicott, "A National Forest," and F.W. Besley, "A Report on the Washington Forest," reprint from American Forestry (June 1910), p. 5.

[2] Stephen Child and William Ellicott, "Report of the American Society of Landscape Architects on National Forest and Regional Plan, Washington, D.C." (February 1921) RG 66, Box 27.

[3] Ibid Child and Ellicott.

[4] "Report to the Baltimore Chapter A.I.A. by its Committee on National Capital Regional Plan (27 May, 1936).

X *See continuation sheet*

Several variations on the parkway theme were proposed.[5] OPB&PP Director Clarence O. Sherrill envisioned a parkway spanning 100 to 1,000 feet for light, high-speed traffic, with no rail or auto crossings:

> It would seem very desirable to me to work out, in connection with the extension of the National Capital Park system, a real park boulevard connecting Washington and Baltimore entirely independent of the present turnpike, . . .to have such boulevard confined to passenger traffic and of such width as to provide ample tree space; to construct it preferably with two roadways, having parking in the middle and also on either side, . . .follow the contours of the land so far as possible to acquire reasonable grades. . . There should be utilized for the route the forested valleys and branches of the streams between Washington and Baltimore, . . .the Anacostia River, the Patuxent, the Little Patuxent, the Middle Patuxent and the tributaries of the Patapsco.[6]

Similarly, landscape architect T.C. Jeffers proscribed a "high-speed" road within a right-of-way of 300 to 1,700 feet wide as an "essential route for rapid and uninterrupted travel" among federal offices and parks.[7]

The Washington Times, too, supported the "proposed parkway boulevard between Washington and Baltimore [that] would not only meet the increasing needs of traffic, but would provide a magnificent entrance to the National Capital."[8] The military significance of such a road, linking Forts Myer and Howard, Camp Meade and the Naval Academy in Annapolis, also surfaced as an enticement "to move the administration to help finance it as a war insurance measure." This argument failed here, but ultimately became the impetus for successful construction of Suitland Parkway during World War II.[9]

---

[5] Nolen to Demaray (4 March, 1948) RG 328. The name was always intended to be Baltimore-Washington, because of the many visitors coming to the capital, and it was felt "that name would serve to interest Maryland in completing its part of the route beyond Fort Meade."

[6] "Public Not Yet Awake to Full Needs of Highway Expansion," Manufacturer's Record (26 November, 1925); C.O. Sherrill to Victor H. Power (23 October, 1925). RG 328.

[7] T.C. Jeffers, "Baltimore Parkway: Its Purpose and Relation to U.S. Department of Agriculture Property in Vicinity o Beltsville" (4 June, 1935).

[8] Editorial, "For Washington-Baltimore Parkway Boulevard, Washington Wants It," Washington Times (17 October, 1925).

[9] Victor Power to C.O. Sherrill (21 October, 1925); Wm. M. Ellicott to Frederick A. Delano (21 October, 1925). RG 328.

X *See continuation sheet*

None of these road schemes would have an administrative means for completion, however, until 1926 when the National Capital Park and Planning Commission was created (to replace its 2-year-old predecessor, the National Capital Park Commission). The NCP&PC's all-important mission was to "provide for the comprehensive, systematic, and continuous development of park, parkway, and playground systems of the National Capital."[10] Chaired by Frederic Delano, president of the American Planning and Civic Association (and FDR's uncle), the NCP&PC would become a major determiner of urban aesthetics during expansion of the Washington metropolitan area.

Jay Downer, an engineer, and Gilmore D. Clarke, a landscape architect, were specialists in urban planning and served as consultants for the development of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway. In New York, Downer had been chief engineer with the Bronx River Parkway Commission and the Westchester County Park Commission, which earned him honorary membership in the American Society of Landscape Architects.

Clarke was a consulting landscape architect on the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway and its model, the Westchester parkway system, until 1935. He then established a practice in New York with Michael Rapuano, and concurrently served as dean of Cornell University's College of Architecture for many years. Clarke served on Washington's Commission of Fine Arts from 1932-50, for thirteen years as chairman.

Thomas C. Jeffers, Sr., (1889-1952) served as principal landscape architect for most of the Washington parkway system. He also worked in the Olmsted Brothers' Massachusetts office for six years prior to joining the OPB&PP in 1923, then went with the NCP&PC when it was created in 1926. Jeffers's twenty-six-year career included the design of the George Washington Memorial, Suitland, and Rock Creek and Potomac parkways, as well as Anacostia Park, and he was a consultant to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission.[11]

NCP&PC planner Charles Eliot, II, was descended from a family of landscape architects. His father worked with the Olmsted Brothers and is credited with founding the first metropolitan system of parks in Boston.[12] Two others who contributed to development of the Baltimore-Washington

---

[10] Cited in Frederick Gutheim, Worthy of the Nation (National Capital Planning Commission, 1977), p. 169.

[11] L.Z., "Thomas C. Jeffers Sr., A Biographical Minute," Landscape Architecture, vol. 42, no. 4 (July 1952), p. 173.

[12] Newton, Design on the Land, p. 389.

X See continuation sheet

Parkway in later years were Harry T. Thompson, associate superintendent of the National Capital Parks, and Domenico Aunese, NPS landscape architect from 1946-51. William Housmann was architect of the bridges, which were designed during the war years. Collectively and continuously, these men directed the planning, design, and implementation of Washington's park and parkway system.

> The 1926 act vested powers in the National Capital Park and Planning Commission to prepare a comprehensive plan, but parkways to and through the city remained the dominant themes in the agency's work program.[13]

In 1928, architect and NCP&PC member Milton Medary espoused the landscaped-parkway ideal as an entry to the city: "He spoke highly of the approach to Washington from Baltimore by way of the Anacostia valley" route, among others.[14] This northerly approach was a particular eyesore, according to an AIA assessment, which noted that "no other great Capital in the world is approached through such unattractive surroundings as those encircling Washington on the Maryland side."[15] About the same time, Eliot urged parkway connections between Oxen Run and the Eastern Branch of the Anacostia River, and encouraged a riverside drive on the Virginia shore similar to that of the Potomac Palisades Parkway--as well as the encircling Fort Drive circuit that would never materialize. Addressing the Anacostia Park development, his 1927 report to the NCP&PC confirms that discussion of a regional connection had been ongoing for many years:

> Between Washington and Baltimore, a number of parkway routes have variously been suggested. The valley of the Eastern Branch offers the opportunity to combine a parkway route with provision of park and play space for the rapidly growing communities along the present Baltimore Boulevard. A parkway from Baltimore and Camp Meade through the valley of Indian Creek and the Eastern Branch might properly enter the Anacostia River Park at the District Line and lead the visitor to the Nation's Capital by the Training School and Arboretum.[16]

After years of debate over location, construction of the new National Arboretum commenced in 1927 between Mount Hamilton, Hickey Hill, and Anacostia Park. Both Anacostia Park and the

---

[13] Ibid., p. 170-71.

[14] Ibid., p. 196.

[15] "Report to Baltimore Chapter A.I.A. by its Committee on National Capital Regional Plan" (27 May, 1936), p. 1.

[16] Charles W. Eliot II, "Preliminary Report: Park System for the National Capital Washington Region" (February 1927), p. 13.

X *See continuation sheet*

Arboretum represent links in the park system dependent upon parkways for access. (In fact, in 1945 it was proposed that Arboretum staff take responsibility for planting and maintenance of the parkway to provide "a very considerable extension of its present territory"; a concept all parties agreed upon, but that apparently was never implemented.[17]) Anacostia Park also contains the related Kenilworth Aquatic Gardens, and was slated to contain a connector parkway heading south along the Potomac River. This development along the D.C.-Maryland line spurred officials from both jurisdictions to seek a cooperative regional agreement.

In Maryland, where complementary planning and legislation was required if the definition of regional byways was to be fulfilled, William M. Ellicott early on urged the undertaking of a very large park system with a parkway component. He wrote:

> I am strongly urging cooperative planning and park and suburban development between Baltimore and Washington and the linking up of drives which may be made to follow stream valleys and forest lands[:] Roads along various branches of the Patuxent, the Patapsco, and the Falls of the Potomac. . . .[18]

By June 1928, according to a newspaper account, the Maryland State Roads Commission had re-evaluated its appraisal of only five years earlier--that an additional Baltimore-to-Washington road was unnecessary--and predicted that within a decade the proposed "boulevard" would be in place; constructed by the state and on which commercial traffic was to be banned.[19] This assessment was based on the fact that the state could not singlehandedly afford to build a new road through Prince Georges and Anne Arundel counties, so after the federal portion was determined, "the State Highway Department of Maryland at a subsequent date picked up the conception of a parkway on to Baltimore. . .more or less hitching their wagon to a star."[20]

The Maryland-National Capital Park & Planning Commission (MNCP&PC) was created in 1927 to represent portions of Montgomery and Prince Georges counties and complement the NCP&PC. Endowed with the power to acquire land and levy taxes, the commission's tasks were greatly influenced by the author of its comprehensive plan, planner and engineer Irving R. Root. Later, in 1943, legislation was passed that gave the state the power to acquire or condemn needed land "for

---

[17] U.S. Grant to Frederic A. Delano, "Baltimore Parkway, Extension of Arboretum" (20 March, 1945).

[18] Wm. Ellicott to Mr. Coldren (June 13, 1928) RG 328.

[19] "New Washington Road Predicted," Baltimore Sun (June 1928). RG 328.

[20] Hearings before the Committee on Public Works on H.R. 5990, No. 81-10 (1-2 February, 1950), p. 16.

X See continuation sheet

the construction of a parkway, highway, motorway or freeway between the City of Washington, D.C., and the City of Baltimore. . . ."[21]

The NCP&PC advocated the parkway project in its annual reports from 1926 to 1929, but the vehicle for the federally owned portion--as far north as Camp Meade--came in 1930 with the Capper-Cramton Act (H.R. 26). Ulysses S. Grant, III, head of the NCP&PC, recognized the potential of the bill to finance a model parkway that would increase the region's tax base, while recognizing the project as a cooperative effort between federal and state authorities:

> There seems to be great opportunity for a parkway similar to the Bronx Parkway in Westchester County, New York, between Washington and Baltimore, following up the Anacostia River and its tributaries. Such a parkway would be a source of delight to a great many people and I believe of economic benefit to the country it would cross. . . . The federal government is ready to do a part in such a project in the immediate vicinity of the National Capital, but evidently Baltimore and Maryland will have to do the rest.[22]

Conrad Wirth, of the NPS and the NCP&PC, contacted the Baltimore Board of Park Commissioners for this reason, "regarding the possibility of drawing up a complete plan showing the possibilities of such a [road, though conceding that] the Washington-Baltimore Parkway is still some distance away."[23]

The approximate route of the parkway was mapped out as early as 1927. It extends out from a well-developed Anacostia River and Bladensburg-area park, and culminates in a proposed Patuxent River valley park; along the way, the linear parkway clings to the east flank of the B&O Railway right-of-way, traversing about ten miles of existing federal and District property owners.[24]

One option readily defeated as impractical was to widen the existing Washington-Baltimore Boulevard, rather than build the parkway anew. Widening and rebuilding had already occurred

---

[21] Laws of Maryland 1943, Chapter 644, filed 29 September, 1944.

[22] U.S. Grant, III, to William Ellicott (21 June, 1930).

[23] Conrad Wirth to William Morris (11 December, 1930) RG 328.

[24] NCP&PC and Charles Eliot, "Park System for National Capital Washington Region, Project C, Baltimore Camp Meade Parkway (February 1927). RG 66.

X See continuation sheet

once during the 1930s, and many felt it would be the more expensive choice because of the high price of abutting land that was already littered with roadside development: an estimated $1,000 per developed acre compared to $20 per acre for new land.[25] Another reason for creating two distinct roads was the segregation of commercial and non-commercial traffic, for it was the "large amount of passenger car traffic which now congests this route, which when mixed with the commercial traffic, makes that route so hazardous."[26] For many years Route 1 was blamed for having "one of the highest accident and fatality rates of any comparable highways in this country."[27]

The proposal for a Baltimore-Annapolis-Washington wilderness area was revived in the early 1930s when the U.S. Forest Service received an emergency fund of $20 million to purchase lands for a national forest. It also was thought of as a convenient vehicle with which to expediate parkway construction, by using Civilian Conservation Corps labor and avoiding a special appropriation.[28] The forest scheme was also advocated as a form of disguising the parkway's taking lines then being studied, so as to avoid purposeful inflation of land prices in the selected right of way.[29] By this time, however, there had been substantial publicity about the parkway and its route between the two cities, and this could not have been construed as a serious ruse.

Despite the years' discussion of the parkway, the Public Roads Administration cited the first real efforts toward construction as a MNCP&PC report of 1937. In "Regional Planning, Baltimore-Washington-Annapolis Area," traffic-survey statistics show that nearly 80 percent of travelers had locations in Maryland, Virgina or Washington, as their origin or destination. The parkway, as proposed in the report, commenced at the D.C. boundary and Anacostia Creek, running north through the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Beltsville facility, west of Fort Meade, and on to Baltimore; new rights-of-way were recommended, as was immediate construction financed with federal assistance--perhaps through the Federal Aid Highway Act. The next year, a reconnaissance survey of the proposed area was undertaken by the Bureau of Public Roads, which determined three potential routes for the parkway.[30]

---

[25] Fisher to Ellicott.

[26] John Nolen Jr. to Samuel Lauver (31 May, 1944).

[27] Secretary of the Interior to George E. Dondero (14 April, 1948).

[28] Ward Shepard, "Proposed National Forest between Washington and Baltimore" (28 May, 1933).

[29] D.K. Este Fisher Jr. to William Ellicott (28 February 1935).

[30] H.J. Spelman, "Baltimore Parkway" (28 August, 1944), p. 2. RG 328.

X *See continuation sheet*

> Later on, informal agreement was reached that the Bureau of Public Roads would develop surveys between Washington and the northern limits of Fort Meade, and that the Maryland Roads Commission would develop surveys between that point and Baltimore. . . . From Jessups Road to Baltimore the Maryland State Roads Commission had charge of the construction of a modern freeway as part of their regular Federal-aid program.[31]

As late as the 1940s, when authorities continued to ponder the route question, interested parties including the Prince Georges County Citizens Association, Prince Georges County Federation of Certified Associations, and the MNCP&PC endorsed this path as one that would best serve the county. The MNCP&PC passed a resolution reasserting that the parkway "vitally affects the future planning of this commission for the metropolitan area and is of particular benefit and great interest to the citizens of Prince Georges County."[32]

The extent of the parkway envisioned in the 1940s was more extensive than that ultimately constructed, due in large part to the failure of other park and parkway elements such as the Fort Drive, an extension of Constitution Avenue, and a southerly Maryland branch of the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

Its planning continued during the early 40s, with construction slated for the five-year period beginning at war's end. All surveys, plans, and supervision of construction were conducted by the Bureau of Public Roads (now Federal Highway Administration); landscape and architectural features were designed by NPS staff; general plans were approved by the NCP&PC, and structures were approved by the National Fine Arts Commission, at the time chaired by Gilmore Clarke. Local road changes were approved by the Maryland State Roads Commission and MNCP&PC.[33]

The war was one justification "for an express highway joining the National Capital with a series of federal installations to the northeast, culminating at Fort Meade. . . . The Commission selected a route going largely through grounds already owned by the federal government, so as to reduce the cost of the right-of-way to a minimum."[34] The designation of 'expressway' is aprapo in this context,

---

[31] Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads, "Final Construction Report, Vol. 2: Roadway, Baltimore-Washington Parkway" (n.d. 1955), p. 6. Located FHWA final construction report files, Arlington, Va.

[32] MNCP&PC, "Resolution" (6 April, 1944), RG 328.

[33] Department of Commerce, "Final Construction Report," vol. 2, p. 12.

[34] U.S. Grant to George Dondero (3 February, 1950)

X See continuation sheet

for historically one important parkway characteristic is that its composition be of new and undeveloped land that is as remote as possible--for scenic and economic reasons. As the parkway exists today, it is a combination of expressway and parkway qualities.

Among the facilities and the employees that the parkway intentionally served were the Agricultural Research Center (2,500 workers) and Fort Meade (10,000 residents); Schrom Airport (near Greenbelt) and Baltimore Friendship Airport; the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge (50 persons), the D.C. Home for Feeble-minded Children and, in the District, the National Training School for Boys (900 persons), and the new site of the National Arboretum. Most important in the post-war context of organized housing and park land, is Greenbelt (more than 7,000 persons).

The latter was built as a model planned garden community, one of a trio of "greenbelt" residential areas developed by the Resettlement Administration as a model solution to the nation's critical housing shortage. The Washington region was selected as the first site because there were no existing housing vacancies and rental costs were 30 percent higher than comparable cities. The location was determined not only for an absence of significant development, but because the adjacent landowner, the Agriculture Department, agreed to purchase the property for its experimental farm if the housing project failed. Construction of the crescent-shaped Greenbelt commenced in 1936, and the first tenants moved in a year later.[35]

The novelty of Greenbelt was--and remains--its network of neighborhood units, interior parks and walkways, and segregated vehicular and pedestian circulation. In addition to a noteworthy layout, it features an 1,100-acre park directly accessed from the parkway. Although the Greenbelt Park operated by the NPS-NCR today is not as fully developed as designers of the '40s had planned, it contains many of the elements. According to a proposed plan, the parkway was to bisect the park with visitor services provided on both flanks, including an eighteen-hole golf course; organized and tourist camp areas; and recreation, picnic, and hiking areas.[36] Today the park is largely undeveloped, offering tent camping, picnic sites, and hiking trails; it carries on the integrated park, parkway, and suburban development idealized by urban planners at the time. Greenbelt's distinctive feature was its parkland buffer, "a safeguard against haphazard development," that could be used for

[35] Mary Lou Williamson, ed., Greenbelt: History of a New Town, 1937-1987 (Norfolk/Virginia Beach: Donning Co., 1987), p. 25.

[36] T.C. Jeffers, "Study of Proposed Park and Recreation Development, Greenbelt Area" (August 1949). RG 79.

X See continuation sheet

gardening, recreation, or future development.[37]

When Greenbelt was conceived, there was little significant private development along the Washington-Baltimore corridor. A 1940 real estate atlas of Prince Georges County shows the parkway occupying the least-developed stretch of land between the District (east) and Anne Arundel (west) lines, and between the Pennsylvania Railway (south) and Route 1 (north). Residential subdivisions in the Riverdale area were thick along the east flank of Route 1, with the town of Cheverly beginning to expand outward; Greenbelt remained the lone subdivision at the north end of the parkway route through the county.[38]

That housing subdivisions the likes of Riverdale, Bladensburg, and Greenbelt were beginning to dominate the countryside on Washington's outskirts, is evidence of the new role of the car and regional road systems, affording the "greater possibility of decentralized habitation and recreation."[39] More than twenty years later, the same conclusion was drawn in a report on the Baltimore-Washington region:

> The most significant finding. . .is that transportation is not the dominant or controlling factor in shaping our cities. With the mobility provided by the automobile, the urban dweller has, for all practical purposes, been freed of distance limitations in his choice of a place to live.[40]

The Baltimore-Washington Parkway certainly had a positive impact on economic development in Prince Georges County--and in particular along this northeast corridor--although it is impossible to determine how much of it is in addition to that which would have occurred naturally. One report predicted that "the fantastic growth in the Baltimore-Washington area since the end of World War II is but a sample of things to come."[41]

---

[37] Williamson, p. 31.

[38] Plat Book of Prince George's County, Maryland, vol. 1 (Philadelphia: Franklin Survey Co., 1940).

[39] Nolen and Hubbard, Parkways and Land Values, Harvard City Planning Studies XI (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937), introduction.

[40] National Capital, and Baltimore Regional Planning Councils, "Baltimore-Washington Interregional Study" (late 1960s?), p. 1.

[41] National Capital, and Baltimore Regional Planning Councils, "Baltimore-Washington Interregional Study" (no date, late 1960s?), p. 1. RG 328.

X *See continuation sheet*

Historically, the economic impact of a parkway on a region is founded on a tax-base expansion that might otherwise not exist, balanced against federal acquisition of land that diminishes the amount of taxable property. The built-in advantage to the Baltimore-Washington Parkway centered on existing government ownership of about one-third of the land over which it was routed. In terms of regional economics, since there was no optional and taxable use for the abutting property, the parkway could only represent an asset to the area.

The more typical circumstances of the Westchester (NY) parkway system reveal certain absolute new growth. Overall county growth rose 585 percent between 1910-32, while growth in the "affected area" of the parkway rose 1,278 percent during the same period. This gain "was the result of the interaction of the parkway or any other specific element," including the character and growth of the population.[42] Evidence on behalf of the Bronx River system shows "the parkway at least participated in creating gains and that the measure of its participation was greater in the narrower strip adjacent to it."[43]

Private industry, federal agencies, residential subdivisions, and transportation entities that subsequently situated near the parkway recognized that "the zones along the corridor of transportation routes leading to Baltimore have the highest [potential-growth] values in the county."[44] Since the 1950s, Prince Georges County and Doctor's Hospitals have been built nearby, as was Baltimore-Washington International Airport. During the late 1940s, a review of sites for an airport to serve the increasing number of personal and business aircraft revealed not only that fast access to the capital was a priority, but the future need for airports "must be met largely outside the more densely developed suburban sections in Montgomery and Prince Georges counties in Maryland and in Fairfax, Virginia."[45] Today, some of the county's largest clusters of office and research-and-development buildings--in Beltsville, Greenbelt, Laurel--rely on the parkway for arterial access.[46]

---

[42] Nolen and Hubbard, p. 93-94.

[43] Nolen and Hubbard, p. 93.

[44] Franz Vidor and Richard Kraft, "Preliminary Draft of the Baltimore-Washington Interregional Study Report" (30 June, 1960), p. 13. RG 328.

[45] NCP&PC Coordinating Committee, "A Preliminary Study of Possible Sites for One or More Airports for Personal Aircraft in the District of Columbia" (January 1948).

[46] Prince Georges County Economic Develpment Corporation, "Prince George's County, Maryland: Survey of Office and R&D Buildings" (December 1987).

X *See continuation sheet*

Similarly, the latest federal organizations to locate directly adjacent to the parkway are the National Security Agency and NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center.

In 1969 the parkway was briefly designated as a component of Interstate 295; and in 1982 it was dedicated to Gladys Noon Spellman, a former congresswoman from Maryland who died in 1988.

LEGISLATION

The history of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway's enabling legislation and funding is closely tied to the evolution of the American highway program as a whole. It also reflects the changing role of roads, from pleasure-vehicle use to one of speed and convenience--and the Baltimore-Washington Parkway's ultimate function as a little of each.

Just as automobiles spurred the development of recreation-oriented parkways, they instigated a series of highway offices and schemes. The Office of Public Roads and Rural Engineering was formed in 1916, within which was a division devoted to national park and forest roads. The same year, the Federal-Aid Road Act appropriated $75 million to help the states finance construction or improvement of public roads used for mail delivery. The bill also provided $1 million annually, for ten years, for the construction of highways in, or partially in, national forests. An amended Federal Highway Act of 1921 largely retained the features of the earlier act; and in 1939 the Office of Public Roads was removed to jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency and it was renamed the Public Roads Administration. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 authorized $500 million a year for the first three post-war years; use of federal aid for urban areas; and specified a National System of Interstate Highways up to 40,000 miles. In 1949 the Public Roads Administration was transfered from the Agriculture Department to the Commerce Department.[47]

Specific to parkway development, short-lived federal legislation was enacted in 1934 in which each state was required to spend not less than 1 percent of federal highway funds for "appropriate landscaping of parkways and highway roadsides," but in 1940 a new bill allowed for the acquisition of "strips of land necessary for the restoration, preservation, and enhancement of scenic beauty adjacent to scenic highways."[48]

---

[47] Truman Strobridge, Records of the Bureau of Public Roads, No. 134 (Washington, D.C.: National Archives, 1962), pp. 2-5; Department of Transportation, America's Highways 1776-1976, p. 456, 487.

[48] U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Scenic Byways '88 (April 1988), p. xiii.

X See continuation sheet

Authorization for the NCP&PC to acquire land and rights-of-way for this and other parkways dates to the Capper-Cramton Act of 1930. This presented a financial dilemma for Maryland, which wanted to complete the parkway on up to Baltimore, for the legislation says "the United States is not to share in. . .the cost of construction of roads [in Maryland] except if and as Federal aid highways."[49] Parkways, by banning trucks and therefore excluding the entire class of commercial traffic, were ineligible for this aid package. In 1944, however, Public Roads Administration Commissioner Thomas MacDonald reported that, "We now have authority to add to Federal Aid Highways any parkway so designated by the State Highway Department."[50] Ultimately, the federal government paid half the cost of the $15 million Maryland-owned portion of the parkway. To facilitate acquisition of the parkway land, Maryland enacted a blanket consent giving the U.S. government the right to buy, condemn, and receive any land or easements through the MNCP&PC "for the construction of a parkway, highway, motorway or freeway" between Baltimore and D.C. [51]

After nearly three decades of delays, the parkway project finally got underway on 9 September, 1942. Under presidential directive, the Public Roads Administration received a $2 million appropriation of unobligated National Industrial Recovery Act funds to purchase nongovernment-owned right-of-way for the parkway, and to construct it as a national defense measure, primarily to serve Fort Meade.

> At the time this move was initiated, the officials of the State of Maryland were called in and asked if they would cooperate, . . .that they would continue the highway on to Baltimore. The officials of Maryland agreed to do this.[52]

According to this agenda, the parkway was to be completed in 1945-47. Yet, two years later little progress had been recorded. In addition to the war-related conservation of materials, the NCP&PC and Public Roads Administration were still unable to agree on a route for the parkway, or on the nature of traffic to use it.[53]

---

[49] Capper-Cramton Act (Public-No. 284--71st Congress. (29 May, 1930)

[50] NCP&PC Minutes (16-17 March, 1944).

[51] Laws of Maryland 1943, Chapter 644, Section 1-31A.

[52] Congressional Record--House, vol. 96, no. 103, 81st Congress/2nd session (15 May, 1950), p. 7126.

[53] Minutes of the NCP&PC (17-18 February, 1944), RG 328. Thre was also concern that the funds would be lost if not used by 30 June of that year.

X *See continuation sheet*

In an effort to refuel the project, bills were introduced in 1948 to dually fund the Baltimore-Washington and Suitland parkways as defense projects to access Camp Springs. The NCP&PC, which considered them "essential elements in a comprehensive and coordinated plan of parkways" for the region, supported it. But "because the Suitland Parkway is already laid and paved on one roadway, whereas the Baltimore-Washington Parkway would require many millions to complete or make usable," the projects were divorced from one another and subsequent legislation was quickly approved for the former road.[54]

Later that year H.R. 5990 was introduced in Congress, which authorized completion of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway and removed its control from the Bureau of Public Roads to the National Park Service. During 1950 hearings on the bill before the Committee on Public Works, it was reported that all the Maryland-owned portion had been surveyed, 7.2 miles was under construction, and 5.3 miles was programmed.[55] Delays at the federal end became potentially embarrassing, as Congressman Lansdale G. Sasscer of Maryland pointed out:

> We are confronted with a situation where we have the Government having started a project, the State of Maryland came on to meet it and now it is not finished and is a complete loss unless it is finished.[56]

Consequently, the cost of completing the federal section was estimated at $13-$15 million, and although its scenic properties remained integral to construction, by this time it was conceded that:

> The main reason. . .is not to construct a parkway. There are two reasons for it. One is access to Government property, and the other is to alleviate the traffic on Roadway No. 1.[57]

In July 1950 the Senate concurred with the House of Representatives' recommendation for passage of the bill with only minor changes, and it became law shortly thereafter. According to Section 2:

> The parkway **shall be** constructed, developed, operated, and administered as a limited access road primarily to **provide** a protected, safe, and suitable approach for passenger-vehicle traffic to the National

---

[54] T.S. Settle to Grant, Demaray and Nolan (3 June, 1949).

[55] No. 81-10 Baltimore-Washington Parkway Hearings, p. 34.

[56] No. 81-10 Baltimore-Washington Parkway Hearings, p. 47.

[57] Congressional Record--House (25 May, 1950), p. 7792.

X *See continuation sheet*

Capital and for an additional means of access between the several Federal establishments adjacent thereto and the seat of government in the District of Columbia.[58]

CONSTRUCTION SEQUENCE

The twenty-nine-mile parkway was constructed as two separate but connecting units: The northern, ten-mile Maryland section was built in 1949-51 by the Maryland State Roads Commission in cooperation with the federal Bureau of Public Roads, which was responsible for building the nineteen-mile southern portion.

FEDERALLY OWNED AND MAINTAINED SECTION

The $2 million funding in 1942 marks the official commencement of the design process, financed the clearing, grading and draining of two single-lane segments of road, and the acquisition of land to complete the right-of-way. The MNCP&PC acquired the right-of-way between the D.C. line and Bladensburg with funds advanced by the NCP&PC. Three-mile road fragments were constructed at the southern terminus from the Bladensburg Peace Cross to Greenbelt, and at the northerly terminus from Laurel Road to the Jessup Road entry to Fort Meade.

Additional construction funding was not legislated until 1950--not to exceed $13 million, later raised to $14.5 million--but the preparation of drawings and plans continued throughout the war. Including the original $2 million appropriation, as of 1950 the parkway cost $770,000 per mile.

Sixteen bridges with a pavement width of 72 feet were slated, at an estimated cost of about $5.3 million. About one and one-half miles of state and county roads were rebuilt, and three miles of local roads relocated. Two 24-foot divided pavements were built, with area for a third lane "that will undoubtedly be built in the near future."[59]

National Park Service and Public Road Administration officials cooperatively designed parkway bridges throughout 1944-45. Good Luck Road was "one of the first structures built on the parkway," and it is nearly identical to the Seminary Avenue Bridge of the Cross County (NY)

---

[58] U.S., Statutes at Larage, LXIV, p. 401. In June 1952, Congress increase the appropriation for building the Baltimore-Washington Parkway to $14.5 million, U.S., Statutes at Large, LXVI, p. 159.

[59] Congressional Record, (25 May, 1950), p. 7793.

X See continuation sheet

Parkway, designed by Gilmore Clarke about 1930.[60] Both feature twin spans with buttresses at the median and each wingwall; the whole covered with rough-faced ashlar in the form of cladding, voussoirs, quoining, and concrete coping. Ironically, Clarke was responsible for some of the most picturesque and derivatively styled bridges of the earlier Westchester County parkway system that combine reinforced concrete, steel, and iron with the texture of rough-faced stone cladding and unique designs.[61]

More than a decade later, his attitude reflects the cleaner design aesthetics brought on by the war and improved technology. Clarke then advocated that a "more or less standardized design may be adopted for similar structures, which could be generally used throughout" and, he confessed:

> As I look at bridges which I designed twenty and more years ago, I feel like taking an ax and cutting off the excrescents which in my younger days I deemed necessary. Now the simpler we make bridges, the better we like them and, incidentally, the more simple the structures are, the better they stand the test of time.[62]

The American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) committee charged with studying parkways and roads came to the same conclusion in its 1950 policy adopted toward parkway bridges:

> Which in essence eliminates the purely stylistic, traditional or eclectic approach in favor of designs rooted in. . .basic principles of architectural design. This does admit the judicious use of stylistic elements where the application is. . .not an accretion, and it does permit an ultimate design in which the appearance may reflect precedent but is wholly contemporary in conception.[63]

The bridges serving the Baltimore-Washington Parkway aptly reflect this range, from sentimental rustic styling to sparer concrete construction. Other site concerns arose, such as the utility lines serving the Agricultural Research Center, which NPS hoped to "be rerouted or relocated so that as few crossings as possible would remain, and those that must remain as as crossing or paralleling lines will be placed underground"; and, to "see maintained sufficient width of woods buffer to

---

[60] Harry Thompson to Gilmore Clarke (5 October, 1945), RG 66.

[61] Gilmore D. Clarke, "Landscape Construction Notes 35, Notes on Texture in Stone Masonry," Landscape Architecture, vol. 21, no. 3 (April 1931), p. 197-208.

[62] Gilmore Clarke to Harry Thompson (18 October, 1945).

[63] Committee on Public Roads, Controlled-access Highways, Parkways, "Selected 1950 ASLA Committee Reports," Landscape Architecture, vol. 41, no. 2 (January 1951), p. 60.

X See continuation sheet

camouflage the existence of nearby lines."[64]

Further construction was stalled because of lack of funding. The NPS's 1947 budget included $15 million for construction of three national parkways--George Washington Memorial, Blue Ridge, and Natchez Trace--and it was hoped that the 1948 budget would include Baltimore-Washington Parkway funding, so that:

> The Washington section of the parkway could thus attain the status of a national parkway like that of the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway and become part of the Nation[al] Capital Park system.[65]

As of November 1952, ten of the eighteen bridges were underway, and half the parkway was graded, with paving to begin the next year. Ultimately, 149 tracts of land were acquired in all; 832 acres from private owners, representing a little more than ten miles of the parkway. The balance of the property was transfered to the Bureau of Public Roads from the agencies that owned it. In the process, thirty-five dwellings and two commercial airplane hangers were condemned. The right-of-way-per mile cost totaled $39,000, cost per acre (including improvements), $480.[66]

MARYLAND-OWNED AND MAINTAINED SECTION

It was the original intention of the federal government that the state of Maryland finance the parkway, and authorization of a toll road from Baltimore to Washington--along this same route--had been made by the state legislature in 1940. However, Congress felt it unwise to give a state rights through federal property, which composes so much of the parkway's right-of-way.

> The [NCP&PC] has therefore recommended that this portion of the project be set up as an extension of the Anacostia River Parkway, thus incorporating it into the park system of the National Capital, making it eligible for construction by the National Park Service.[67]

---

[64] Harry T. Thompson to H.J. Spellman (1 February, 1945).

[65] Rudolph Kauffmann II, "Baltimore-Washington Parkway Slowly Begins to Take Shape," The [Washington] Evening Star (6 March, 1946), p. 1.

[66] Department of Commerce, "Final Construction Report," vol. 2, p. 10.

[67] NCP&PC Minutes of Conference regarding Route for Baltimore-Washington Parkway (4 November, 1942).

X See continuation sheet

As funding for the federal portion of the parkway was being addressed in congressional hearings, Maryland had already completed seven miles of its ten-mile portion. In keeping with federal parkway stipulations, the state consented to build it with a 400-foot minimum right-of-way, with dual 24-foot roadways divided by medians no less than 100 feet wide--although contemporary appearance suggests this was not fully complied with.[68] On 16 December, 1950, the section of this route from Baltimore to Friendship International Airport officially opened.

PRESENT CONDITION

The Baltimore-Washington Parkway (BWP) occupies the western edge of the Atlantic Coastal Plain, on the edge of the Piedmont plateau. Historically throughout the early twentieth century, the geographic region through which the BWP runs was composed of hardwood forest. The dominant types were red and white oak, sweet gum and tulip trees, however, the cleared portions of the parkway were initially invaded by Virginia pine and other scrub growth such as blackjack oak and black locust. More recently, southern yellow pine, oaks, ash and sweet birch have grown up in the right-of-way, in addition to occasional mountain laurel, American holly, and tupelo.[69]

The topography ranges from gently rolling to steep and includes several drainage basins. From the District line north to Kenilworth Avenue, the soil is silty and clayey, supporting trees that were salvaged during construction or weed trees that invaded later. From Kenilworth to Landover Road, the terrain is a rugged 25 to 65 perent slope, with a heavy wood of Virginia pine and mixed hardwoods. The soil make up of silt and sandy loam predominates up to the Jessup Road interchange. From Landover to the NASA Access Road, the naturally undulating, low pitch of the land is topped by a mix of hardwoods with scrub and Virginia pines close to the shoulders and an understory of mountain laurel and holly. Between Good Luck Road and I-495, the parkway traverses Greenbelt Park: the median and roadsides here are thickly wooded with mixed pine and oak, approaching a climax forest. From the NASA access to Jessup Road, the parkway lies in a nearly level, rolling plateau no steeper than 4 percent. USDA lands flank both sides of the parkway up to the Patuxent River, which contain oak, tulip, ash, maple, sweet gum, and sycamore; the flat, marshy, floodplains of both Patuxent Rivers contain only deciduous plants such as white ash, red

---

[68] Congressional Record, Vol. 96, No. 103, 81st Congress/2nd Session (18 May, 1950), p. 7125; Congressional Record, Vol. 96, No. 104, 81st Congress/2nd Session (25 May, 1950), p. 7791.

[69] System Design Concepts, Clarke & Rapuano, and Bolt, Beranek & Newman, "Baltimore/Washington Parkway Study Report" (April 1981), Sec. II, p. 43. Located in NCR-Profesional Services; F.W. Besley, "Map of Anne Arundel County Showing Forest Areas by Commercial Types" (1913), LC; F.W. Besley, "Map of Prince Georges County Showing Forest Areas by Commercial Types" (1912), LC.

X *See continuation sheet*

maple, birch. Between the two rivers, the parkway is bordered largely by Fort Meade lands; mature oak and pine coexist here with second-growth scrub pine woodlands.

The median varies from a mown, grassy strip in some areas--between Landover and Riverdale roads--to dense woodland--between Good Luck Road and I-95, and between the rivers.[70]

The parkway makes two major waterway crossings in the federal section, the Patuxent and Little Patuxent rivers. Four railroad crossings exist: the B&O Railroad at the D.C. line, Kenilworth Avenue, and near Maryland Route 32; and the Conrail/Amtrak (formerly Pennsylvania RR) line by Kenilworth Avenue connectors. Three types of bridges cross the parkway and interchanges: rigid arch of reinforced concrete, beam with steel or concrete, and steel girder.[71] In addition to overpasses and underpasses, scores of culverts and drainage infrastructures exist along the parkway.

The development flanking the parkway begins in the District of Columbia as dense industrial and roadside commercial; from the border to the Greenbelt area, it is comprised primarily of single-family residential subdivisions interspersed with high-rise apartments and commercial enclaves. From NASA to Jessup Road, adjoining property is almost completely federal or public.

Since the parkway opened in 1954, maintenance on road and park land has been aimed at the preservation of five aesthethic qualities "with the objective of not only minimizing negative impacts, but also of enhancing parkway character wherever possible." Features to be preserved include: right-of-way with heavy slope vegetation; opposing roadways separated by a variable-width median; curvilinear road alignments; stone-faced bridge abutments; and contour grading fit to the topography.[72]

The parkway was constructed according to design standards established by the Bureau of Public Roads in November 1943, which were incorporated into the standards for rural sections of interregional highays in a report issued early the following year.[73] These include the accommodation of "high-speed" traffic of 75 miles per hour throughout; a right-of-way 400 to 800

---

[70] System Design Concepts et al., sec. II, pp. 41-48.

[71] System Design Concepts et al., sec. II, p. 5.

[72] Ibid, sec. III, p. 7-8.

[73] Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads, "Final Construction Report, Baltimore-Washington Parkway, Vol. 2: Roadway" (1955?), p. 8. Located in FHWA final construction report files, Arlington, Va.

X See continuation sheet

feet across; mainline lane width of 12 feet, with a 12-foot shoulder designed for conversion to a third auto lane if needed; and a median 15 to 200 feet wide, in keeping with desirable parkway standards. There are no outstanding scenic or natural highlights along the route, but the parkway does play off the natural landscape and indigenous plant growth. The route provides a modest undulation of tangential curves, gentle valleys with a maximum grade of 3 percent, and contrasting open and solid planting arrangements. Entrance and egress ramps are similarly treated as landscaped graduations to roadways that were purposely situated at a higher or lower grade than the mainline:

> Designs for these interchanges differ according to the probable traffic volume to and from the parkway, and vary from the standard full cloverleafs to less-elaborate connections.[74]

About three miles of local roads were rerouted to accommodate the parkway route, which followed the least-developed path northeastward.

Construction implemented with the initial $2 million funding took place from July 1945 to August 1947, and included four grading projects. No further work was undertaken until January 1951 when additional funding was legislated, leading to completion of the parkway in October 1954. The latter bulk of the work was divided into separate projects: eighteen bridge, eleven grading, and six paving. Cost of the stone facing used on the majority of structures was $90-$122 per cubic yard; the granite dimensioned masonry, $265-$375 per cubic yard. The total grading cost for the parkway was $3.8 million, paving $3.4 million.[75]

The first four projects--completed by 1947--consisted of the grading of two sections: Laurel-Fort Meade Road to Jessup Road, and MD 450 to a tributary of the Northeast Branch north of Riverdale Road. These were followed by the stretch from Laurel-Bowie to Fort Meade roads, then portions from the tributary to Laurel-Bowie Road, and the region closest to the D.C. line, respectively; concurrent to which construction of drainage conduits and paving was also accomplished. The culmination of construction in 1954-55 were the approaches to the Anacostia River bridge, installation of traffic signs and guardrails, and right-of-way fencing.[76]

---

[74] Ibid., p. 9.

[75] Ibid., pp. 11-12.

[76] Ibid., p. 14.

X *See continuation sheet*

BRIDGES

Originally there were fourteen highway grade separations intended to traverse the federal portion of the parkway, in addition to three river crossings, and two railway crossings. The design of these structures was carried out during WW II (though domestic construction was limited to defense-related projects by the Bureau of Public Roads' Design Office) in cooperation with the National Capital Parks, "who were particularly interested in the architectural features of the designs."[77] Bridge styling ranged from stone-clad elements characteristic of the earliest parkways, to streamlined concrete constructions reflective of the 1940-50s, depending upon its location.

> In general, where the Parkway went under a State or County road, stone facing was used on the exposed portions of the structures. This usually consisted of stone of varied colors, obtained from local quarries, with granite masonry trimming. The architectural features of the various structures were varied to give each bridge a distinctive, individual appearance. The structures that were not stone-faced had the exposed concrete faces given a smooth, plywood-formed finish.[78]

The cost of the eighteen original bridges (exclusive of engineering) was approximately $6.62 million. Work on bridge contracts began on 5 January, 1951, with the Little Patuxent River crossing, and were complete by 11 June, 1954.[79] Because the stone treatment on each was a more delicate undertaking than the general construction, a sample of the wall work was prepared on a preliminary basis for NPS approval, prior to overall finishing.

Today, the parkway is crossed over by eight road- and railways: Route 450/Annapolis Road, Good Luck Road, Route 193/Greenbelt, NASA Access Road, Route 197/Laurel-Bowie Road, Route 198/Fort Meade Road, Route 32/Savage Road, abandoned tracks near Route 32, and the Greenbelt pedestrian bridge. The parkway crosses over the Patuxent and Little Patuxent rivers and eight subordinate roads: Route 50 at Kenilworth Avenue, Kenilworth Avenue, Route 202/Landover Road, Route 410/Riverdale Road, Interstate 95, Beaverdam Road, Route 212/Powder Mill Road, and the abandoned old Fort Meade Road.

---

[77] Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads, "Final Construction Report, Baltimore-Washington Parkway, Vol. 1: Bridges" (1 August, 1955), p. 4. Located in FHWA final construction files, Arlington, Va.

[78] Ibid.

[79] Ibid, p. 4-5.

X *See continuation sheet*

The bridges at Route 450, Good Luck Road, and Route 32 (rail and vehicular)--all crossing over the parkway--best reflect the origins of parkway-structure styling. The double spans and wing walls are covered with decorative rough-cut stone; the segmental arches feature voussoirs; and buttresses and intersecting seams are quoined. (Route 32 is constructed with steel beams, but the wingwalls are treated appropriately.) The thorough decorative treatment is attributable to the bridge position, such that parkway motorists view the entire structure.

> The stone facing used on the wingwalls, parapets, and arch spandrels was usually a native stone obtained from local quarries in Maryland. It varied in color among brown, grey, and blue, some being seam and some split-faced, and of varying sizes. It was finished with raked joints. . . . Dimensioned (grey granite) masonry trimming was used on the arch ringstones, pier ends, abutment corners, and copings.[80]

An intermediate design treatment is found on the bridges at Routes 410, 193, 212, and 198. Each features a combination of concrete span and recessed support walls that curve out to meet the wingwalls. These, too, are clad with dressed rough-cut stone, but they are smaller and more angular than the previous type of bridges. The double row of steel railing is more visually obvious here, because it is an element anchored abruptly by each wingwall.

The bridges designed with the least regard for rustic-like detailing are those that carry the parkway over the rivers and local roads: Kenilworth Avenue, Route 202, Beaverdam Road, Route 197, and old Fort Meade Road. These more modest single and double spans lack any decorative stone treatment in lieu of very simple poured-concrete structural units. The greatest reason for aesthetic and financial economy here is that these structures are not seen by parkway travelers and therefore do not need to reflect traditional parkway styling. All bridges originally permitted a 14-foot vertical clearance at the pavement's edge, 16 feet at the center point.

CULVERTS

There are approximately 175 box and pipe culverts along the federally owned portion of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, which open onto the flanks and/or the median. About 100 of these have formal headwalls or wingwalls. Many culverts were classified as "incidental road work" included in some of the bridge-construction contracts, while others were part of roadway contracts. "Work on culverts was concurrent with bridge operations. . . . Headwall construction was similar to

[80] Ibid., p. 6.

X See continuation sheet

bridge-abutment construction with the same procedures being used."[81]

The dressed conduit headwalls represent contributing architectural elements to the parkways' historicity. The decoratively finished inlets are many sizes and shapes, featuring rows of dimensioned stone cladding. The predominant forms are 18-inch, 24-inch and 36-inch pipe culverts, ranging to the most visible and dramatic twin box culvert 4-by-6 feet, and a 6-foot arch culvert. The openings are finished by a broad lintel or ornamental semicircular archwork, voussoirs, and a keystone.

LANDSCAPE

No final or comprehensive design plans have been located for the parkway landscape. However, based on occasional site plans and written documentation, it was undoubtedly the intention of NPS architects and landscape architects to retain the thick, forested vegetation of the right-of-way and median, interspersed with areas of grassy lawn. An undated (probably ca. 1945-55) service-area study, for example, indicates clusters of bushy vegetation broken up by open space to allow for visibility and variation, with individual or grouped plantings highlighting the residual island fragments created by access ramps and parking areas. According to a turnaround study (1952) where the right-of-way is narrowest, the contour of the topography immediately adjacent to the mainline was altered from gentle slope to a pattern of steep parallel banks on the flanks and in the median. Two years after the parkway opened, Riverdale Road apparently typified the ideal landscaping, for Conrad Wirth felt that "the preservation of existing indigenous plant material such as now exists in this area is a requisite of parkway standards."[82]

Plans (1955) exist for five of the major intersections: 175/Jessup Road, 212/Powder Mill Road, 201/Kenilworth Avenue, 202/Landover Road, and 450/Annapolis Road. According to these drawings, the northern terminus of the federal portion of the parkway just below Jessup Road featured two large areas of "existing trees" on the west flank, with the remaining property on both sides and between the roadways open with picturesque scatterings of 7-foot nannyberry, 4-foot flowering dogwood, red maple and northern red oak, water tupelo, white fringetree, and some 7-foot eastern redbud.

---

[81] Vol. 1: Bridges, p. 73.

[82] Conrad Wirth to Orlo A. Bartholomew (20 July, 1956), RG 326, Box 127.

X See continuation sheet

The prevalent landscape at Route 212, formerly East-West Highway, was an existing buffer of forest around the interchange area, the interior portion planted with willow oak, red maple, and northern red oak, 6-foot Washington hawthorne, and a sprinkling of flowering dogwood.

The Route 201/Kenilworth crossing contains a greater diversity of introduced plantings, probably because of the greater amount of existing development and necessary construction for the parkway at this point. Two small banks of existing trees and a border of 2-foot red pine along the southbound flank serve as the backdrop for groupings of pin, scarlet, willow, and northern red oak; red and eastern white pine; red maple, 7-foot redbud, American planetree, water tupelo and flowering dogwood; as well as a few southern crabapple, shagbark hickory, and 7-foot blackhaw viburnum.

Entirely new plantings were slated for the Route 202/Landover Road interchange. These include red maple and nothern red oak, Washington hawthorne, redbud, blackhaw viburnum, and flowering dogwood, as well as some pin oak and black willow.

At Route 450/Defense Highway, the diamond-shaped intersection was planned as a lightly landscaped open space enclosed on all sides by forest buffer. The plantings slated for the area were predominantly 6-foot American hornbeam, scarlet oak, blackhaw viburnum, red maple, and northern red oak, with some 6-foot southern crabapple and flowering dogwood. Overall, the most frequent choice was red pine, northern bayberry, fragrant sumac, flowering dogwood, and northern red oak--native enhancements to the young forest that existed along the parkway at that time.

INVENTORY OF STRUCTURES

Note: (listed south to north with construction project numbers in parentheses)
cost is exclusive of engineering
* = non-contributing

U.S. Route 50 (Project 1A6):
Built 1952-54; continuous steel plate girder, 513 feet; carries BWP over the Anacostia River; 4 spans; completion cost $1.41 million.

MD Route 201/Kenilworth Ave. (1A5):
Built 1952-53 as River Road rerouted; concrete rigid frame; carries 6 BWP lanes over 4 lanes; 2 82-foot spans; cost $287,500.

X See continuation sheet

(1A10)
Built 1953-54; steel plate girder; entrance ramp; carries 1 BWP lane over 2; 3 spans 114 feet; cost $303,900.

(1A7)
Built 1953-54; concrete rigid frame; carries 2 (southbound) BWP lanes over 2 (northbound) BWP lanes; 1 44-foot span; cost $205,800.

(1A4)
Built 1952; concrete rigid frame; carries BWP over B&O RR; 1 span 38 feet; cost $243,226.

MD Route 202/Landover Road (1A3):
Built 1952-53; concrete rigid frame; 6 BWP lanes over 2 lanes; 2 52-foot spans; cost $300,300.

MD Route 450/Annapolis Road (1A2):
Built 1951-53 as Defense Highway; concrete rigid frame; carries 4 lanes over 4 BWP lanes; 2 55-foot spans; cost $437,000.

MD Route 410/Riverdale Road (1B2):
(2) Built 1951-53; concrete rigid frame; carries 2 BWP lanes over 2 lanes; 60-foot span; cost $372,524.

Good Luck Road (1C2):
Built 1951-52; concrete rigid frame; carries 3 lanes over 4 BWP lanes; 2 71-foot spans; cost $270,300.

Interstate 95*:
Interchange built 1962.

Beaverdam Creek Culvert*:
(2) Built 1966; concrete box culvert; carries 2 BWP lanes; 2 10-foot spans.

Greenbelt Pedestrian Bridge* (0.3 miles from Route 193):
Built 1983; steel box beam single-girder; 1 lane over 4 BWP lanes; 2 106-foot spans.

MD Route 193/Greenbelt Road (1D2):
Built 1952-53 as Branchville-Glenn Dale Road, reconstructed 1965; concrete rigid frame; carries 5 lanes over 4 BWP lanes; 2 82-foot spans; cost $181,000.

NASA Goddard Space Flight Center Access Road*:
Built 1966; span-steel plate girder and wide flange beam; 6 spans.

X *See continuation sheet*

Beaverdam Road (1E2):
Built 1952-53; concrete rigid frame; carries 4 BWP lanes over 2 lanes; 1 39-foot span; cost $224,200.

MD Route 212/Powder Mill Road (1E3):
Built 1951-53 as East-West Highway; concrete rigid frame; carries 4 BWP lanes over 2 lanes; 1 60-foot span; cost $272,3000.

MD Route 197/Laurel-Bowie Road (1F3):
(2) Built 1951-53; concrete rigid frame; carries 2 BWP lanes over 2 lanes; 1 84-foot span, 1 91-foot span; cost $333,126.

Patuxent River Bridge (1F2):
(2) Built 1951-53, reconstructed 1976; concrete T-beam; 3 BWP lanes; 5 78-foot spans; cost $488,500.

Old Fort Meade Road (1G3):
(2) Built 1951-52; concrete rigid frame; carries 2 BWP lanes over 2 abandoned lanes; 1 43-foot span; cost $140,510.

MD Route 198/Fort Meade Road (1G2):
(2) Built 1951-52; concrete rigid frame; carries 3 lanes over 2 BWP lanes; 1 65-foot span, 1 63-foot span; cost $243,152.

Little Patuxent River Bridge (1H2):
(2) Built 1950-53, reconstructed 1976; concrete T-beam; 3 BWP lanes; 5 78-foot spans; cost $577,102.

MD Route 32/Savage Road and B&O Railway (1J2):
(2) Built 1950-52 (Annapolis Junction Road, reconstructed 1977); steel-plate girder; 3 BWP lanes and 1 track lane over 4 lanes; 2 58-foot spans; cost $359,694.

8. Statement of Significance

Certifying official has considered the significance of this property in relation to other properties:
☐ nationally ☒ statewide ☒ locally

Applicable National Register Criteria ☒ A ☐ B ☒ C ☐ D

Criteria Considerations (Exceptions) ☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F ☒ G

Areas of Significance (enter categories from instructions)	Period of Significance	Significant Dates
TRANSPORTATION	1942--54	1942, 1950
LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE		1954

Cultural Affiliation: n/a

Significant Person:

Architect/Builder: National Park Service; Federal Bureau of Roads

State significance of property, and justify criteria, criteria considerations, and areas and periods of significance noted above.

The Baltimore-Washington Parkway achieves state and local significance in the areas of transportation and landscape architecture under criteria A and C: It is associated with urban development of the national capital as a federal center, it exemplifies the last period of construction for this type of road, and it is the only fully developed parkway of its kind in Maryland. It achieves extraordinary significance under criteria G as a contributing element to the national capital park and parkway system developed during the first half of the twentieth century, although the parkway itself was constructed largely between 1950-54 and is less than fifty years old. Although conceived and promoted from the 1920s, construction of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway was not initiated until 1942. Its enabling legislation justifies it: as a major scenic artery within the park and parkway system of the nation's capital; as a formal entrance to the city of Washington, D.C.; as a defense/military route among suburban federal installations and the city; and as a contributing element to the commercial and residential development of the Baltimore-Washington corridor. The parkway maintains original integrity of setting, design and associations characteristic of the earliest parkways designed for pleasure motoring--the preservation of natural topography and vegetation for scenic purposes coupled with "high-speed" elements of modern freeway design.

9. Major Bibliographical References

See: Major Bibliographic References of the multiple property nomination **"Parkways of the National Capital Region, 1913–1965."**

☒ See continuation sheet

Previous documentation on file (NPS):

- ☐ preliminary determination of individual listing (36 CFR 67) has been requested
- ☐ previously listed in the National Register
- ☒ previously determined eligible by the National Register
- ☐ designated a National Historic Landmark
- ☐ recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey # _____
- ☐ recorded by Historic American Engineering Record # _____

Primary location of additional data:

- ☐ State historic preservation office
- ☐ Other State agency
- ☒ Federal agency
- ☐ Local government
- ☐ University
- ☒ Other

Specify repository: National Capital Planning Commission

10. Geographical Data

Acreage of property 1,353

UTM References

	Zone	Easting	Northing
A	18	331700	4309260
B	18	331140	4309140
C	18	331880	4309580
D	18	332590	4306560

☐ See continuation sheet

Verbal Boundary Description

The boundary of the nominated district is delineated by an elongated polygon whose vertices are marked by the UTM coordinate points A through MM.

☐ See continuation sheet

Boundary Justification

The boundary is coterminus with the original right-of-way determined by the federal Bureau of Public Roads and that which is maintained by the National Park Service. It encompasses numerous manmade features--culverts, bridges, and contributing landscape-architectural elements--in addition to the natural topographic features.

☐ See continuation sheet

11. Form Prepared By

name/title Sara Amy Leach - Historian

organization National Park Service date 15 September, 1990

street & number P.O. Box 37127 telephone 202-343-9607

city or town Washington, DC 20013-7127 state _____ zip code _____

UTMs continued

	zone/easting	northing	
E	18/332380	4309970	
F	18/333330	4310550	
G	18/333060	4301830	
H	18/333940	4311690	
I	18/334300	4311480	
J	18/334510	4313340	points A - Q:
K	18/334740	4313180	Washington East, D.C.-MD quad
L	18/335080	4315160	
M	18/335820	4315200	
N	18/336600	4317380	
O	18/336680	4317270	
P	18/337340	4317820	
Q	18/337540	4317580	
---	---	---	
R	18/337900	4318060	points R, S:
S	18/338080	4318000	Lanham, MD quad
---	---	---	
T	18/338600	4318930	
U	18/338720	4318850	
V	18/339020	4320580	
W	18/339200	4320330	
X	18/339500	4321920	
Y	18/339860	4321910	
Z	18/340730	4324700	
AA	18/340940	4324300	
BB	18/341560	4326020	points T - KK:
CC	18/341590	4327810	Laurel, MD quad
DD	18/343820	4328650	
EE	18/344030	4328380	
FF	18/345080	4329790	
GG	18/345240	4329620	
HH	18/346210	4330810	
II	18/346260	4330680	
JJ	18/347270	4331920	
KK	18/347520	4331920	
---	---	---	
LL	18/348200	4333210	points LL, MM:
MM	18/348020	4333280	Savage, MD quad