1. NAME OF PROPERTY

Historic Name: **PINE MOUNTAIN STATE PARK**

Other Name/Site Number: FDR STATE PARK, WESTERN HALF

2. LOCATION

Street & Number: 2970 Georgia Hwy. 190 Not for publication:___

City/Town: Pine Mountain Vicinity: X

State: Georgia County: Harris Code: 145 Zip Code: 31822

3. CLASSIFICATION

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

Number of Resources within Property

Contributing	Noncontributing	
80	15	buildings
1	0	sites
30	17	structures
1	0	objects
112	32	Total

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

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

4. STATE/FEDERAL AGENCY CERTIFICATION

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

_____

_____
Signature of Certifying Official Date

_____
State or Federal Agency and Bureau

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

_____

_____
Signature of Commenting or Other Official Date

_____
State or Federal Agency and Bureau

5. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that this property is:

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

_____

_____ Signature of Keeper
Date of Action

6. FUNCTION OR USE

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

7. DESCRIPTION

ARCHITECTURAL CLASSIFICATION: Bungalow/Craftsman; Other: NPS Rustic

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

Describe Present and Historic Physical Appearance.

Summary

Pine Mountain State Park is located in Harris County in southwest Georgia, about 30 miles north of Columbus. With Atlanta about 75 miles to the north and Macon 60 miles to the east, the park was positioned to serve three large metropolitan areas. Pine Mountain State Park was both an 1,550-acre state park project and a contiguous 3,018-acre "recreational demonstration area" (RDA). The RDAs were New Deal planning projects intended to retire submarginal agricultural lands and develop them for recreational use. A number of federal agencies were involved in the construction of Pine Mountain State Park, with the National Park Service providing overall technical supervision and the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) and the Works Progress Administration (WPA) providing labor and materials.

The 4,568-acre NHL District described here encompasses the historic state park and the contiguous RDA area, which were described together in historic master plans as Pine Mountain State Park. Today the park is managed as a discrete "western half" of the (approximately) 10,000-acre Franklin D. Roosevelt State Park. The "eastern half" of FDR State Park, which includes Roosevelt's Little White House at Warm Springs, was transferred to the Georgia Department of Natural Resources in 1980 and is not included in this NHL District. This larger eastern half does not abut directly on the NHL District and was not part of Pine Mountain State Park historically.

The setting of the NHL District is a forested ridge that rises abruptly to a height of 1,300 feet above sea level, 400 to 600 feet above the surrounding Georgia Piedmont north of Columbus. Pine Mountain is the first major mountain jutting out of the Piedmont, and sweeping views of the farmland below are available from the long ridge top. The steep topography and rocky soil deterred farming on the slopes of the ridge, and Pine Mountain therefore remained forested, although hardwoods have replaced most of the original Loblolly and Shortleaf pine forests. Sourwood, sumac, and mountain laurel grow among the Chestnut Oaks, which now predominate; the flora has as much in common with the Great Smoky Mountains to the north as with the surrounding Piedmont country.

Scenic views, the cooler weather of the mountain top, and the warm springs that gush from its base all attracted visitors to the area already in the mid-19th century. The springs were at the center of the most venerable spa resort in the state, which reached its heyday during the decades following the Civil War. In 1924 Franklin Roosevelt arrived at Warm Springs seeking therapy for his recently crippled legs. He returned to the area regularly for the rest of his life, acquiring hundreds of acres of land for a model farm nearby, and in 1932 building a small house that became known as the Little White House. Planning for Pine Mountain State Park began in 1933, and expanded in 1934 when the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA) committed funds to acquire submarginal agricultural lands for various new purposes. The Pine Mountain site was recognized as an ideal location for both state park development and an RDA because of its inherent beauty, its location between the state's principal metropolitan areas, its limited usefulness for agriculture, and its availability for purchase. Roosevelt's personal interest in the immediate area certainly affected federal proposals for the region as well. While visiting Warm Springs, Roosevelt had boosted Pine Mountain as an appropriate state park location since the late 1920s, and he also initiated the scenic drive project that became the Pine Mountain Parkway.

The CCC and the Park Service arrived at the Pine Mountain State Park site in 1933, and park construction accelerated in 1934 when the state acquired the mountaintop parkland and the FERA land program began acquiring land for the RDA adjacent to it. In 1938, the park opened to the public and the group camps were ready for their first summer campers. By the time the CCC ended its activities at the site in 1941, the park was complete. The Pine Mountain Parkway ran the length of Pine Mountain, with the Pine Mountain Tavern (now the FDR Inn) at its summit. The park included new lakes on either side of the ridge, one developed with vacation cabins and the other with the RDA group camps. A day use area with a pool, bathhouse, and picnic shelters was completed below the inn site to the north.

A.H. Stephens Memorial Park in Taliaferro County, Georgia is currently the only CCC-era state park in Georgia placed on the National Register of Historic Places

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

Spatial Organization
Circulation
Topography
Vegetation
Structures
Objects
Buildings
Sites

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

Spatial Organization
The overall spatial organization of Pine Mountain State Park was determined by the master plan initiated in 1933 by the National Park Service in cooperation with the State of Georgia. Several features of the overall site plan are typical of the hundreds of state park plans drawn up by Park Service landscape architects in cooperation with local park authorities between 1933 and 1942. Other aspects of the plan point out the unique situation of this particular state park.

Typical of Park Service state park plans of the period, the Pine Mountain master plan delineated a road system that extended to reach the key facilities and viewpoints of the park but minimized the intrusion of road construction and automobiles as much as possible. Also typically, a central day use area (defined by the bathhouse, and picnic grounds, and ball field) was situated near one entrance to the park on a main park road. This arrangement allowed day use visitors easy access to the area and

also prevented the flow of daily traffic from unnecessarily disturbing other areas of the park, such as the vacation cabins and the RDA group camps.

Like the day use area, other developed areas of the park were well defined and discrete. The maintenance area, for example, was sited on a spur road off the Pine Mountain Parkway where it was convenient to the Pine Mountain Tavern and the day use area, but was also well separated from these public areas. To the west, the vacation cabin area on the lakeshore also was accessed by a spur road off the parkway. This arrangement allowed vacationers in the cabins to remain undisturbed by most daily park activities or through traffic. The cabins were arranged to form a group, but each was sited independently in relation to the topography and views available. The cabins, arranged along a spur road, formed a small, semi-private community somewhat independent of other park activities.

Also typical of Park Service park planning of the period, the basic spatial organization and zoning implied in the park's master plan responded to the topography, vegetation, and other existing features of the site. Pine Mountain itself, for example, separates the more public day use and vacation cabin areas from the RDA group camp on the other (southern) side of the mountain. A second lake was impounded for the RDA to further establish the independence of the area. The ridge of Pine Mountain, which provided the obvious route for the scenic highway, bisects the park, between the group camp to the south and the other park areas to the north and west.

If in many ways, the overall spatial organization of Pine Mountain State Park was typical, in others the park plan reflected the unique circumstances surrounding its creation. The scenic highway across the long ridge of Pine Mountain might have been just any other scenic highway proposal of the period, except for the fact that it was boosted by a local gentleman farmer named Franklin Roosevelt. The state park that was subsequently planned around that scenic drive might have been just one more of the over 500 such park developments undertaken by the Park Service with CCC labor, except for the fact that FDR himself had envisioned a park for the site before becoming president. The RDA developed on the southern slope of Pine Mountain might have been just one of the over 30 such model group camps developed by the Park Service during these years, but this RDA was only a few miles from the Little White House, and Roosevelt visited it while under construction and took a special interest in its development. Pine Mountain, perhaps more than any other state park of the period, was a kind of personal demonstration project for FDR's benefit: it included many different types of park development (some at reduced scale) within one state park project of less than 5,000 acres. The skyline parkway, the RDA group camp, the overnight lodge and cabin complex, the vacation cabin complex, the day-use area, and the public campground were all brought together creating a maximum diversity of park elements within a relatively small area.

The overall strategy for developing this range of facilities, while assuring that each area would remain discrete and coherent, was to use the ridge and hollows of Pine Mountain itself to determine sites for each developed area. The Pine Mountain Parkway, which consistently follows the well defined mountain ridge, divides the park in two and is the spine of the park's circulation system. Several overlooks along the parkway provide convenient access to scenic vistas. The Pine Mountain Tavern and overnight cabins provide a significant roadside complex in addition to scenic views. Placed directly on the parkway, the tavern provides a convenient place to stop for a meal, or even for the night, and the area also has one of the best views of the region to the south. The tavern and the string of cabins associated with it all are sited to take advantage of this prospect, which includes views of the

federally sponsored Pine Mountain Valley agricultural community, the Lake Franklin RDA, and the surrounding Piedmont farmlands, all spread out below to the south.

Because of the number of elements squeezed into Pine Mountain State Park, the Lake Franklin RDA, which is visible from much of the parkway, could only accommodate two group camps (as opposed to the more common three) and one of these was in fact only a partial camp, since in included only two units, or clusters of cabins (as opposed to the more common three or four). The group camps around Lake Franklin are also compact, since normally there would have been more room between the two camps. By placing them on either side of the lake, however, this defect is ameliorated.

Certain observations about the spatial organization of the Lake Franklin large group camp (on the west shore of the lake) illustrate the principles of ideal group camp design promulgated by the Park Service for RDAs all over the country. The camp cabins are organized in four groups of six, each cabin spaced 50-100 feet from the next. The cabins accommodate four campers, and each group of six cabins has its own unit lodge (a communal building), counselor's cabin, and latrine/washhouse. The four cabin clusters, or units, are themselves grouped around a central group of buildings, including the main camp dining hall, administration building, crafts building, infirmary, and staff quarters, garage, and store house. Typically each cluster of cabins is spaced at least 500 feet from the next. The entire ensemble, covering about 50-60 acres, makes up the group camp. The group camp is located in the park plan overall to provide privacy from other group camps and from day use visitors. The camp is also sited to fully exploit scenic and recreational opportunities in the area. Some sort of swimming, boating, and fishing facilities were available for each camp, as were other open areas for activities.

There are, as a result of this spatial organization, hierarchies of spaces, from intimate to quite large, from the semi-private space around an individual cabin, to the more communal spaces of the camp. There is also a continuous spectrum in the degree of privacy offered by these spaces, from the individual cabin, to the cluster of cabins, to the main gathering points around the Dining Hall or (in the evening) around the campfire circle. Both group camps around Lake Franklin have an extraordinary degree of integrity to the historic period, with virtually no major alterations made to their layout or to individual structures.

If all of Pine Mountain State Park were intended to accommodate group camps, the second lake created, Lake Delanor on the north side of the mountain, probably would have been developed along similar lines. But in this case, a public state park development was planned for this lake, with a picnic area, campground, and vacation cabin area, as well as a public boat house to be operated by a concessioner. This area was, and is, the most heavily used in the park, and it subsequently has sustained the greatest impacts on integrity. The seven original vacation cabins were carefully spaced at least 200 to 500 feet apart, and 75 to 100 feet from the southern lake shore. The nine new cabins built since World War II have been jammed between the cabins, and also built along a new spur road built for the purpose. The north shore of the lake has also sustained unnecessary visual impacts, since RV camping pads have been located there, close to the shore rather than set back were they would be less intrusive. In addition, the campground has been extended to the north, providing needed new camping spots. A through road was opened to provide access to Rte. 354 from the campgrounds, effectively turning the Lake Delanor spur road into a through road, something Wirth's park planners always tried to avoid, since through traffic created unnecessary disturbances.

Nevertheless, even in the Lake Delanor area of the park, the overall integrity of the spatial organization remains high: the basic outdoor spaces, and the public sequence through those spaces, remain as originally intended. And in the case of the day use area of the park, which is the area around the swimming pool and bathhouse on Rte. 354, the integrity of the spatial organization is complete. Located away from Lake Delanor and near the park entrance from the north on Rte. 354, the day use area includes a swimming pool, bathhouse, ballfield, and picnic area. The location of the area greatly reduced the potential through traffic in the Lake Delanor area, and elsewhere in the park. The bathhouse and pool complex is one of the finest intact examples of its type. Unpretentious, yet remarkably well planned, the Liberty Bell Pool, as it is known, and bathhouse persist with nearly perfect integrity, with only an intrusive security fence marring the original arrangement. Visitors arrive at the bathhouse on its uphill side, and as they move through, see the pool from terraces on the upper level. As they descend, visitors are directed to the mens' and womens' facilities on either side on the lower level. They are then brought back together in the central area below, before descending a final set of stone steps to the poolside.

Circulation

The patterns of visitor circulation through Pine Mountain again constitute an example of Park Service state park planning that is in some ways typical and in some unique. Although park planners typically liked to have only one automotive entrance to a park, an arrangement that was considered desirable to control traffic, this was impossible at Pine Mountain since the entire circulation pattern is predicated on the Pine Mountain Parkway, which cuts through and bisects the park. Like a park loop road, however, such a skyline drive is a classic park circulation diagram. The parkway made it possible to reach all the major attractions in the park via spur roads. These spur roads connect to the Lake Delanor vacation cabin area, the Lake Franklin RDA, and the park service area, thereby eliminating through traffic in all these areas and enhancing their separation from the more public parkway.

The day use area, located on the intersecting Rte. 354, established a cross axis in the main park circulation pattern. By concentrating this activity at that point (near what is a side entrance to the park) the overall circulation plan was greatly decentralized, reducing the potential effects of crowding in any single area. In addition, the scenic views of the parkway, and the location of the Pine Mountain Tavern directly on the parkway, assure that the majority of visitors can visit the park's main attractions without disturbing the more long term park visitors in the valleys below on either side of the mountain at the ends of spur roads.

Overall, all road construction at Pine Mountain was intended to follow topography, avoid sensitive areas, and minimize impacts of construction, while opening particular scenic areas and other features to easier public access. Major road structures are listed and described individually below. Minor structures--such as culverts, retaining walls, and guardwalls--are not listed individually, but are contributing portions of the road structures themselves. The construction of culvert headwalls, paved swales, and retaining walls along the road typically employ the same irregular fieldstone masonry found in the rest of the park. The "rustic" construction and stylistic uniformity of the smaller elements of road construction are important aspects of these contributing resources.

Topography

Pine Mountain itself was obviously the inspiration for the entire park and the determining factor in its subsequent development. Although technically not part of the Appalachian Range, Pine Mountain (1,300 feet) is one of the first ridges that rises abruptly from the Piedmont, and in effect can be seen as

one of the very southernmost foothills of the Appalachians. In addition, copious warm springs emerge from several locations at the base of the mountain at a consistent temperature of 88 degrees. The views from the mountain (especially to the south), the warm springs, and the relatively mild summer temperatures combined to make Pine Mountain an important early resort in the state.

The master plan for Pine Mountain State Park responded to the site's topography in each case, siting facilities and zoning activities to appropriate areas. Where possible, roads and trails follow the contours of the land. The spur roads down to the lakes created on either side of the mountain, for example, wind and parallel contours as much as possible. Scenic overlooks and the water tower were, of course, sited on the highpoints of the terrain. The lakes on either side of the mountain took advantage of existing terrain and water tables to minimize necessary excavation.

As a matter of policy, the necessary manipulation of topography for the construction of roads, buildings, and other facilities was kept to an absolute minimum. The important exceptions to this policy at Pine Mountain involved the provision of swimming areas and fish rearing ponds. The rivers and creeks of the park offered limited opportunities in these regards, and since swimming and fishing were considered necessary activities for a successful camp or park, a number of dams and excavations were carried out to create pools and flows fed by stream water. Lake Franklin, the largest of the new lakes, was created below and to the south of the mountain at an elevation of 822 feet above sea level. Lake Delanor, on the opposite side of the park, was created at an elevation of 881 feet. The series of fish rearing ponds near Lake Delanor were established at about 950 feet. In all cases, the lakes and pools were sited in existing hollows and declivities in order to minimize necessary excavation.

The Pine Mountain Parkway is the most obvious response to the topography at the site. The route of the parkway, first suggested by FDR in the late 1920s, simply follows the highest points of the ridge for the entire length of the park and beyond. This skyline drive proposal had much in common (at a greatly reduced scale) with the contemporary Skyline Drive proposed for Shenandoah National Park (authorized in 1926), a road that was also completed with New Deal funds.

Vegetation

Since the park was located mainly in second growth forests and areas of submarginal agricultural land, the subsequent regeneration of forests since the creation of the park often presents a considerable contrast to the original appearance of the vegetation during the period of significance. This change has been characterized by the maturation of now more diverse forests of mixed hardwoods and evergreens.

The pines that gave Pine Mountain its name have given way to Chestnut Oak as the dominant species in the area. Although logging took its toll on the pines in the area, it has also been suggested that Creek Indians burned the hillsides periodically to increase game and other forest products, and that this management regime had been responsible in part for delaying the succession to a mixed hardwood forest.

The reforestation of the park was not only anticipated by park planners in the 1930s, but was a principal consideration. In general, forestry projects attempted to reestablish more conifers, above all pines, to improve the diversity of both flora and fauna. As forests were established in abandoned fields or grew up on their own, however, keeping certain views open along roadsides--and especially from overlooks--became one of the most important aspects of the planned management of the

vegetation. The Lake Franklin and Pine Mountain Tavern overlooks, specifically, were designated scenic vistas.

Afforestation, erosion control, insect control, and fire suppression were all practiced by CCC recruits within the park forests during the period of significance. Hundreds of thousands of Loblolly and Longleaf pine seedlings, in particular, were propagated and planted by the CCC boys. Abandoned cotton fields and pastures were targeted for reforestation. In certain areas, such as along the park roads, groves of pines and other species planted by the CCC can be easily identified by the patterns and ages of the stands. Hundreds of acres of pine seedlings (at least) were planted by the CCC throughout the Pine Mountain area. Although an exhaustive vegetative cover analysis would be required to identify all the trees planted in the park by the CCC, forest management during the period of significance definitely had an impact on the forest's subsequent appearance and species diversity over a large portion of the NHL District.

A great deal of landscape work was also done within the historic district during the CCC period. Construction of roads and buildings was typically followed by "landscape naturalization," which involved transplanting native species from nearby woods and meadows in order to create planting compositions inspired by plant communities native to the area. A native plant nursery was operated by the CCC boys and provided thousands of plants for landscape work in the park. The oaks in front of the Pine Mountain Tavern and other conspicuously placed shade trees and shrubs around most of the buildings in the park are evidence of this work. This planting typically enhanced a new building's elevation (rather than obscuring it), and also served to erase scars of construction.

Structures, Buildings, Objects, and Sites
Note: NOTE: "GHR" numbers refer to the Georgia Historic Resource Number, as assigned in the Georgia Department of Natural Resources. If left blank, no number has been assigned. Information on buildings and other structures in the park has been taken from a survey of state-owned historic buildings completed by Mark R. Edwards for the Georgia Department of Natural Resources in 1994.

All of the landscape structures in Pine Mountain State Park share a unified inspiration and common materials and workmanship. This consistency was a principal goal for the park's planners. The consistent "rustic" quality of construction also reflects the working conditions of the CCC camps themselves, where labor was plentiful and materials were acquired and processed locally and by hand whenever possible. Throughout Pine Mountain State Park, roughly worked local stones, particularly buff, golden, and reddish fieldstone, were the material of choice. Masonry joints are typically fairly thick, but avoid obvious horizontal or vertical coursing. The surface of the randomly laid masonry is relatively smooth, unlike the more heavily rusticated masonry typical in Western state parks of the period. Similarly, walls tend to be battered very little or not at all, and the size of stones tends to be fairly consistent from the bottom courses to the top courses.

The buildings of the historic district share a strong stylistic unity that can be attributed to the park architects and landscape architects, but also to the general policies for state park development promulgated by Conrad Wirth at the National Park Service. All the buildings in the park, like the smaller structures, are outstanding examples of "NPS Rustic" style as adapted to state park development beginning in 1933. In many Georgia parks, and in Eastern parks in general, this style typically was more restrained, and often drew on colonial or farm architectural influences, as opposed

to the more fanciful "pioneer" architecture of massive logs and boulders typical of Western state and national parks.

Wood frame construction was often used in conjunction with load bearing masonry walls. Although peeled logs were used in places, squared timbers and milled lumber were more common. Wooden elements were usually stained deep brown, a shade which complemented the golden hues of the stone work. Roofs typically were covered in hand split shakes, although most have now been replaced by brown asphalt shingles. The vacation cabins and some other buildings have been fitted with storm windows, and minor alterations have been made to many park buildings, but overall the park buildings continue to possess an unusually high degree of integrity.

Main Park Roads, Pine Mountain Tavern, and Overnight Cabin Area

CS1. Structure: Pine Mountain Parkway (Rte. 190) GHR#:
Location: Pine Mountain Date: 1934-38
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC/Georgia Highway Dept.

This seven-mile, ridge-top highway stretches from the Tip Top (western) entrance of the park to the Hines Gap (eastern) entrance. FDR personally chose the route of the Pine Mountain Parkway (also known as the Pine Mountain Scenic Highway) and began boosting it in the late 1920s. Initial work on the road began in 1933, but most construction was done between 1934 and 1938. The CCC did all the grading and construction and the Georgia State Highway Department paved sections as they were completed. The five defined overlooks and other pull off points are included here as part of the road structure. Starting from the west, the first two overlooks face north, towards what is now Callaway Gardens, the adjacent private resort. The next two overlooks face south towards the Pine Mountain Valley community, and the last, the Lake Franklin Overlook, looks over the RDA portion of the park.

CS2. Structure: Route 354 GHR#:
Location: Pine Mountain Date: Early dirt road, rebuilt 1934-38
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC/Georgia Highway Dept.

This one-mile road runs perpendicular to and, at Kings Gap under, the Pine Mountain Parkway. Outside the park it continues to the Town of Pine Mountain (formerly Chipley) to the north. The Kings Gap route between Chipley and Shiloh was a Creek Indian route, then an important mountain pass for American settlers beginning in the early 19th century. The one-mile section of the road within Pine Mountain State Park was reconstructed by the CCC between 1934 and 1938.

CS3. Structure: FDR Memorial Bridge GHR#: HS-20
Location: Pine Mountain Date: 1934-38
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

This massive stone and concrete arch bridge carries Rte. 354 under the Pine Mountain Parkway at Kings Gap, a historic pass in the Pine Mountain ridge at the center of Pine Mountain State Park. FDR personally envisioned a bridge at this site to carry the scenic ridgetop highway he promoted. Also known as the "Rock Bridge," the massive abutments are built of the fieldstone masonry typical of the park.

CS4. Structure: Service Area Spur Road GHR#:
Location: Pine Mountain Date: 1934-38

Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This half-mile spur road connects the service area and the superintendent's residence to the Pine Mountain Parkway near the Pine Mountain Tavern.

CS5. Structure: Cabin Spur Road GHR#:
Location: Pine Mountain Date: 1934-38
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This eighth of a mile spur road serves the overnight cabin area and connects to the Pine Mountain Parkway.

CS6. Structure: Parking Lot GHR#:
Location: Near Pine Mn. Tavern Date: ca1935
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC
The original parking lot has remained unchanged from its original appearance, other than being paved. Original stone curbs and steps lead to the main path up to the front entrance of the Pine Mountain Tavern.

CO1. Object: Gas Pump GHR#:
Location: Near Pine Mtn. Tavern Date: ca1935
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC
This original 1930s gas pump is on the edge of the parking lot.

CS8. Structure: Watertower & Pumphouse GHR#:
Location: Near Pine Mtn. Tavern Date: ca1935
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC
The tower is an open concrete structure with a metal tank on top. The pumphouse is a low stone structure with a concrete slab roof. Entry to the pumphouse is through a hatch in the roof.

CS9. Structure: Storage Shed GHR#:
Location: Adjacent Tavern Date: ca1937
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC
The storage shed in this area is of highly unusual construction for a CCC-era structure: concrete block. The blocks feature an exterior rusticated finish.

CS10. Structure: Terrace & Retaining Wall GHR#:
Location: Adjacent Tavern Date: ca1935
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC
Adjacent to the tavern, the stone terrace provides an outdoor area with views off the ridge to the south. The fieldstone masonry roughly matches the tavern.

CS11. Structure: Stone Amphitheater GHR#:
Location: Near Pine Mtn. Tavern Date: ca1939
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC
The symmetrically arranged amphitheater near the tavern features seating at either end, with the long sides of the structure open to the view to the south. Constructed of fieldstone masonry, the structure is artfully sited among natural rock outcrops typical of the ridgetop.

CB1. Building: Pine Mountain Tavern (FDR Inn) GHR#: HS-1
Location: Pine Mountain Parkway Date: ca1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

The Pine Mountain Tavern originally rented rooms and served meals; it now functions as a visitor center and park headquarters. The two story rectangular building with a central entrance and symmetrical facade (with elements of Colonial Revival) evokes a stone farmhouse. Built in the irregular, fieldstone masonry typical of the park, the tavern is set in a landscape complete with winding path, shade trees, and ornamental shrubs that similarly recall a farm setting. The unsquared fieldstone masonry, ranging from buff to reddish brown, gives the building a characteristic warm color and appearance that is consistent in almost all the stone structures in the park. Lintels, shutters and other wooden elements are milled lumber, stained deep brown. An oversize iron light fixture over the front door and other hardware were hand forged by the CCC. The side-oriented gable roof is covered in wood shingles. This was an early, high profile success for the CCC; early buildings like this one were often featured in newspapers and magazines as examples of the kind of work the CCC could do.

CB2. Building: Overnight Cabin 1 GHR#: HS-2
Location: Near Tavern Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

Four stone overnight cabins are sited in a line along the Pine Mountain ridge east of the tavern. The overnight cabins originally had two separate rooms, each with stone fireplaces, accessed from a central hall. They relied on the tavern for food and other services. In each case, one side of the cabins has now been converted to a kitchen, and the cabins now serve only one group of guests apiece. This one-story stone cottage has a T-shaped plan and cross gabled roof covered in asphalt shingles. The randomly laid fieldstone masonry is typical of the park.

CB3. Building: Overnight Cabin 2 GHR#: HS-3
Location: Near Tavern Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

This one-story stone cottage has a rectangular plan and side oriented gabled roof covered in asphalt shingles. The randomly laid fieldstone masonry is typical of the park.

CB4. Building: Overnight Cabin 3 GHR#: HS-4
Location: Near Tavern Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

This one-story stone cottage has a T-shaped plan and cross gabled roof covered in asphalt shingles. The randomly laid fieldstone masonry is typical of the park.

CB5. Building: Overnight Cabin 4 GHR#: HS-5
Location: Near Tavern Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

This one-story stone cottage has a rectangular plan and side oriented gabled roof covered in asphalt shingles. The randomly laid fieldstone masonry is typical of the park.

CB6. Building: Superintendent's Residence GHR#: HS-6

Location: Service Area Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
A wooden cottage with a stone foundation and a pyramidal roof covered in asphalt shingles. Some alterations were made in the 1970s and 1980s: the old porch was made an interior room, a new porch was added, and rear, gabled addition was built. Although these changes are notable, the original pyramidal cottage remains intact and the building is considered here as a contributing resource in the historic district.

CB7. Building: Asst. Superintendent's Residence GHR#: HS-7
Location: Service Area Date: ca1939
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
An L-shaped wooden cottage with a stone foundation and a cross gable roof covered in asphalt shingles. Again, some alterations were made in the 1970s and 1980s: In this case, half the old porch was made an interior room, and a rear addition with a low pitched roof was built. Although these changes are notable, the original cottage remains intact and the building is considered here as a contributing resource in the historic district.

CB8. Building: Servants' Quarters GHR#: HS-8
Location: Service Area Date: ca1937
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This dogtrot-style, rectangular residence was built of the same unusual concrete block as the shed adjacent to the tavern. The blocks feature a rusticated exterior finish. The gabled roof is covered in asphalt shingles, and the windows have concrete lintels and brick sills. Again, some alterations were made in the 1970s and 1980s: in this case, the old porch was removed, and the dogtrot passage was sealed off with regular concrete block. Although these changes are notable, the original cottage remains intact and the building is considered here as a contributing resource in the historic district.

CB9. Building: Garage GHR#:
Location: Near Pine Mtn. Tavern Date: ca1935
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC
A stone, two-bay garage, with double doors, wooden lintels, and hand wrought iron lamp centered on the front. The masonry is the randomly laid fieldstone typical of the park. Wooden shingles have been replaced with brown asphalt.

Non-contributing resources in this area:

NCS1. Structure: Privacy Fence GHR#:
Location: Adjacent to Tavern Date: ca1980
Architect/Builder: Georgia DNR

NCS2. Structure: New Parking Lot GHR#:
Location: Adjacent to Tavern Date: ca1975
Architect/Builder: Georgia DNR

NCS3. Structure: Concrete Walks GHR#:
Location: Adjacent to Tavern Date: ca1980
Architect/Builder: Georgia DNR

NCS4. Structure:	Wood Railing	GHR#:
Location:	On Stone Terrace, Adjacent to Tavern	Date: ca1980
Architect/Builder:	Georgia DNR	
NCS5. Structure:	Incinerator	GHR#:
Location:	Service Area	Date: ca1980
Architect/Builder:	Georgia DNR	
NCS6. Building:	Garage	GHR#:
Location:	Service Area	Date: ca1980
Architect/Builder:	Georgia DNR	
NCS7. Structure:	Pine Mountain Trail	GHR#:
Location:	Parallel to parkway	Date: Mostly post-war
Architect/Builder:	Georgia DNR	
NCB1. Building:	Shop and Office	GHR#:
Location:	Service Area	Date: ca1980
Architect/Builder:	Georgia DNR	

Day Use (Pool) Area

CS12. Structure:	Liberty Bell Pool	GHR#: HS-22
Location:	Day Use Area	Date: 1939
Architect/Builder:	National Park Service/CCC	

The curvilinear edges of the pool result in a shape in plan that suggests a bell. The edges and bottom of the concrete pool are lined in fieldstone masonry veneer, which has survived in very good condition and gives the pool a unique character. A semi-circular wading pool is at one end. The name of the pool was suggested by FDR during one of his many visits to construction sites in the park.

CS13. Structure: Stone Terraces GHR#:
Location: Around Pool Date: 1939
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
A stone masonry apron surrounds the Liberty Bell Pool and the wading pool. The masonry is the randomly laid fieldstone typical of the park.

CS14. Structure: Terrace & Steps GHR#:
Location: Pool Side of B'House Date: 1939
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
A large stone terrace projects from the bathhouse and two sets of steps lead down to the pool. The masonry is the randomly laid fieldstone typical of the park.

CS15. Structure: Retaining Wall & Steps GHR#:
Location: Entrance side of B'House Date: 1939
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
A large retaining wall and steps take up the grade between the entrance to the bathhouse and a small grassy play area below.

CS16. Structure: Drinking Fountain GHR#:
Location: Day Use Area Date: 1939
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
An original stone drinking fountain, circular in plan and about three feet tall, is near the steps and retaining wall on the entrance side of the bathhouse. The masonry is the randomly laid fieldstone typical of the park.

CS17. Structure: Parking Lot GHR#:
Location: Day Use Area Date: 1939
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
The day use area parking lot was designed for 125 cars, a large number even today. The parking lot has stone curbs and forms an arc between the picnic shelter and the bathhouse.

CS18. Structure: Ball Field GHR#:
Location: Day Use Area Date: 1939
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Although it did not end up in the area originally indicated on historic plans, the ball field on the opposite side of Rte. 354 is an original feature of the day use area.

CS19. Structure: Town of Chipley Water Reservoir GHR#:HS-24
Location: SE of Day Use Area Date: Unknown
Architect/Builder:
The structure is a concrete box, about 50 feet by 25 feet, sunk into a stream bed. The structure appears on historic park plans, and may have been part of the water supply for the pool at one point.

CB10. Building: Bathhouse GHR#: HS-21
Location: Day Use Area Date: ca1940
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This two story stone bathhouse is built into a slope overlooking the Liberty Bell Pool. The central section of the building is two stories on the pool side, and one story on the uphill, entrance side. The central portion of the pool side elevation features a large opening, and is flanked on either side by mens' and womens' facilities. These wings are one story, and the flat roofs serve as terraces accessible from the second story level of the central part of the building. This upper level also has a recessed porch on the pool side. The fieldstone rubble masonry of the building is complemented by a side gable roof covered with brown asphalt shingles and brown clapboard siding in the gable ends. This simple but elegant bathhouse has extremely good integrity.

CB11. Building: Picnic Shelter/ Comfort Station GHR#: HS-23
Location: Day Use Area Date: 1939
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
A combination comfort station and picnic shelter. The front portion is an open, side-gabled structure of stone with clapboard gable ends and square timber posts on the open side. The building has a T-shaped plan, and the comfort station (enclosed) portion is covered by an intersecting gable roof, which like the main roof is now covered in brown asphalt shingles. The comfort station is entirely of stone, with separate doors for each side and a clapboarded end gable. Tapered buttresses extend beyond the ends of the walls of the comfort station. This is the largest picnic shelter in the park.

Non-contributing resources in this area:
NCS8.Structure: New Parking Lot GHR#:
Location: South of Rte. 354 Date:ca1980
Architect/Builder: Georgia DNR

NCS9. Structure: Security Fence Around Pool GHR#:
Location: Day Use Area Date:ca1980
Architect/Builder: Georgia DNR

Lake Delanor (Vacation Cabin) Area
CS20. Structure: Lake Delanor and Dam GHR#: HS-18
Location: Lake Delanor Area Date:1935/1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
The earthen dam impounds a secondary branch of Mountain Creek; the outlet is at the north end of the dam, and the Lake Delanor park road runs along the top of the dam. The lake was named in honor of Eleanor and Franklin Delano Roosevelt. The name resulted from a competition to name the lake organized by the Atlanta Constitution. The winner received a free week's stay in one of the vacation cabins.

CS21. Structure: Lake Delanor Road GHR#:
Location: Lake Delanor Area Date: ca1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

This one-mile road runs from the Pine Mountain Parkway at the Pine Mountain Tavern down to Lake Delanor.

CS22. Structure: Cabin Spur Road GHR#:
Location: Lake Delanor Area Date: ca1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This half-mile spur road connects to the original vacation cabin area along the south shore of Lake Delanor.

CS23. Structure: Picnic Area Spur Road and Campground Loops GHR#:
Location: Lake Delanor Area Date: ca1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
A half-mile spur roads connect to the picnic area and campground on the west and north shores of Lake Delanor.

CS24. Structure: Boat House Terrace GHR#:
Location: Lake Delanor Area Date: ca1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This stone terrace extends along the south shore of Lake Delanor and originally associated with the boathouse activities. The rail fence along the edge is supported by stone piers.

CB12. Building: Lake Delanor Boathouse GHR#: HS-9
Location: Lake Delanor Date: ca1939
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This one story, wood frame boathouse is on the south shore of Lake Delanor, and originally was used by a concession to rent rowboats and operate a small store. At some point it was converted to serve as a small bathhouse. The building is clapboarded with board and batten in the gable ends. Porch supports are square timbers, and the foundation is concrete.

CB13. Building: Cabin 6 GHR#: HS-10
Location: Lake Delanor Date: ca1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
A series of seven log vacation cabins were built along a spur road on the south shore of Lake Delanor. These cabins were originally equipped with small kitchens and were intended to serve one group of visitors apiece. The accommodations were therefore roomier and more independent than those of the duplex overnight cabins near the tavern, and the vacation cabins were intended to be rented for longer stays. The cabins were generously spaced and kept 75 to 100 feet away from the edge of the lake to avoid spoiling the view from the opposite side. All are of log construction chinked with concrete, with gable roofs covered in asphalt shingles and board and batten in the gable ends. All have massive stone chimneys and fireplaces. The seven original cabins have been altered slightly in some cases, and all have new storm windows; overall, however, their integrity is very good. Cabin 6 is a one story log cabin with a single door set within a small porch. The porch roof is a small projecting gable supported by diagonal log braces. There is a lamp over the door and a log truss in the gable.

CB14. Building: Cabin 7 GHR#: HS-11
Location: Lake Delanor Date: ca1935

Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This log cabin faces toward the lake and has a stone terrace that wraps around two sides. A portion of the terrace is covered by a front gabled porch roof with squared timber porch supports. The front door and one window are set within the screened-in porch.

CB15. Building: Cabin 8 GHR#: HS-12
Location: Lake Delanor Date: ca1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This Cabin has a screened porch with squared timber posts that extends across the front of the cabin. The porch floor is stone. The front door is flanked by windows within the porch.

CB16. Building: Cabin 9 GHR#: HS-13
Location: Lake Delanor Date: ca1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This Cabin has a screened porch with squared timber posts and a stone floor; the front is two bays wide with the door to the left and a window to the right. Identical to Cabin 11.

CB17. Building: Cabin 10 GHR#: HS-14
Location: Lake Delanor Date: ca1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This Cabin was originally a duplex cabin with a four bay front elevation. Windows are in the outer bays and doors are in the inner bays, behind a porch with squared timber posts.

CB18. Building: Cabin 11 GHR#: HS-15
Location: Lake Delanor Date: ca1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This Cabin has a screened porch with squared timber posts and stone floor. The front is two bays wide, with the door to the left and a window to the right. Identical to Cabin 9.

CB19. Building: Cabin 5 GHR#: HS-16
Location: Lake Delanor Date: ca1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
The cabin is set on a steep slope with a tall stone foundation on the downhill side. The front part of the cabin is side gabled with a large rear gabled wing. The only opening in the front wall is the door, which is set off center within a screened porch.

CSI1. Site: Fish Hatchery Pools GHR#: HS-19
Location: Near Lake Delanor Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This site consists of the remains of what were seven linked pools, excavated and equipped with valves, spillways, and pipes for the purpose of hatching fish. By careful site selection excavation costs were minimized; the pools were created by throwing low dams across small gullies and existing depressions. Although one pool apparently remains filled, all are in a state of considerable disrepair and generally are dry.

Non-contributing resources in this area:
NCS10. Structure: New Cabin Spur Road GHR#:

Location:	South and west from Lake Delanor Road	Date:ca1980
Architect/Builder:	Georgia DNR	
NCS11. Structure:	New Cabin Loop Road	GHR#:
Location:	Extending from original Lake Delanor cabin road	Date:ca1980
Architect/Builder:	Georgia DNR	
NCS12. Structure:	New Road to Rte. 354	GHR#:
Location:	Extending from original Lake Delanor campground	Date:ca1980
Architect/Builder:	Georgia DNR	
NCS13.Structure:	New Campground Loops	GHR#:
Location:	North of original Lake Delanor campground	Date:ca1980
Architect/Builder:	Georgia DNR	
NCS14. Structure:	New Wood Fishing Dock	GHR#:
Location:	Next to existing boat house stone terrace	Date:ca1980
Architect/Builder:	Georgia DNR	
NCS15.Structure:	RV Campsite Pads	GHR#:
Location:	Off park road, north shore of Lake Delanor	Date:ca1975
Architect/Builder:	Georgia DNR	
NCS16.Structure:	Picnic Shelter	GHR#: HS-17
Location:	Lake Delanor Dam	Date: Unknown
Architect/Builder:	Georgia DNR	
NCS17.Structure:	Campfire Circle	GHR#:
Location:	Near Lake Delanor Dam	Date: Ca. 1980
Architect/Builder:	Georgia DNR	
NCB2-5. Buildings:	Comfort Stations (4)	GHR#:
Location:	Lake Delanor Campgrounds	Date:Ca.1970-80
Architect/Builder:	Georgia DNR	
NCB6-14. Buildings:	Vacation Cabins (9)	GHR#:
Location:	Lake Delanor, along new cabin spur road, new cabin loop road, and in between original vacation cabins	Date:Ca.1970-80

Architect/Builder: Georgia DNR

Lake Franklin (RDA) Area

CS25. Structure: Lake Franklin and Dam GHR#: HS-88
Location: Lake Franklin Date:ca1938
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

The Lake Franklin RDA is composed of two group camps: a large camp on the west side of Lake Franklin and a smaller camp on the east side. The large camp has four cabin units, or clusters, and the small camp has two. The slightly curved earthen dam impounds a branch of Bethlehem Creek to create Lake Franklin, the larger of the two lakes built on either side of Pine Mountain. It was named for Franklin Roosevelt.

CS26. Structure: Lake Franklin Road GHR#:
Location: Lake Franklin Date:ca1938
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

A three-mile road winds down to Lake Franklin from Rte. 354 south of Kings Gap. The road connects back to Rte. 354 outside the southern boundary of the park, providing a second access point for the Lake Franklin area.

CS27. Structure: Spur Road to Spring GHR#:
Location: Lake Franklin Date:ca1938
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

A half-mile spur road winds up from half way down the Lake Franklin Road to a spring which is the main source for the Lake Franklin inlet.

CS28. Structure: Camp Spur Road GHR#:
Location: Lake Franklin Date:ca1938
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

An eighth of a mile spur road leads to the large group camp unit on the west shore of Lake Franklin.

CS29. Structure: Storage Building GHR#: HS-28
Location: Lake Franklin/ Large Group Camp Date: ca1937
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

This Building is a wood frame, rectangular side gable facility with double doors centered on front. The front porch is a roofless wooden platform set on stone piers, and foundation is stone. The building has clapboard siding and asphalt shingles.

CS30. Structure: Storage Building GHR#: HS-80
Location: Lake Franklin/ Small Group Camp Date: ca1939
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

This building is a rectangular, wood frame, one story storage facility with side oriented gable and asphalt shingles. Double doors are centered on front, uncovered wood stoop porch. This building is similar to the storage building in the large group camp.

CB20. Building: Ranger's Residence GHR#: HS-25
Location: Entrance Lake Date: ca1939
Franklin Area
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
The Residence is single story, L-shaped in plan, with cross gables, asphalt shingles, and clapboard siding, and board and batten in the end gables. The foundation is stone and the porch, now partially enclosed, is set within the ell. A fieldstone chimney is set off center within the roof.

CB21. Building: Dining Hall GHR#: HS-26
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1937
Large Group Camp
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
The large group camp mess hall, at the center of the large camp, has a T-shaped plan. The main room is the projecting, front gabled wing with a recessed porch on the front, which serves as the campers' dining hall. The side gabled wings to the rear contain the kitchen and other areas. A massive stone chimney is set in the center of the rear of the building. Construction is mortise and tenon, brace frame trusses; the siding is clapboard, and the foundation is stone with stone piers in places. Wood shingles have been replaced with brown asphalt shingles, but otherwise the building (like all the buildings around Lake Franklin) has excellent integrity.

CB22. Building: Cook's Cabin GHR#: HS-27
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1937
Large Group Camp
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This Cabin is a rectangular, one story, wood frame building with front oriented gable, asphalt shingles, and clapboard siding. It has a stone pier foundation, with gabled porches at the front and rear, and doors set asymmetrically at each end.

CB23. Building: Canteen GHR#: HS-30
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1937
Large Group Camp
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
The Canteen is a rectangular, one story wood building set on stone piers, with side oriented gable, asphalt
shingles, and mortise and tenon, wood brace construction. The building has a small gabled porch with squared timber posts at the front entrance. A small pavilion has been added to the rear of the building, ca. 1975.

CB24. Building: Infirmary GHR#: HS-31
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1937
Large Group Camp
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
The Infirmary is a rectangular, one story wood building set on stone piers. It has a front oriented gable, asphalt shingles, and wood frame construction with clapboard siding. The porches on the front and rear have stone and concrete floors, squared timber posts, and shed roofs.

CB25. Building: Comfort Station GHR#: HS-32
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1937

Large Group Camp
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

The Comfort station is a rectangular, one story wood building set on a stone foundation, with side oriented gable, asphalt shingles, wood frame construction, and clapboard siding. Screened openings are set under the eaves, and one side has a set of stone steps. There are entrances on both sides of the building.

CB26. Building: Registration Office GHR#: HS-33
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1937
Large Group Camp
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

The Registration office is a one story, T-shaped plan, wood frame construction building, with cross gable roofs, clapboard siding, and stone piers. The main entry is a set of double doors set in the recessed porch on the front gabled portion of the building. On either side wall of this wing are triple windows. Small porches with stone floors and shed roofs are set on both side wings.

CB27. Building: Craft Cabin GHR#: HS-34
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1937
Large Group Camp
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

The Cabin is a one story, rectangular plan, wood frame building, with side oriented gable and asphalt shingles, clapboard siding, and stone foundation. A porch covers two sides and has shed roof and built in benches.

CB28. Building: Picnic Shelter GHR#: HS-35
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1936
Large Group Camp
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

The Picnic Shelter is a rectangular building, with front oriented gable roof, mortise and tenon brace frame, and board and batten in the gable ends. The foundation is concrete and the shingles are asphalt.

CB29. Building: Youth Pavilion GHR#: HS-36
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1936
Large Group Camp
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

The Youth Pavilion is a rectangular building, with front oriented gable roof, mortise and tenon brace frame, and board and batten in the gable ends. The foundation is concrete and the shingles are asphalt. Squared timber posts have curved diagonal braces.

CB30. Building: Lodge #1 GHR#: HS-37
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1936
Large Group Camp
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

The Lodge is a one story, rectangular plan, wood frame construction building, with front oriented gable and asphalt shingles, clapboard siding, and a stone foundation. The front, recessed porch has a shed roof. The side porch has a stone chimney centered through it, and the porch supports are squared timbers.

CB31. Building: Lodge #2 GHR#: HS-38
Location: Lake Franklin/ Large Group Camp Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
The Lodge is a one story, rectangular plan, wood frame construction building, with front oriented gable and asphalt shingles, clapboard siding, and a stone foundation. The front recessed porch has a shed roof. The side porch has stone chimney centered through it, and the porch supports are squared timbers. Identical to Lodge #1.

CB32. Building: Lodge #3 GHR#: HS-39
Location: Lake Franklin/ Large Group Camp Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
The Lodge is a one story, rectangular plan, wood frame construction building, with front oriented gable and asphalt shingles, clapboard siding, and a stone foundation. The front recessed porch has a shed roof. The side porch has a stone chimney centered through it, and porch supports are squared timbers. Identical to Lodge #1.

CB33. Building: Lodge #4 GHR#: HS-40
Location: Lake Franklin/ Large Group Camp Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
The Lodge is a one story, rectangular plan, wood frame construction building, with front oriented gable and asphalt shingles, clapboard siding, and a stone foundation. The front recessed porch has a shed roof. The side porch has a stone chimney centered through it, and porch supports are squared timbers. Identical to Lodge #1.

CB34. Building: Restroom, Unit 1 GHR#: HS-41
Location: Lake Franklin/ Large Group Camp, Unit 1 Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
The Restroom is a rectangular, wood frame construction building, with side oriented gable, clapboard siding, asphalt shingles, and a stone foundation. The stoop porch on the front is uncovered. There is a ribbon of screened openings above the clapboards. The one door is set asymmetrically.

CB35. Building: Restroom, Unit 2 GHR#: HS-42
Location: Lake Franklin/ Large Group Camp, Unit 2 Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
The restroom is a rectangular, wood frame construction building, with side oriented gable, clapboard siding, asphalt shingles, and a stone foundation. The stoop porch on the front is uncovered. There is a ribbon of screened openings above the clapboards. The one door is set asymmetrically.

CB36. Building: Restroom, Unit 3 GHR#: HS-43
Location: Lake Franklin/ Large Group Camp, Unit 3 Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

The Restroom is a rectangular, wood frame construction building, with side oriented gable, clapboard siding, asphalt shingles, and a stone foundation. The stoop porch on the front is uncovered. There is a ribbon of screened openings above the clapboards. The one door is set asymmetrically.

CB37. Building: Restroom, Unit 4 GHR#: HS-44
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1936
Large Group Camp, Unit 4
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

The Restroom is a rectangular, wood frame construction building, with side oriented gable, clapboard siding, asphalt shingles, and a stone foundation. The stoop porch on the front is uncovered. There is a ribbon of screened openings above the clapboards. The one door is set asymmetrically.

CB38. Building: Cabin 11 GHR#: HS-45
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1936
Large Group Camp, Unit 1
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

The Cabin is a one story rectangular building with side oriented gable, wood frame construction, asphalt shingles, and clapboard siding. It is set on a stone foundation with a door centered on the front facade. Above the clapboards, the walls alternate vertical boards and screened openings. The openings have interior shutters. Cabin has no fireplace, exposed rafters, and small recessed porches.

CB39. Building: Cabin 15 GHR#: HS-46
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1936
Large Group Camp, Unit 1
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

Identical to Cabin 11.

CB40. Building: Cabin 21 GHR#: HS-47
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1936
Large Group Camp, Unit 2
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

Identical to Cabin 11.

CB41. Building: Cabin 28 GHR#: HS-48
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1936
Large Group Camp, Unit 2
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

Identical to Cabin 11.

CB42. Building: Cabin 33 GHR#: HS-49
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1936
Large Group Camp, Unit 3
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

Identical to Cabin 11.

CB43. Building: Cabin 37 GHR#: HS-50
Location: Lake Franklin/ Large Group Camp, Unit 3 Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Identical to Cabin 11.

CB44. Building: Cabin 47 GHR#: HS-51
Location: Lake Franklin/ Large Group Camp, Unit 4 Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Identical to Cabin 11.

CB45. Building: Cabin 48 GHR#: HS-52
Location: Lake Franklin/ Large Group Camp, Unit 4 Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Identical to Cabin 11.

CB46. Building: Cabin 12 GHR#: HS-53
Location: Lake Franklin/ Large Group Camp, Unit 1 Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
The cabin is a one story rectangular building with side oriented gable, wood frame construction, asphalt shingles, and clapboard siding. It is set on a stone foundation with a door centered on the front facade. Above the clapboards, the walls alternate vertical boards and screened openings. The openings have interior shutters. These cabins have a full front porch with shed roofs and squared timber supports set on stone piers.

CB47. Building: Cabin 13 GHR#: HS-54
Location: Lake Franklin/ Large Group Camp, Unit 1 Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Identical to Cabin 12.

CB48. Building: Cabin 14 GHR#: HS-55
Location: Lake Franklin/ Large Group Camp, Unit 1 Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Identical to Cabin 12.

CB49. Building: Cabin 16 GHR#: HS-56
Location: Lake Franklin/ Large Group Camp, Unit 1 Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Identical to Cabin 12.

CB50. Building: Cabin 17 GHR#: HS-57
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1936

Large Group Camp, Unit 1
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Identical to Cabin 12.

CB51. Building: Cabin 18 GHR#: HS-58
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1936
Large Group Camp, Unit 1
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Identical to Cabin 12.

CB52. Building: Cabin 23 GHR#: HS-59
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1936
Large Group Camp, Unit 1
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Identical to Cabin 12.

CB53. Building: Cabin 25 GHR#: HS-60
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1936
Large Group Camp, Unit 2
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Identical to Cabin 12.

CB54. Building: Cabin 26 GHR#: HS-61
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1936
Large Group Camp, Unit 2
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Identical to Cabin 12.

CB55. Building: Cabin 27 GHR#: HS-62
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1936
Large Group Camp, Unit 2
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Identical to Cabin 12.

CB56. Building: Cabin 32 GHR#: HS-63
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1936
Large Group Camp, Unit 3
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Identical to Cabin 12.

CB57. Building: Cabin 34 GHR#: HS-64
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1936
Large Group Camp, Unit 3
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

Identical to Cabin 12.

CB58. Building: Cabin 35 GHR#: HS-65
Location: Lake Franklin/ Large Group Camp, Unit 3 Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Identical to Cabin 12.

CB59. Building: Cabin 41 GHR#: HS-66
Location: Lake Franklin/ Large Group Camp, Unit 4 Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Identical to Cabin 12.

CB60. Building: Cabin 42 GHR#: HS-67
Location: Lake Franklin/ Large Group Camp, Unit 4 Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Identical to Cabin 12.

CB61. Building: Cabin 43 GHR#: HS-68
Location: Lake Franklin/ Large Group Camp, Unit 4 Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
The Cabin is a one story rectangular building with side oriented gable, wood frame construction, asphalt shingles, and clapboard siding. It is set on a stone foundation with a door centered on front facade. Above the clapboards, walls alternate vertical boards and screened openings. The openings have interior shutters. These cabins each have a small front porch set on stone piers with shed roofs and one squared timber support at each end.

CB62. Building: Cabin 44 GHR#: HS-69
Location: Lake Franklin/ Large Group Camp, Unit 4 Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Identical to Cabin 43.

CB63. Building: Cabin 45 GHR#: HS-70
Location: Lake Franklin/ Large Group Camp, Unit 4 Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Identical to Cabin 43.

CB64. Building: Cabin 46 GHR#: HS-71
Location: Lake Franklin/ Large Group Camp, Unit 4 Date: ca1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Identical to Cabin 43.

CB65. Building: Cabin 22 GHR#: HS-72
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1936
Large Group Camp, Unit 2
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Identical to Cabin 43.

CB66. Building: Cabin 24 GHR#: HS-73
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1936
Large Group Camp, Unit 2
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Identical to Cabin 43.

CB67. Building: Cabin 31 GHR#: HS-74
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1936
Large Group Camp, Unit 3
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Identical to Cabin 43.

CB68. Building: Cabin 38 GHR#: HS-75
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1936
Large Group Camp, Unit 2
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
The Cabin is a one story rectangular building with front oriented gable, wood frame construction, asphalt shingles, and clapboard siding. It is set on a stone foundation with a door centered on front facade. Above the clapboards, walls alternate vertical boards and screened openings. The openings have interior shutters. These cabins have a full front porch with shed roof and four squared timber supports.

CB69. Building: Cabin 36 GHR#: HS-76
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1936
Large Group Camp, Unit 3
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Identical to Cabin 38.

CB70. Building: Garage GHR#: HS-29
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1937
Large Group Camp
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
The Garage is a wood frame, rectangular side gable building with two doors arranged asymmetrically. The larger part of the building is a two bay garage, with a smaller storage area at one end. It has clapboard siding and asphalt shingles.

CB71. Building: Dining Hall GHR#: HS-77
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1937
Small Group Camp
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

The small group camp mess hall, at the center of the smaller camp on the east side of the lake, has a Latin Cross shaped plan. The main room is a long, narrow, side gabled structure. Small ells with lower gabled roofs project perpendicularly near one end. The main entrance is via the recessed porch on the front of one of these ells. At the opposite (southern) end of the building are the kitchen and other facilities. The north (dining hall) end has a large stone chimney centered in it. Construction is mortise and tenon, brace frame trusses, the siding is clapboard, and the foundation is stone, with stone piers in places. Wood shingles have been replaced with brown asphalt shingles, but otherwise the building (like all the buildings around Lake Franklin) has excellent integrity.

CB72. Building: Infirmary GHR#: HS-78
Old Admin and First Aid Bldg.
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1937
Small Group Camp
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

The Infirmary is a one story, H-shaped cabin with two front gabled rooms connected by a cross gabled breezeway, dogtrot style. Each room has a door opening onto the breezeway. The building is of wood frame construction, has asphalt shingles, and clapboard siding, and is set on stone piers.

CB73. Building: Cook's Cabin GHR#: HS-79
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1937
Small Group Camp
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

The Cabin is a rectangular, one story, wood frame building with front oriented gable, asphalt shingles, and clapboard siding. It has a stone pier foundation, gabled porches at the front and rear, and doors set asymmetrically at each end.

CB74. Building: Lodge GHR#: HS-81
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1939
Small Group Camp, Unit 2
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

The Lodge is a one story, rectangular plan, wood frame construction building, with front oriented gable, asphalt shingles, clapboard siding, and a stone foundation. It has a veranda porch with a gabled roof on the front. The side porch has a shed roof, and porch supports are squared timbers.

CB75. Building: Cabin 22 GHR#: HS-82
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1939
Small Group Camp, Unit 2
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

These cabins have a Greek Cross shape in plan. At the center of the longer facade, cross gabled ells project. The roofless, stone stoop porch is attached to the front of the projecting ell on the one side, and the front door is centered there. These larger cabins have one long room and a smaller room for storage. They are set on stone piers, have wood frame construction, clapboard siding, and asphalt shingles. Each other bay has a large screened opening with shutters.

CB76. Building: Cabin 21 GHR#: HS-83
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1939
Small Group Camp, Unit 2
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

Identical to Cabin 22.

CB77. Building:	Cabin 23	GHR#: HS-84
Location:	Lake Franklin/ Small Group Camp, Unit 2	Date: ca1939
Architect/Builder:	National Park Service/CCC	

Identica to Cabin 22.

CB78. Building:	Cabin 11	GHR#: HS-85
Location:	Lake Franklin/ Small Group Camp, Unit 1	Date: ca1939
Architect/Builder:	National Park Service/CCC	

Identical to Cabin 22.

CB79. Building:	Cabin 12	GHR#: HS-86
Location:	Lake Franklin/ Small Group Camp, Unit 1	Date: ca1939
Architect/Builder:	National Park Service/CCC	

Identical to Cabin 22.

CB80. Building: Cabin 13 GHR#: HS-87
Location: Lake Franklin/ Date: ca1937
Small Group Camp, Unit 1
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Identical to Cabin 22.

Non-contributing resources in this area:
NCB15.Building: Horse Stable Concession GHR#:
Location: Lake Franklin Road Date:Ca.1970-80
Architect/Builder: Unknown

8. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

Applicable National Register Criteria: A X B X C X D__

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

NHL Criteria: 1, 2, 4

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

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

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

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

Period(s) of Significance: 1933-1941

Significant Dates: 1934, 1936, 1938

Significant Person(s): Roosevelt, Franklin D.

Cultural Affiliation: NA

Architect/Builder: Brooks, James H., Jr.; Bishop, J.E.; Woodward, Stuart M., Jr.; Day, Cecil C.; "E.L.B."; "A.M.M."; "H.E.S."

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

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

Summary

The Pine Mountain State Park NHL District meets National Historic Landmark Criterion 1 for its association with the American park movement. The high artistic significance and great integrity of the park make it an outstanding example of Park Service/CCC collaboration. This collaboration was one of the most significant events in the history of American parks, and the results of this collaboration today continue to make up the core of many state park systems. The park also meets NHL Criterion 2 because of its direct and personal association with Franklin D. Roosevelt. Roosevelt, largely because of his strong interest in the CCC, was responsible for more park development than any other American in history; Pine Mountain State Park can be considered the one state park of the period most closely associated with Roosevelt personally. The NHL District also meets National Historic Landmark Criterion 4 as an exceptionally valuable example of American landscape architecture, specifically as a significant example of the Park Service collaboration with the CCC and local park authorities in the 1930s.

Pine Mountain State Park (now known as FDR State Park, Western Half) is an extremely significant and well preserved state park of the period, and epitomizes the artistic quality and high aspirations held for state parks designed by the Park Service during the 1930s. It is also one of the best remaining examples of "recreational demonstration area" (RDA) design in the country. In this case, the RDA (or group camp) facilities were included together with the state park in a combined development. Pine Mountain State Park is one of the highest achievements of the collaboration of the Park Service, the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), other New Deal agencies, and local park authorities during the New Deal.

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

In the case of Pine Mountain State Park, there exists an important historical association with Franklin D. Roosevelt that adds to the importance of the outstanding integrity and artistic excellence of the park. Exceptional to begin with, because of its fine and well preserved bathhouse, cabins, and other development, Pine Mountain, more than any other state park of the period, also has a direct personal association with FDR. Roosevelt, whose Warm Springs Little White House and model farm were adjacent to the land that became Pine Mountain State Park, had an interest in land stewardship in the area going back to 1924, when he first arrived at Warm Springs to seek therapy for the crippling effects of polio. Even before he became president, Roosevelt was directly responsible for proposals for a scenic skyline drive and a state park at Pine Mountain. After personally initiating the creation of the CCC, Roosevelt took a great personal interest in the youth program. The CCC camps at Pine Mountain (so close to his vacation home) became the camps most often visited by Roosevelt in person. More than at any other state or national park of the period, it was at Pine Mountain that

Roosevelt observed the CCC crews working, and he even made suggestions regarding park design and construction. At Pine Mountain, Roosevelt had a personal hand in implementing a specific example of his expansive general vision for state park development.

The Pine Mountain State Park NHL District is significant under National Register Criterion A for its association with the American park movement. The district is also significant under National Register Criterion B because of its association with Franklin D. Roosevelt. The district is also significant under National Register Criterion C as an example of American landscape architecture, specifically as an extremely significant example of the Park Service collaboration with the CCC and local park authorities.

The period of significance extends from the beginning of planning and design for the park in 1933 to the end of CCC activities in the park in 1941. Other significant dates include 1934, when the State of Georgia acquired some of the land for the park, and the FERA "land program" was authorized to acquire submarginal agricultural land that eventually also became part of the park; 1936, when many of the park buildings and structures were complete and one of the two CCC camps was moved out of the park; and 1938, when the park was officially opened to the public.

Historic Context

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

By 1933, chief landscape architect Thomas C. Vint and his atelier of Park Service designers and engineers were in a unique position to offer technical support for New Deal programs. Since 1927, the closely knit group of up to 16 professionals had been growing in number and refining its procedures. The Landscape Division's authority within the Park Service had been steadily enhanced as Park Service Director Horace Albright and other officials came to recognize the usefulness and efficiency of the park "master planning" process. The compilation of master plans proved to be a particularly significant activity in the early 1930s. Besides safeguarding parks from excessive or poorly coordinated road construction and other development, the master plans also detailed at a six-year program of prioritized construction activity.

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

unable to take part so quickly and competently in the emergency conservation and public-works program."[1]

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

For its part in the "emergency conservation work," the Park Service was asked to plan, design, and give other technical assistance for all the park and recreational developments undertaken by the CCC outside of national forests. This of course included the work contemplated for the national parks themselves, but it also entailed the planning and design of hundreds of state, county, and even large municipal parks in almost every state and territory. Over 70 percent of the CCC work subsequently supervised by the Park Service was done in the over 560 non-federal park areas the bureau helped plan and develop during the 1930s. To accomplish this, the Park Service cooperated and provided direct technical assistance to state park and other planning agencies in 47 states, 26 counties, and 69 cities.[3]

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

The Park Service quickly regionalized portions of its operations to meet the new requirements placed on it. Four "districts" were created by Albright in May 1933 to handle the huge administrative burden

---

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

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

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

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

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

Bureaucratic growth and regionalization were necessitated by a huge expansion of staff and responsibilities. Before the spring of 1933, the Park Service had about 700 permanent and 373 temporary employees. Of these, fewer than 150 worked in the Washington office or in the eastern and western field headquarters.[6] By 1935, over 13,000 people were employed with the Park Service, and at the peak of New Deal activities the number was closer to 14,000. This number was inflated by employees who maintained the public buildings of the nation's capital (one of the many responsibilities transferred to the Park Service in the 1933 reorganization); but even when this function was divested to another agency in 1940, permanent Park Service personnel still numbered over 7,300. The Park Service "branch of plans and design," as Thomas Vint's division was now known, went from 16 design and engineering professionals in 1933, to 120 in 1935. In 1936 the total rose to 220, but that number still did not include professionals working in the national park CCC camps as supervisors and foremen, or the hundreds of professionals working in the Park Service's state park CCC program.[7] Annual appropriations for the Park Service rose steadily as well, from about $10 million in 1933 to over $25 million in 1939 (before returning to $10 million in 1941).[8]

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

In 1921, Mather helped organize a National Conference on Parks in Des Moines, bringing together dozens of prominent park advocates from all over the country. The Park Service director was motivated in part by the desire to protect the standards and integrity of the national park system, since by encouraging the creation of state parks he hoped to avoid substandard properties from being forced on the Park Service. But there were far more ambitious goals for state park planning being expressed by other park advocates at the national conference. The group officially proclaimed that outdoor recreation was a basic human need, and that the national parks were often too far from centers of population to meet that need consistently. More accessible municipal parks, for their part, were insufficient to provide the desired experience of "the great outdoors." A complete, nation-wide park system needed to include a full typology of parks, including what J. Horace McFarland described as "broad areas that will give opportunity to enjoy the great outdoors as well as to preserve and make available the characteristic scenery of any particular state." Speaking at the second National Conference on State Parks held in 1922 at the Bear Mountain Inn, McFarland declared, "No American family should have to travel a thousand miles or more to reach a great open space." What was needed was a fully developed, national system of parks, including national parks certainly, but also including far more numerous state and county scenic reservations, which if less spectacular than national parks, were far more accessible to urban populations.[11]

A growing number of park advocates in the early 1920s were calling for coordinated, national outdoor recreational planning that would assure that a full range of recreational opportunities--from neighborhood playgrounds to national parks--would be available. The rapidly organizing state park movement brought together many different park promoters who advocated the coordinated expansion of different park systems. In 1924, Calvin Coolidge recognized this trend by convening the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation, which assembled 28 national organizations and scores of local groups to discuss how, in Coolidge's words, "to expand and conserve throughout the country our recreational opportunities."[12] The conference resulted in the creation of a cooperative association of national, state, and local groups working together to coordinate "national policy" on recreational planning for all categories of public lands. But the creation of such policy remained far beyond the mandate of any federal bureau. Mather's encouragement of state park planning, like the formation of the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation, relied on the spirit of cooperation for effectiveness

---

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

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

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

and on private charity for most funding. Individual planners, such as Benton MacKaye or Warren Manning, who advocated their own national recreational plans in the early 1920s, did so largely at their own expense. By 1933, no truly coordinated policy for national recreational planning yet existed. Individual state and federal land management agencies pursued park plans independently, without the benefits or drawbacks of a centralized planning authority.

By the late 1920s, however, certain states had produced individual state-wide recreation plans that later influenced the course of New Deal national planning. In several states, what had been scattered collections of scenic reservations and historic sites were being consolidated and enlarged as state park systems. Many of these park systems, such as the Forest Preserve Districts around Chicago or the Westchester County parks outside New York, included areas that served large crowds of urbanites looking for picnic groves, swimming pools, and hiking trails within day-tripping distance. But no state park plan proved more significant than the State Park Survey of California completed by Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., in 1929. In 1927, the California state legislature established a state park commission and authorized it to undertake a comprehensive survey to determine the "ultimate development of a comprehensive, state park system" as a means of "conserving and utilizing the scenic and recreational resources of the state."[13] The commission immediately hired Olmsted, already well-known in the state for his advocacy of national and state parks and as the planner of Palos Verdes Estates (1923). Olmsted's California survey demonstrated a standard procedure for planning a diverse park and recreation system over a large and geographically varied area, and the plan became a procedural blueprint for scientific and comprehensive state park planning.[14]

It was not immediately clear in the spring of 1933, however, that New Deal programs (particularly the CCC) would emphasize recreational planning to the degree they eventually did. The CCC "tree army," for example, was at first expected to concentrate mainly on forestry and soil conservation activities. Most CCC camps were planned for national and state forests, where the Forest Service would oversee them. The CCC boys, in their late teens and early twenties generally had few or no skills, and it was expected that they would be occupied mostly in constructing fire roads, fighting forest fires, reforesting cutover land, and stabilizing eroded slopes. At the Park Service, Albright at first placed his chief forester, John Coffman, in charge of national and state park CCC activities, anticipating that forestry projects would be the main work of the CCC program.[15]

Once the CCC camps were operational, however, it was soon evident that the recruits would be able to successfully undertake demanding construction and park development projects, in addition to their forestry activities. Trepidations regarding the quality of masonry and wood construction the young men would be capable of soon were assuaged, and the Park Service began to employ CCC labor in

---

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

[14]Olmsted, Report of the State Park Survey of California, 9, 39-53; Joseph H. Engbeck, Jr. State Parks of California, 1864 to the Present (Portland, Oregon: Graphic Arts Center Publishing Company, 1980), 47-56; Norman T. Newton, Design on the Land (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1971), 572-575.

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

more ambitious park projects. There were a number of reasons why the CCC program was so successful. A number of "local experienced men," for example, were hired at each camp and provided vital guidance and training while laboring with the recruits. The construction projects, like the camps themselves, were also extremely well supervised. The silver lining of the Depression was soon revealed: the unemployed condition of thousands of professionals, scientists, and educators made them available and eager to participate in the CCC and other New Deal programs. Landscape architects, in particular, were hired to work in state and national park CCC camps, but many other unemployed professionals were hired as supervisors and foremen as well. In a CCC camp in Keosauqua, Iowa, landscape architect Kenneth F. Jones worked as a "landscape foreman," supervising work crews of about 20 boys apiece. Each crew, he reported, had a "working foreman" with professional training: a landscape architect, an architect, a civil engineer, an agricultural engineer, a forester, a forest pathologist, and an entomologist.[16] Higher up in the organization, a network of regional inspectors, including many well-known landscape architects and architects, relentlessly enforced uniform high standards for design and construction in national and state parks. Under these circumstances, difficult and complex construction could be successfully undertaken by the CCC. If the CCC program was originally intended to reclaim a generation of unemployed youths by employing them in forestry activities, the great potential of using their labor to build national, state, and local parks became clear within the first months of the program. The political rewards of building new parks for hundreds of local communities also obviously exceeded those of less functional forestry projects.[17] As Herbert Evison later observed, "From the moment it was realized that the CCC could legitimately be utilized to perform Emergency Conservation Work on State parks, the State park situation underwent, for good or evil, the most radical change in its seventy-year history."[18]

Another reason for the success of CCC camps in the case of national parks were the master plans that Thomas Vint and his colleagues had already developed for virtually every national park and monument by 1933. The plans outlined many useful and carefully designed improvements that were waiting to be implemented. In the fall of 1933, Vint relocated from San Francisco to Washington, and his title was changed from "chief landscape architect" to "chief architect."[19] By 1934, the landscape architecture division had been renamed the "branch of plans and design." In the rapidly growing San Francisco office, Vint's assistant William Carnes took over as head of the "western division" of the branch of plans and design; the "eastern division," which remained under Charles Peterson, moved to Washington as it also took on dozens of new staff.[20] As Vint's design division grew to many times its former size, the procedures and policies he had instituted remained in effect. Experienced Park

---

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

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

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

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

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

Service landscape architects, such as Ernest Davidson, Merel Sager, John Wosky, Kenneth McCarter, Harry Langley, Herbert Krellenkamp, and Howard Baker were ready to supervise scores of fresh recruits, many of whom were well qualified but had no experience in park planning. In 1933, Vint assigned each of these veterans responsibility for a "district" (a cluster of national parks), assuring that in every area of the park system new design staff would be supervised by someone he had personally trained in San Francisco.[21]

Established master planning procedures continued to guide the park planners of Vint's branch of plans and design as the CCC and other New Deal Programs, especially the Public Works Administration (PWA) invested unprecedented labor and capital in the national park system. In state park design, as well, Park Service landscape architects adapted Vint's master planning process to guide state and local park developments. In this case, Park Service planners created state park master plans that mimicked the larger national park master plans in their basic format. There were differences in the state plans, of course, besides their scale. Scenic preservation remained a major goal for state parks as it was for national parks; but state park design, done in cooperation with local park authorities, naturally incorporated a wider and more varied range of recreational uses within a smaller area. If the basic procedures of national park master planning were easily adapted to state parks, different policies determined how much and what type of landscape development would be deemed appropriate in the state reservations. State park design was also administered separately within the Park Service. While chief forester John Coffman remained in overall charge of Park Service CCC programs, state park CCC "planning and cooperation" was supervised out of the "branch of lands" at the Park Service. Vint's new branch of plans and design remained primarily concerned with work related to federal properties; the branch of lands, located in a parallel position on the Park Service organizational chart, took responsibility for all state and local park planning. In 1934, the branch was renamed the "branch of recreational land planning," and in 1936 it became the "branch of recreation, land planning, and state cooperation," indicating the growth and development of its activities.[22] After 1934 it was usually referred to simply as the "branch of planning." The assistant director in charge of the branch was a young landscape architect named Conrad L. Wirth, who had joined the Washington office in 1931.

Wirth was the son of the famous Minneapolis park superintendent, Theodore Wirth, and through his father he had many contacts with prominent figures in the American park movement. He had graduated from Frank Waugh's landscape program at the University of Massachusetts, and later went into business with a partner in New Orleans. When the Gulf Coast real estate market collapsed in 1927, the landscape architect was thrown out of work. Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., subsequently arranged for him to be hired by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, where Wirth was in charge of investigating and reporting on potential additions to the Washington park system. Three years later, when the position of assistant director in charge of land planning opened up at the Washington office of the Park Service, Horace Albright asked Wirth to transfer and take over similar planning responsibilities for the national park system.[23]

---

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

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

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

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

Herbert Evison, the executive secretary of the National Conference on State Parks, was enlisted to assist Wirth, and together they administered CCC state park planning through the regional administrations established in 1933. The "district officers" of this shadow park service included leading figures from the state park movement. Lawrence Merriam, the California forester, headed the Western district office in San Francisco. Paul V. Brown, an important figure in Indiana state parks, led a Midwestern district in Indianapolis. John M. Hoffman, who had been commissioner of Pennsylvania state parks, ran the Eastern district in Washington. Perhaps most significantly for the subsequent history of Park Service design, Herbert Maier, the architect of the Yellowstone trailside museums, was hired as the regional officer for the Rocky Mountain district in Denver.[24] They were an impressive group, and with the resources of the Park Service and CCC behind them, they were prepared to implement what would have only recently seemed visionary state park plans.

Over the next several years the CCC was acclaimed as an unqualified success of the New Deal. New state parks all over the country were particularly convincing evidence of the value and permanence of the work being done by the CCC boys. The state parks were designed by scores of planners and landscape architects who, whether supervised by state park departments ("local park authorities") or directly by the Park Service regional offices, were paid through federal funds and met standards for their work imposed by Conrad Wirth and his associates.[25] Wirth insisted that the arrangement was "an extension of the understandings that were developed in 1921 when the National Conference on State Parks was organized," based on a purely voluntary "exchange of ideas"; but the desirability of CCC state park camps and funding gave the Park Service far greater leverage with local governments than Wirth acknowledged.

Local park authorities submitted applications for the assignment of CCC camps based on state recreational land use plans--usually part of an overall state plan--that identified desirable state park areas based on a statewide survey of land suitabilities and characteristics. The Park Service district offices reviewed the applications, supervised park planning, and assigned the camps. State park

---

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

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

departments (where they already existed) hired professionals to prepare park plans, procured all supplies and materials, and generally were in direct control of their park projects. Of course they did all this with the federal money disbursed to them as part of the CCC program, and the Park Service oversaw and supervised every aspect of park planning and development. Wirth's state park CCC program hired regional inspectors (just as the national park CCC program did) who were usually professional designers or engineers of some standing. Very early in the state park program, when Wirth felt that "the planning and development operation was not up to standard" in many states, he reminded his inspectors (and indirectly state park officials) that failure to meet design and construction standards would result in the loss of CCC state park camps. It was an effective if indirect threat, and Wirth reported receiving excellent cooperation from both his regional inspectors and local park authorities once the point was made.[26]

As chief of state park planning and cooperation at the Park Service, Wirth instituted far-reaching policies in 1933 and 1934. At the 15th annual National Conference on State Parks, held at Skyland, Virginia in 1935, Wirth summarized his planning policies. He felt that state parks (and for that matter all parks) should be considered in two categories: those set aside for "conservation," and those set aside "primarily for recreation." The two types, he added, might be joined or separated, and "one might even completely surround the other, forming a multiple-use area." But Wirth also warned his planners that they should "always bear in mind the distinction" between conservation and recreational areas, and "forever seek a means of separating these two types." Inappropriate or poorly sited recreational development would simply degrade conservation areas, he explained, something which too often occurred because of public and official pressure to develop recreational facilities. In either category, proposed state parks were also required to meet certain standards that would distinguish them from county or municipal parks. For the conservation category, proposed state reservations should contain "the outstanding natural scenic areas of the state." The plants, wildlife, and geologic features of the area also should "attract State-wide recognition." Areas suitable for recreational development, on the other hand, were often more difficult to select since they did not possess the obvious scenic features that qualified an area in the conservation category. To know where state recreational developments were needed, extensive statistical and demographic information needed to be compiled for surrounding populations. Selecting recreational areas also required imagination to "visualize how . . . barren land," which otherwise might be overlooked, "could be transformed to serve good recreational purposes" near cities and towns in need of such areas.[27]

If the task of national recreational planning was huge, tremendous resources had been made available. Herbert Evison estimated that in 1934, 700 landscape architects, architects, and engineers, working for various local park authorities but paid through CCC funds administered by the Park Service, were engaged in state park planning. This total did not include the 220 professionals employed by Vint's branch of plans and design by 1936, or those working as supervisors and foremen in national park CCC camps. Thomas Vint's assistant, William Carnes, later recalled that of the 1,000 or more design and engineering professionals directly or indirectly supervised by the Park Service during the mid-1930s, about 400 were landscape architects--a figure that suggests more members of the profession

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

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

were working for the Park Service at the time than were not.[28] By 1934, five states that previously had no state parks had acquired between one and six, and 20 other states had acquired new parks and added to existing ones. By 1935, 600,000 acres of state parkland had been added to the national total. That summer, 90,000 CCC boys were at work building state parks in 475 camps. The CCC was either already developing or planned to develop one half of the total of 3.5 million acres of state parkland in the country.[29]

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

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

Within the first two years of the beginning of the CCC program, Wirth's state park organization within the Park Service influenced the operations of the Park Service as a whole, and the entire project of national recreational planning began to coalesce in the aggregate activities of the Park Service and the over 140 state, county, and municipal authorities with which it eventually cooperated. As the state park CCC program grew, it became desirable to combine all Park Service CCC planning rather than continue with parallel organizations to administer state park and national park CCC projects. Considering the size and scope of the state park operations, Director Cammerer decided in 1936 that

---

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

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

Conrad Wirth should assume the administration of both state and national park CCC work, taking over chief forester John Coffman's responsibilities. All CCC planning (for national as well as state parks) would then be administered out of the CCC regional offices Wirth had set up.[30] One implication of this consolidation was to effectively regionalize most of the Park Service; 70 percent of the bureau's personnel--the proportion involved in CCC related work--were brought under the supervision of the regional offices by this action.[31] While Arno Cammerer was consolidating the Park Service CCC programs, he was also proposing a complete regionalization plan that would further consolidate Conrad Wirth's recreational planning division with the rest of the Park Service. Four new Park Service regional offices were proposed to replace and absorb the CCC regional offices; all Park Service operations were to be brought together in a consolidated, but regionalized, administration.

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

The substantial role of Park Service officials in New Deal "national planning" had begun during the Hundred Days of 1933. When Secretary of the Interior Ickes assumed the administration of the PWA, he knew that the plans for public works prepared in advance by groups like the Park Service would only go so far. To guide massive public works spending efficiently, some form of national planning authority was needed to coordinate the projects proposed by federal, state, and local organizations. Ickes therefore organized the National Planning Board within the PWA. Chaired by Frederic A. Delano, then president of the American Civic Association, the new group found an energetic executive director in landscape architect Charles W. Eliot II, who transferred from the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. The national board, which changed its name several times over the next 10 years, immediately encouraged states to initiate coordinated state plans, including the plans for expanded state park systems that became the basis for state park CCC work. Although the National Planning Board could no more than suggest such cooperation from state governments, it was understood that future work relief spending might be influenced by such plans, and within one year 35 states had initiated state planning efforts. By 1936 every state (except Delaware) had at least begun a state plan.[32]

From its beginning, the National Planning Board relied on the Park Service as the best available source for information and advice on the recreational needs and trends of the nation. In 1934 the board, now renamed the National Resources Board, asked the Park Service to begin a comprehensive national study of "national and state parks and related recreational activities." To undertake the study, a "recreation board" was set up within the Park Service, headed by Herbert Evison and George M.

---

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

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

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

Wright, chief of the wildlife division.[33] The report was presented that fall, but in the words of one of the planners, "It was evident, from our first considerations, that the requisite information was not available. The time allotted . . . was all too brief."[34] The only definitive conclusion in 1934 was that a more comprehensive national survey of recreational resources was indeed needed, and that year Secretary Ickes began pressing Congress for legislation that would allow the Park Service to undertake such a project. In June 1936, Congress passed the Park, Parkway and Recreational-Area Study Act, which effectively validated and extended the role the Park Service had already assumed as the nation's recreational planning agency. The law authorized the Park Service to undertake a truly comprehensive national survey of all types of recreational areas, and to use that information to assemble a plan that would coordinate the activities of federal land agencies and local park authorities to meet the future recreational needs of the country. The bill also contained provisions which allowed the Park Service to fund the planning activities of local park authorities, and which gave consent for two or more states to cooperate in completing regional surveys of recreational resources.[35]

The 1936 Park, Parkway and Recreational-Area Study Act marked the high point of the CCC's promise, and therefore of the Park Service's role as a national recreational planning authority.[36] Once the bill became law, Arno Cammerer appointed Conrad Wirth as chairman of a special Park Service "recreation committee," and Wirth also replaced Secretary Ickes as the Interior representative on the CCC advisory council. Wirth's renamed "branch of recreation, land planning, and state cooperation" compiled the ambitious plan, and CCC emergency conservation work appropriations paid for it.[37] The National Resources Board, now called the National Resources Committee, provided assistance and advice. In January 1937, the Park Service recreation committee distributed a procedural manual instructing state and local governments on what the national recreational survey was intended to be and how they could help assemble the needed information. The committee described the "problem of recreational land use" in the United States: although there had been stunning growth in state park systems since 1933, much of it had, "of necessity been based on inadequate planning," resulting sometimes in "unhealthy growth" and "ill-suited and unneeded development of available lands." Wirth suggested that each state conduct a comprehensive survey of "existing park, parkway, and recreational facilities," and of "potential areas . . . for acquisition and development." These surveys could then be compiled by the Park Service and become the basis of a "comprehensive report on a Nation-wide basis."[38]

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

States responded quickly to the call to organize recreational planning efforts. In 1938, 43 states arranged to participate in the study, and seven states completed tentative final reports. By 1941, when the Park Service published the completed study, 34 states had contributed finished surveys which were condensed and published as an index of national recreational resources. The final report, titled A Study of the Park and Recreation Problem of the United States, summarized the philosophy of New Deal recreational planning. As Secretary Ickes wrote in its forward, "The proper use of leisure time is a fundamental problem of modern society . . . . Outdoor recreation answers this need." The secretary described the fundamental goal of the Park Service planning activities: "To establish the basis for coordinated, correlated recreation land planning among all the agencies--Federal, state, and local--having responsibility for park and recreational developments."[39]

The physical results of unified, national recreational planning soon appeared. A plethora of new parks--and new kinds of parks--were planned and developed to meet outdoor recreational needs at every level. The national park system acquired some of its most extensive "wilderness" parks during the 1930s, including Everglades and Olympic national parks. At the same time, the bureau created new categories of national parks that were unlike earlier scenic reservations. The typological expansion had already begun under Horace Albright with the creation of new historical parks at Yorktown, Virginia and Morristown, New Jersey; the 1933 transfer of national military, battlefield, and historic sites, monuments, and memorials accelerated the process. Conrad Wirth's planners, however, backed by the CCC, 47 state park departments, and other New Deal agencies and programs, introduced whole new categories of national and state parks. They were aided in these efforts by the federal acquisition of vast areas of land beginning in 1933. The Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA), for example, was authorized to provide funds to buy out farmers who were cultivating "submarginal land" at a loss to themselves as well as the environment. The land was to be put to other uses, and in some cases it was suitable for recreational purposes; thousands of acres were transferred to Wirth's branch of planning at the Park Service, which developed the areas as "demonstrations" of recreational planning and use. Most of these demonstration areas were later turned over to local park authorities; other remain today part of the national park system. The Bureau of Reclamation, building new dams in the West with New Deal funds, created hundreds of miles of new lakeshore, which the Park Service made plans to develop for boating, swimming, and other recreational uses. In the Appalachians, national parkway projects connecting the new Eastern mountain parks similarly opened up opportunities for outdoor recreational activities. By 1941, the Park Service had built or was planning at least four distinct new kinds of national parks, called recreational demonstration areas, national recreation areas, national parkways, and national seashores.[40]

But of all contributions made by professional landscape architects to the manifold social and economic experiments of the New Deal, no physical expressions more completely captured the aspirations, innovations, and characteristic spirit of the era to a greater degree than the hundreds of state and local parks built by the CCC and designed by the Park Service in cooperation with local park authorities. This field of park design--state park and recreational planning--was not so much

---

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

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

expanded by the New Deal as created by it. To this day, many states owe the origins of their state park systems and the majority of facilities in them to the labor of CCC recruits and the landscape design and planning of Park Service professionals. National recreational planning at this scale consummated the long and mutually influential relationship between the Park Service and American landscape architecture. The state parks produced through this partnership remain today among the most potent symbols of New Deal idealism.

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

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

By 1924, L. H. Weir, the field secretary of the Playground and Recreation Association of America, reported at the annual meeting of the National Conference of State Parks that "organized groups or massed camps for boys and girls and for adults have increased very rapidly within the past ten years." Weir estimated that up to a million campers--mostly children--were taking part in 5,000 to 6,000 organized camps being operated nationwide that summer. Most of these camps were conducted on property owned or leased by the camping organizations themselves; but Weir foresaw the day when this inherent limitation on the size and number of group camps might be overcome. "There is no question that large State Park and Forest reservations are destined to play an important part," he predicted, "in providing opportunities for that splendid form of outdoor life represented by the organized camp."[41]

But state park advocates and group camp organizers, at least up to this point, were not always the same people. The state park movement had mostly emphasized the preservation of historic sites and scenic areas outside of cities. Group camp organizations had concentrated on social issues in the cities, and especially on improving the lives of urban children. Much as municipal park departments embraced the playground movement in the first decade of the century, however, state park officials had begun to welcome camping organizations into state parks by the 1920s, even if concerns were

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

expressed over the intensive use such arrangements would entail. The great precedent for the state park as a site for group camping was Palisades Interstate Park (in New York and New Jersey), where by 1924 the park's superintendent, Major William A. Welch, provided sites for no fewer than 81 "fresh air" organizations from the New York City region.

Major Welch began this wholesale embrace of group camp organizations in 1913, and the Palisades quickly became the national center and exemplar for park development of this type. Among Major Welch's early admirers were Stephen Mather and Horace Albright, both of whom were very familiar with Bear Mountain and the other units of the Palisades park system. The group camp movement expanded rapidly during the 1920s, as "recreational specialists" and social workers brought their increasingly professional attentions to the cause. Many aspects of the operation and design of group camps were worked out at this time and have remained fundamentally unchanged since then. By the mid-1920s, the peculiarly American institution of the summer camp had taken shape. No less an authority on education than Charles W. Eliot, who died in 1926, suggested that the "organized summer camp is the most significant contribution to education that America has given the world."[42]

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

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

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

---

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

November 1936, however, Wirth's planners (who chafed under this arrangement) assumed complete control of the acquisition and development of RDA projects. By 1941, the Park Service had acquired nearly 400,000 acres in 24 states for RDAs, most of which were developed by the CCC. Harvard landscape architecture professor Norman T. Newton, who was himself a regional CCC inspector at this time, later suggested that the RDAs were "perhaps the most remarkable collateral product of CCC days."[43]

The generic term "recreational demonstration project" at first referred to a number of different demonstrations the Park Service established with the help of the FERA funds for acquiring land. Pieces of land as small as 20 acres were acquired for highway "wayside" parks, while in other cases tracts of land up to 20,000 acres were acquired as extensions to existing state and national parks. But the type of demonstration project that quickly caught the imagination of the New Dealers (and which became known specifically as the "recreational demonstration area") was the large park of 5,000 to 20,000 acres devoted specifically--but not exclusively--to the accommodation of group camp organizations. These projects were not, according to the Park Service in 1936, "national parks, state parks, county parks, metropolitan parks, or forests of any technical classification. They are newcomers to the recreation field--part of a recreational awakening." The RDAs were not intended to compete with or replace existing park systems, in other words, they were "vitally needed adjuncts to these parks, providing facilities for low-cost recreation in the form of organized camps--a special service to the cities' lower-income groups."[44]

One of the first of these new parks to be completed opened in the summer of 1937, south of Washington, DC, in Virginia. Known as Chopawamsic, the area has been retained as a federal property today known as Prince William Forest Park (in part perhaps because it is surrounded on three sides by the Quantico U.S. Marine Reservation). The Park Service and Resettlement Administration planners who collaborated on the project reported that more than 100 families had been living in the 15,000-acre project area around the Town of Joplin. The farmland, however, was exhausted, local businesses were dying, and many of the families in question "had suffered extreme poverty" and were on various forms of relief. Some of the families were relocated to new farms, some remained, others left the area on their own after being bought out. The land was then developed with artificial lakes, and three large, well separated sites for group camp operations: a boys' camp, a girls' camp, and an area for "family groups." The planners insisted that "a program of dual value is thus being perfected. . . . The people of the cities are to have, without cost, a share of the good earth and the health and happiness that goes with it; and poverty stricken farmers are to have a new chance."[45]

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

---

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

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

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

based primarily on the topographic, demographic, and scenic qualities of proposed areas. As a result, the "dual value" that had been pressed as a goal in 1935 and 1936 (mostly during the year and a half the RDA program was under Tugwell's authority) was rarely achieved. "Submarginal" agricultural land with appropriately impoverished inhabitants simply could not be counted on to meet Park Service requirements for new state parks. Adequate group camps sites required low-lying areas, for example, with substantial streams running through them that could be impounded to create lakes for swimming and boating. But such sites often included the most fertile and productive land in a given region; the exhausted soils of subsistence farms were more often located on higher slopes, away from the rich bottomlands. The higher elevations of a site might be acquired, but they would be of limited use for recreation without the lakes that could be created below.[46]

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

If Conrad Wirth found that the purposes of park development and those of agricultural reform frequently crossed, a more harmonious relationship soon developed between the Park Service and the professional educators and social workers who had advocated organized group camping over the previous 20 years. In this case, the goals of group camps and those of state parks could be successfully combined in the design of a new kind of state park that would accommodate camping organizations in some areas, and day use visitors in others. Recreational specialists, like L. H. Weir, had described in detail how state parks could accommodate group camps already by the mid-1920s. In order "to function effectively as centers for organized camping," Weir wrote in 1924, the new parks should provide "a source of pure water for domestic purposes, . . . an area of such size to permit the orderly layout of the camp, . . . water for swimming, boating, canoeing, etc. . . . [and] a site that is not too far from the home communities of the campers." Again drawing on the Palisades as the best example of such a park, Weir also described the specific types of buildings that ideal group camps would require, including the dining hall, the recreation building, sleeping tents or cabins, latrines, and wash houses.[47]

For Weir and other social reformers, the ultimate goal of organized camps was to give children the experience of "outdoor life" that (it was felt) was essential to build physical health, moral character, and social skills. The layout and design of the camps therefore expressed, at least to some degree, ideal social relationships. "The planning of camp-sites is city planning in miniature," as Weir put it. The size of camping groups, the relationship of buildings to one another, and the overall layout of the camps were all the subject of careful consideration based on their perceived effects on the physical and emotional health of the children that would inhabit--and perhaps be shaped by--their experience in these ideal cities.

---

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

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

It is interesting to note, therefore, that many group camp advocates were not sure at first that Park Service landscape architects would be able to contribute in constructive ways to the design of the RDAs. Julian H. Salomon, a camp advocate who became a "recreational specialist" at the Park Service in 1933, recalled in 1936 that "I never realized that a landscape architect could ever contribute anything to a camp until I went down to Washington and sat next to Lou Croft [Park Service landscape architect Louis P. Croft] . . . I have learned a great deal from him." In fact, Salomon (who went on to become a leading expert on group camp management and design for decades) and other recreational specialists hired by the Park Service participated in a remarkable

period of collaboration with Conrad Wirth's planners between 1933 and 1936. During that time, dozens of state parks designed specifically to accommodate organized camping associations were designed for sites all over the country.

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

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

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

The camp itself was arranged, at a larger scale, along the lines of the individual units. The camp administration building, Solomon advised, "should be the first one to be reached in approaching the camp," with a nearby parking area that would handle most vehicular traffic arriving at the camp. Although functionally the center of operations for the camp, the building did not need to be at its physical center; it should however be roughly equidistant from the three or four units that made up the camp, and within walking distance from each. Nearby the administration building, the dining hall

and kitchen complex also served the entire camp. An infirmary, staff quarters, a recreation hall, and a craft shop also were part of the central administrative group, around which the units of the camp were evenly clustered.[48]

The plans Solomon described were the result of intensive collaboration between landscape architects and recreational planners. The two groups had been brought together on an unprecedented scale within Conrad Wirth's branch of planning. Wirth attended the conference at Camp Edith Macy, where he was received warmly and given great credit for the recent advances in both state park design and organized camping. Wirth himself (typically) deflected the credit back to his audience. The RDAs, he insisted, represented "an accumulation of study and effort of people who were never in the Park Service." His planners and administrators had "analyzed those [efforts] and picked out what we thought were the best."[49] In his later memoirs, however, Wirth clearly regards the organized camps of the RDAs among his most significant contributions to the New Deal state park effort. Without the Park Service planners and programs, the camping organizations never would have been able to exploit the opportunities of the New Deal as effectively. Wirth credits in particular Matthew C. Huppuch, his deputy, who supervised the RDA program. The other chief RDA planners in Washington included Peter DeGelleke, Charles H. Gerner, Julian Salomon, and Fay Welch.[50]

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

There were a total of 46 projects described as RDAs in 1937, but nine of these were in fact simply additions to the national park system--either new parks or additions to existing ones. Two more of the RDAs were demonstrations of highway "wayside" parks, a popular idea that never achieved substantial success, although state and federal highway designers later incorporated "rest areas" into limited access highway design. Five large state parks were expanded through the RDA program, including Pine Mountain, in Georgia, and Lake Guernsey, in Wyoming. The remaining 31 RDAs were completely new RDA projects, intended to become state parks eventually. Of the total of 46 RDA state park projects, 34 had planned group camp facilities, and the term RDA eventually was used specifically to describe these group camp/state park developments. By 1941, over 200,000 acres had been acquired to build the 34 group camp/state parks; beginning in 1942, all but two were eventually given to their respective state park departments. (In addition to Chopawamsic, a portion of the Catoctin Mountain RDA was retained in the federal system; a portion of the park had been

---

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

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

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

developed as the presidential retreat FDR called Shangri-La and which Eisenhower later renamed Camp David.)[51]

If the CCC state parks (and the RDAs in particular) are among the most characteristic accomplishments of the New Deal, this is certainly due in part to the fact that Franklin Roosevelt personally invented the CCC, and continued to follow its accomplishments with great interest. Every biographer of the president has commented on the great personal conviction and attention Roosevelt brought to his programs to improve the condition of the nation's forests and soils. Most would agree with Eleanor Roosevelt that "the Hudson River Valley was in my husband's blood," and that Roosevelt's deeply felt responsibilities as a steward of the nation's agricultural and forested lands resulted from his early experience as a landowner and manager of the family estate in Hyde Park, New York.[52] As governor of New York between 1928 and 1932, Roosevelt instituted some of the first work relief programs of their kind in the country, including programs that put large numbers of the unemployed to work on forestry and soil conservation projects. And in 1933, President Roosevelt immediately put forward plans for a national organization that would put an army of unemployed young men to work in parks and forests, in order to reclaim both the human and the natural resources of the nation. Roosevelt remained personally and intensely interested in the implementation and progress of the Civilian Conservation Corps over the next eight years. As historian John A. Salmond observes, "more than any other New Deal agency, [the CCC] bore the personal stamp of President Roosevelt."[53]

But if the Hudson River Valley was the incubator of Roosevelt's deeply felt commitment to the land and its resources, that sense of commitment matured later in life, in another, vastly poorer part of the nation. And if Roosevelt's desire to reach out and assist the unemployed and others stricken by hard times began as a sense of patrician duty, real personal hardship later galvanized those idle sentiments and led to the remarkably vigorous executive actions of the Hundred Days. If the disease of polio myelitis indeed worked a profound change upon Franklin Roosevelt at a critical juncture in his life, it was the hardscrabble farms and exhausted cotton fields of southwest Georgia, and not the pastoral landscapes of Dutchess County, that represented and helped effect that change.

Franklin Roosevelt arrived in Meriwether County, Georgia, in 1924, three years after he had been paralysed by the effects of polio. Already a national figure in American politics, the easy going upstate Democrat had been expected to attain high office almost as a matter of course. That future, however, appeared completely beyond the capabilities of someone who, despite his protestations to the contrary, would never walk on his own again. Now 42 years old, for three years Roosevelt had worked with numerous specialists and therapists both at Hyde Park and in the warm waters of Southern Florida. Polio victims who did not quickly recover the use of ravaged limbs following their illness were less likely to regain strength in them as time went by. But Roosevelt chose to continue to try every promising means to achieve recovery.

---

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

[52]Eleanor Roosevelt, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Hyde Park (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1949), 1.

[53]John A. Salmond, The Civilian Conservation Corps, 1933-1942: A New Deal Case Study (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1967), 8.

Roosevelt had been brought to Georgia by an invitation from George Foster Peabody, a Wall Street acquaintance who lived in Columbus, Georgia. Peabody had invested in the Meriwether Inn, a somewhat rundown, 19th-century hotel in the town that was then called Bullochville, north of Columbus, near the warm springs that gushed from the side of Pine Mountain. The town was renamed Warm Springs in 1924, a change that indicated the hopes held by Peabody and others that the popularity of the resort could be revived. This optimism was based in part on the fact that the mineralized waters, which were channelled into a swimming pool at the inn, provided buoyant and sufficiently warm waters for hydrotherapy that was beneficial to the victims of infantile paralysis. At least one polio victim had found that he was able to float in the water for hours every day, exercising muscles that were too weak to exercise effectively otherwise, eventually regaining enough strength to walk with only a cane. After hearing from Peabody of the purported effects of this type of therapy, Roosevelt came to Warm Springs that October and swam in the pool at the Meriwether Inn himself.

Over the next eight years, Roosevelt spent many weeks at Warm Springs, especially during the spring and fall months when the mild climate is particularly inviting and the surrounding landscape is either in bloom or in fall color. He insisted that great progress was made rehabilitating his crippled legs and thighs; but the cure that was taking place at Warm Springs probably was only marginally related to his physical handicap, which stubbornly persisted. If a physical cure remained elusive, however, another kind of recovery was taking place. Roosevelt seemed to be somehow lifted up and encouraged by the people and places around Warm Springs, and his interest in the region extended far beyond hydrotherapy.

In a specially fitted Model T, Roosevelt made long trips all over the surrounding country, introducing himself, making inquiries, and generally doing what came naturally to a great politician. The contrast between southwest Georgia and the Hudson Valley in the mid-1920s was profound. If farmers in Dutchess County suffered from low prices and other problems as farmers did everywhere, the green hills of upstate New York remained dotted with the manor houses and farms of a long established elite. In western Georgia, Roosevelt discovered a landscape as crippled as he was himself. Collapsing prices after World War I, soil erosion, and finally the boll weevil combined to create depression conditions in rural Georgia a decade before the stock market crash of 1929. If the once venerable Meriwether Inn was somewhat down at the heels in 1924, the people living on farms and in small towns around Warm Springs were experiencing sometimes desperate hardship by that time. Crop failures and inadequate living conditions in Meriwether and adjacent Harris counties gave Roosevelt a thorough preview of the more widespread ills about to grip the nation.[54]

In some ways, Roosevelt's desire to rehabilitate crippled bodies (including his own) at Warm Springs became inextricably identified with his hopes for healing and revitalizing the stricken landscape of rural Georgia. His commitment to both causes soon intensified. In 1926, Roosevelt arranged to purchase the Meriwether Inn, which at $190,000 was an enormous and questionable investment for him, and the largest business venture of his life. His original purpose was to create a resort that would welcome both the disabled, who would come for hydrotherapy, and the kind of fashionable vacationers who had patronized the springs in the past. The latter clientele, however, proved difficult to attract; in 1927 Roosevelt created the Warm Springs Foundation and thereafter concentrated on developing Warm Springs primarily as a center for the treatment of infantile paralysis. Roosevelt's

[54]For a full account of Roosevelt's experiences in Georgia, see Theo Lippman, Jr., The Squire of Warm Springs: FDR in Georgia, 1924-1945 Chicago: The Playboy Press, 1977).

deep involvement in this work was cut short by his decision to run for governor of New York in 1928, but he continued to spend time at Warm Springs after being elected, and the foundation he created continued to grow under the management of his associates.[55]

The Warm Springs property Roosevelt purchased in 1926 included 1,000 acres of forested land around Pine Mountain. Roosevelt also began acquiring other parcels of land, and he eventually owned at least 2,700 acres in Meriwether and Harris counties. Roosevelt began a model farm, called Roosevelt Farms, in which he tried to demonstrate profitable new forms of agriculture appropriate to local soils and markets. Cotton and peaches had been the predominant crops in the area for generations, but collapsing prices and exhausted soils were ruining many farmers. Roosevelt put much of his acreage into pine tree plantations, and in other areas he tried cattle farming. He also experimented with other alternative crops, including apples and grapes.[56]

Once elected governor in 1928 and president in 1932, Roosevelt would never again be able to stay in Georgia for months at a time, and neither would he be able to move about the countryside with the same casual familiarity. But Roosevelt had already emerged at Warm Springs as a reinvigorated public figure, dedicated to helping not only himself, but others afflicted by adversity, whether the crippled "polios" who now came in large numbers to Warm Springs to seek help, or the farmers and sharecroppers of the surrounding counties who were just trying to survive. It is not too much to say that some of the programs Roosevelt later advanced for rural electrification, soil conservation, buyouts of submarginal agricultural land, reforestation, and agricultural reform were shaped by his experiences in Georgia in the 1920s.

Roosevelt's enthusiasm for Warm Springs also extended to proposals for scenic highway and state park development for the area. When Roosevelt first saw Pine Mountain in 1924, Georgia still had virtually no state parks, although as in other states at this time, numerous proposals and initiatives were underway. The Georgia Legislature created a State Board of Forestry in 1925, and although that group remained interested primarily in logging not recreation, Indian Springs and Vogel state forests were designated "state forest parks" in 1925 and 1926. No state park commission yet existed, however, nor were any state reservations set aside strictly for scenic preservation and outdoor recreation. In 1931 Georgia created a Department of Forestry and Geological Development, and all state park development remained under that department (in its Division of Forestry) until 1937.[57]

One of the principal attractions of the Warm Springs area for Roosevelt, however, was Pine Mountain itself, which he recognized could be a major attraction for tourists and therefore an economic boon for the area. The mountain rises abruptly out of the surrounding Piedmont to an elevation of 1,300 feet above sea level, some 400 to 600 feet above its surroundings. The views are impressive, and the mountain, with diverse flora and fauna, many streams, and temperate weather, had long been a favorite destination. One of the pieces of land Roosevelt purchased in the mid-1920s was a 100-acre tract on the side of Pine Mountain. Too steep for farming, he bought it because it led up to his favorite picnic spot, Dowdell Knob on Pine Mountain; Roosevelt arranged to have a road built across

---

[55]Lippman, The Squire of Warm Springs, 31-50.

[56]Lippman, The Squire of Warm Springs, 101-125.

[57]Raymond H. Torrey, State Parks and the Recreational Uses of State Forests in the United States (Washington, DC: The National Conference on State Parks, 1926), 90.

the land so that he could drive up to the knob. Roosevelt also discussed similar projects with some of the more influential friends he had made in the area. Henry Chambers Kimbrough, a successful merchant in the nearby town of Chipley (now Pine Mountain), recalled that sometime around 1929 Roosevelt suggested to him and several other prominent local figures that they press the state government to undertake a scenic highway project from the Flint River to the Chattahoochee, over the long east-west ridge of Pine Mountain. Roosevelt described similar proposals he was pursuing as governor of New York, and he even stressed the character-building influence this kind of work could have on young men employed in this fashion.[58]

Other local figures realized the potential for tourism to the area, including Cason Callaway, a wealthy mill owner and another friend of Roosevelt's in Georgia. In the late 1930s, Callaway began acquiring land in Harris County for what would become his own private resort park, Callaway Gardens. In 1939, Callaway remembered that he and Roosevelt had discussed proposals for a state park on Pine Mountain while the latter was still governor of New York. Roosevelt was also credited by Callaway and others with suggesting the route of what became the Pine Mountain Parkway, and with locating the site for the Kings Gap Bridge along that parkway. According to Callaway, Kimbrough, and others, it was Roosevelt who originally suggested that the state government be encouraged to develop Pine Mountain as a state park, including a scenic drive across the ridge itself.[59]

The state park project at Pine Mountain, however, did not get underway until after Roosevelt was elected president and the CCC was created. The CCC (and the Park Service) arrived in the area in May of 1933 and began setting up a camp and getting to work before land acquisitions and development plans had even been finalized. Pine Mountain had been immediately identified as a desirable site for park development and by 1934 over 1,500 acres of the ridge top and the slopes to the north had been acquired. The state's acquisition of the land was helped along by a group of prominent local residents, the Pine Mountain Park Association, who acquired about 1,000 acres on top of the mountain and deeded it to the state; the state purchased about another 500 acres.[60] In the meantime, the first CCC recruits, Company 1429, had already established Camp Meriwether in Warm Springs, in a location formerly known as Kitchen's Grove. The boys were immediately put to work on a "fire break" along the summit of Pine Mountain. The cleared path, according to the camp newspaper, was "the first step in the building of a scenic highway." By October, the recruits had also invited Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt to their first Thanksgiving dinner at the camp, since they knew Roosevelt had made a tradition of spending Thanksgiving at Warm Springs. From the first day the CCC arrived at Pine Mountain, Roosevelt's presence--even his potential presence--imparted a special air of excitement for recruits and supervisors alike.[61]

---

[58]Louise Calhoun Barfield, History of Harris County, Georgia, 1827-1961 (Roswell, Georgia: W. H. Wolfe, Associates, 1978), 624-625.

[59]Louise Calhoun Barfield, History of Harris County, 633-634.

[60]State of Georgia, Division of State Parks, Historic Sites and Monuments, Department of Natural Resources, "Pine Mountain State Park [Master Plan]," 1940. State park master plan documents are conserved at the Georgia Department of Archives and History, 330 Capitol Avenue, Atlanta, Georgia, 30334.

[61]Meriwether Tri-C News, Volume 1, No. 3, November 1, 1933. The newspapers printed by every CCC camp vary greatly in quality, but are an invaluable resource for information on camp life. The papers are available through the Center for Research Librarians, 6050 South Kenwood Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637.

The president did not disappoint and arrived at Warm Springs that November 17. The CCC boys then began a tradition of their own, which continued until 1941: the recruits formed a "Guard of Honor" to meet the president at the Warm Springs station. Standing shoulder to shoulder in freshly pressed uniforms, the boys served as a barrier between the president and the sometimes large crowds that invariably welcomed him on his arrival to the town. Roosevelt soon came by Camp Meriwether on an informal inspection, and engaged in many conversations with the recruits as well as with the state park and Park Service officials who accompanied him. Roosevelt's interest in the ongoing work grew specific at times, and he did not refrain from making suggestions regarding the development of the park in which he had such personal interest. Described in the camp newspaper as "the Father of the CCC," "the world's greatest man," and a "swell guy," for the rest of the decade Roosevelt visited one or both of the CCC camps near Warm Springs almost annually (at least), and the president had a profound effect on camp life at Pine Mountain. The camp papers reported every rumor of an impending visit and subsequently elaborated on every detail afterwards. In a survey of CCC alumni of the park's CCC camps conducted by landscape architect Lucy Ann Lawliss in 1989, almost every alumni who responded claimed to have seen or met Franklin Roosevelt while serving in the CCC.[62] In terms of Roosevelt's personal involvement, the situation at Pine Mountain State Park was unique.

By the spring of 1934, the Camp Meriwether recruits had planted 16,500 Loblolly and Longleaf pines, cleared 22 miles of "wide road fire breaks," and had completed 90 miles of "survey work." The Park Service and state planners had been active as well: the camp paper reported that " complete and elaborate maps have been prepared showing all the work done and proposed." That summer, the State of Georgia acquired title to the 1,500 acres on top of Pine Mountain and work could begin in earnest.[63] Under the direction of the first camp superintendent, S. A. Darnell, the major projects were earthmoving at the Lake Delanor site, cabin construction, foundation construction for the Pine Mountain Tavern, fire break clearing, and forestry projects, including the propagation and transplanting of thousands of pines. Work continued through the winter, although it was sometimes delayed by days of rain. A water tower was erected, latrines dug, utility lines buried, and nursery beds were established with some 3,000 native shrubs and trees heeled in for future landscape work around the construction sites.[64]

By the following spring, several log vacation cabins had been completed around Lake Delanor, and the stone work of the Pine Mountain Tavern, on top of the mountain, was up to the second story. The excavation of the lake, which had been hampered by lack of adequate earthmoving equipment, accelerated greatly with the arrival of a new gas shovel and later with the long awaited delivery of five new dump trucks. All the work underway, including the rapidly progressing tavern and cabin construction, was "CCC labor throughout," according to Darnell, and was "a credit to all concerned." The camp nursery, under the supervision of a Professor A. F. Conradi, formerly of Clemson College, was a particular source of pride. "We have every species of trees and shrubs that are native to this territory," the superintendent reported. One million Loblolly pine seedlings were being propagated in

---

[62]Lucy Ann Lawliss, "The Civilian Conservation Corps and the State Park: An Approach to the Management of the Designed Historic Landscape Resources at Franklin D. Roosevelt State Park, Pine Mountain, Georgia" (Master of Landscape Architecture Thesis, University of Georgia, 1992).

[63]Meriwether Tri-C News, Vol. 2, No. 3, March 1, 1934; Vol. 2., No. 9, December 1, 1934.

[64]S. A. Darnell, "Narrative Report, State Park No. 7, Pine Mountain, Months of December 1934, January 1935," Entry 37, State Park File: 1933-1947, Georgia, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

the spring of 1935, as well as 500,000 Longleaf pines; 140 acres of abandoned fields within the park had already been planted in pines.[65]

By the end of the summer, the watergate was closed and Lake Delanor began to fill. The lake received its interesting name as a result of a competition organized by the Atlanta Constitution to name it. The winners (who combined Delano and Eleanor) received a free week-long stay in one of the cabins on the lake.[66] By the end of the year, the Pine Mountain Tavern was nearly complete and, except for the plastering, the impressive building was entirely the product of labor from within the camp. Road surveys were underway in the fall for the scenic ridge highway that would connect the tavern to both ends of Pine Mountain, to the east and west.[67] That August more CCC recruits arrived (Company 4463) and began setting up their camp just outside the park, west of what is now the day use area. The camp was soon named Camp Kimbrough, in honor of the merchant Henry Kimbrough who had been one of the most important backers of the state park effort locally. For the next 10 months, Pine Mountain Park experienced the busiest period of its development, as up to 400 recruits in the two camps worked together building state park roads and facilities. In May 1936, however, Camp Meriwether was abandoned after its CCC company was transferred; the camp was demolished and the materials were used to build the new Camp Kimbrough, which remained in operation until 1941.[68]

There were setbacks and frustrations as well as rapid progress. In February 1936, as the winter rains swelled Lake Delanor for the first time, water seeped in around the sluice gate eventually undermining it and causing the entire dam to fail. The nursery downstream was nearly destroyed and a recently completed foundation for a picnic shelter was washed away. Repairs had to be left to the new recruits of Camp Kimbrough but presented no major problems. Other Camp Kimbrough projects included the excavation of a series of fish ponds near Lake Delanor, continued cabin construction, excavation and grading on the Pine Mountain Parkway and other park roads, landscape work around buildings, construction around the new day use area, and forestry work.

All the while, the recruits constantly anticipated the next visit Franklin Roosevelt would make to Warm Springs, knowing that he would be driving by on informal inspections, striking up conversations with the awe struck boys. "Camp Hopes for Roosevelt Visit," was a frequently repeated headline in the camp papers; anecdotes of encounters with the president were reported in the papers as well.[69] Camp officials were just as eager. The superintendent at Camp Kimbrough, C. B. Ellington, proudly reported that he had accompanied Roosevelt on "his tour of inspection over the Pine

---

[65]S. A. Darnell, "Narrative Report, State Park No. 7, Pine Mountain, Months of April 1935, May 1935," Entry 37, State Park File: 1933-1947, Georgia, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[66]Barfield, History of Harris County, 635-636.

[67]S. A. Darnell, "Narrative Report, State Park No. 7, Pine Mountain, Months of August 1935, September 1935," Entry 37, State Park File: 1933-1947, Georgia, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC; .

[68]Lucy Ann Lawliss, "The Civilian Conservation Corps and the State Park," Appendix A; Meriwether Tri-C News, Volume 3, No. 9, September 1, 1935; Georlina Tri-C News, No. 1, June, 1936. Company 1429 was moved to York, South Carolina, "much to the surprise of everyone," and began a new paper there.

[69]Pine Mountain Progress, Vol. 1, No. 2, October 15, 1935; Vol 1, No. 4, December 15, 1935; Vol. 2, No. 11, October, 1937. The Pine Mountain Progress was Camp Kimbrough's paper.

Mountain Scenic Parkway" early in December 1935, noting that the president "voiced his approval of the manner in which the work was progressing since his last visit."[70] Any comment the president made while in the park was of course taken very seriously. In 1939, while the swimming pool in the day use area was under construction, Roosevelt commented that the shape of the pool reminded him of the Liberty Bell. The pool was known by that name from that moment on, and the plans of the pool were even altered to make the outline more suggestive of a bell.[71]

By the spring of 1936, much of the park was complete. Lake Delanor was filled and six log vacation cabins were arranged on one shore. The public campground had been established on the north side of the lake, and "thousands of native plants, trees, and shrubbery" had been transplanted to the area. The tavern was complete, and native oaks were transplanted to its dooryard. In addition to various park roads, about three miles of the Pine Mountain Parkway had been graded, making that project "fifty percent complete."[72] Other parks in Georgia had shown similar progress, and the state suddenly could boast an extensive and beautifully developed park system of nine parks totalling over 5,000 acres (not counting the still federally-owned RDAs, which totaled as much acreage again). Pine Mountain was the largest, and in many ways the flagship of state park development of the period. Others included Vogel, Little Ocmulgee, Fort Mountain, Chehaw, Santo Domingo, Indian Springs, Jefferson Davis Memorial, and Alexander H. Stephens state parks.[73]

The last of these Georgia parks, A. H. Stephens also had a "recreational demonstration area" (RDA) group camp associated with it, as did Pine Mountain. (A third Georgia RDA was located at Hard Labor Creek.) Once the FERA "land program" was underway in 1934, Pine Mountain had been quickly identified as a good site for an RDA, and the Park Service began acquiring thousands of acres on the south side of Pine Mountain adjacent to Pine Mountain State Park. The construction of Lake Franklin (the second artificial lake built at Pine Mountain), and group camps on either shore of the new lake, was supervised by the same Park Service and Georgia state officials who oversaw construction in the rest of Pine Mountain State Park; by 1938 (and probably earlier) master plans for Pine Mountain State Park included the 3,018-acre RDA within the designated boundaries of the park, even though the RDA would not become state property until after 1942. But the CCC boys did not provide the bulk of the labor for the construction of the dozens of small wooden cabins, dining halls, and other facilities for the Lake Franklin group camps. As was sometimes the case with RDA projects of various types, the nearby CCC boys may have provided road improvement, excavation, landscape, and other labor, but construction was funded with WPA funds and so was done by local unemployed men drawn from relief roles.

All planning for the RDA at Pine Mountain, however, was done by the same architects, landscape architects, engineers and planners who worked either for the Park Service or the State of Georgia

---

[70]C. B. Ellington, "Narrative Report, State Park No. 7, Pine Mountain, Months of December 1935, January 1936," Entry 37, State Park File: 1933-1947, Georgia, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[71]Lucy Ann Lawliss, "The Civilian Conservation Corps and the State Park," 77.

[72]C. B. Ellington, "Narrative Report, State Park No. 7, Pine Mountain, Months of March 1936," Entry 37, State Park File: 1933-1947, Georgia, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[73]Press Release, May 12, 1936, National Park Service, Fourth Regional Office, Atlanta. Entry 37, State Park File: 1933-1947, Georgia, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

designing Pine Mountain State Park overall. In 1937, Georgia created a Department of Natural Resources, with a Division of State Parks, Historic Sites and Monuments within it. Georgia now had a state park department as well as a state park system. As was the case in other states, park planners mixed freely at the state and national level, and the new state park organization drew on the expertise and procedures (and often hired away the personnel) of the Park Service. At Pine Mountain, some of the key designers included the all important regional inspectors, in this case J. E. Bishop and Stuart M. Woodward, Jr., who first worked out of Richmond (Region I) and then (after 1935) out of Atlanta (Region IV). Cecil C. Day drew the presentation drawings for the Pine Mountain Tavern, the vacation cabins, and other early buildings in the park, and he may have designed them as well. Most of the other landscape architects and draftsmen putting together the plans for the park are known at this point only by the initials they left in the title blocks of the design drawings: "E.L.B.," "H.E.S.," and "A.M.M."[74]

Once the Department of Natural Resources was created, however, planning activities in Atlanta expanded, and the name of one landscape architect in particular emerges as a key figure in landscape architectural planning and design at Pine Mountain: James H. Brooks, Jr. A master plan for the park prepared by Brooks was approved by Conrad Wirth in Washington in September of 1938, and earlier planning and design drawings bear the initials "J.H.B." The 1938 master plan for Pine Mountain State Park treated the park and RDA portions as a single entity. By that time the larger group camp on the west shore of Lake Franklin had been completed, and the RDA was being expanded (although as with all RDAs the group camps were not meant to be open to the day-tripping public). Most of the park, in fact was complete by 1938, with the exception of the day use area, the final portions of the Pine Mountain Parkway, and some other structures. During the summer of 1938 Pine Mountain State Park had been officially opened to the public.[75]

Wirth's comments on the 1938 plan were based on the extensive observations made by Herbert Evison, who had left Washington in 1937 and was now the acting regional director for Region IV in Atlanta, a post he held until 1940. Evison's comments had been directed to his regional inspector, Stuart Woodward; Wirth's comments were directed to the first director of the new Georgia state park division, Charles N. Elliott. As usual, the criticisms of the plan were surprisingly detailed and specific. Wirth and Evison worried, for example, that the planned small group camp at Lake Franklin was too close to the lakeshore and would be visible from the large group camp across the lake. Generally, however, they were quite complementary of Brooks's work, noting that "the master plan material . . . effectively describes the area and its proposed planning."[76]

The most important construction done between 1938 and 1941, when park construction apparently came to an end, was the day use area bathhouse and swimming pool. Original plans had called for a swimming area around Lake Delanor, but the park planners found that the sources of water in that area were inadequate. The new swimming facility, named the Liberty Bell Pool following Roosevelt's

---

[74]Many planning and design drawings for Pine Mountain State Park are conserved at the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, Parks, Recreation and Historic Sites Division, Floyd Tower East, Suite 1352, 205 Butler Street, Atlanta, Georgia, 30334.

[75]State of Georgia, Division of State Parks, Historic Sites and Monuments, Department of Natural Resources, "Pine Mountain State Park [Master Plan]," July 15, 1938.

[76]Herbert Evison to S. M. Woodward, September 18, 1938, Entry 37, State Park File: 1933-1947, Georgia, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

1939 observation, became the center of a day use area that included the park's most elaborate picnic shelter (combined with a comfort station), a ball field, and a parking lot designed for 125 cars. By 1941, Pine Mountain State Park had been completed. With very few changes, the same park continues to serve the public today.[77]

As extensive as the Pine Mountain State Park and RDA development were, they were not the limit of federal land planning, acquisition, and development in the area. The FERA land program begun in 1933 also identified and acquired rural areas in which to plan whole new planned communities. In 1935, 28 such communities had been established using FERA land money to acquire land and build new houses. Of these "agricultural and industrial communities," three were kept directly under the supervision of the Rexford Tugwell's Resettlement Administration after 1935 as pilot projects. One was in Florida, one was in Arkansas, and the third was adjacent to Pine Mountain, near Warm Springs Georgia. Eventually 13,000 acres of the Shiloh Valley, an area of mixed cutover pine forests and rundown farms south of Pine Mountain, was acquired and became the site of a planned community that is today known as Pine Mountain Valley. The community abutted directly onto Pine Mountain State Park and RDA. Together the three projects made up almost the entire view from Franklin Roosevelt's favorite picnic spot, Dowdell Knob. All told, by the end of the New Deal almost 20,000 acres of land around Warm Springs had been acquired by the state and by various New Deal agencies, all of whom developed what they hoped would be showcase projects of recreational land use, progressive agriculture, and new community development. Although there is no reason to believe that Roosevelt directed his bureau chiefs and planners to pay particular attention to Meriwether and Harris counties in western Georgia, clearly his personal interest in the area had resulted in increased consideration from his administration as well as from Georgia state officials.

Pine Mountain State Park persists as solid evidence of the degree of craftsmanship, design, and planning that the CCC, the Park Service, and cooperating local park authorities attained between 1933 and 1942. The park survives as one of the best examples nationally of combined group camp and regular state park planning. As significant as Pine Mountain State Park is in these regards, it also is unique in that it is the best surviving record of the personal interest and essential role of Franklin Roosevelt in creating and inspiring the entire CCC program.

---

[77]For excellent analysis and documentation of all the developed areas of Pine Mountain State Park, see Lucy Ann Lawliss, "The Civilian Conservation Corps and the State Park."

9. MAJOR BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

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

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

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

Lawliss, Lucy Ann. "The Civilian Conservation Corps and the State Park: An Approach to the Management of the Designed Historic Landscape Resources at Franklin D. Roosevelt State Park, Pine Mountain, Georgia." Master of Landscape Architecture Thesis, University of Georgia, 1992.

Lippman, Theo, Jr. The Squire of Warm Springs: F.D.R. in Georgia, 1924-1945. Chicago: Playboy Press, 1977.

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

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

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

U.S. Department of the Interior. Annual Reports of the Department of the Interior. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of the Interior. National Park Service. The CCC and Its Contribution to a Nation-Wide State Park Recreational Program. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1937.

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

U.S. Department of the Interior. National Park Service, in Cooperation with State of Georgia, State Planning Board. Tentative Final Report on Outdoor Recreation in Georgia. Washington, DC: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1938.

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

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

Previous documentation on file (NPS):

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

Primary Location of Additional Data:

___ State Historic Preservation Office
X Other State Agency
___ Federal Agency
___ Local Governrnent
___ University
___ Other (Specify Repository)

10. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

Acreage of Property: 4,518

UTM References:

	Zone	Easting	Northing		Zone	Easting	Northing
A	17	708840	3637720	**B**	17	708860	3636900
C	17	709700	3636980	**D**	17	709700	3636240
E	17	708800	3636600	**F**	17	708890	3633980
G	17	706360	3633920	**H**	17	706340	3635020
I	17	704280	3635000	**J**	17	701760	3632600
K	17	700770	3632140	**L**	17	701780	3633460
M	17	701820	3636940	**N**	17	704540	3636380
O	17	704540	3637680				

Verbal Boundary Description:

The Pine Mountain State Park NHL District is defined by the current statutory boundary of FDR State Park, Western Unit, as shown on the accompanying USGS map.

Boundary Justification:

The boundary corresponds to the park's historic boundary shown on the National Park Service master plan, developed in cooperation with the Georgia Division of State Parks, Historic Sites and Monuments during the park's period of significance.

11. FORM PREPARED BY

Name/Title: Mark R. Edwards, Lucy Ann Lawliss, Susan Begley, Ethan Carr

Org.: National Park Service

Street/#: 800 North Capitol Street

City/Town: Washington

State: DC

ZIP: 20002

Telephone: (202)343-8148

Date: January 8, 1997