## 1. NAME OF PROPERTY

Historic Name: **BASTROP STATE PARK**

Other Name/Site Number:

## 2. LOCATION

Street & Number: East of Bastrop, between State Routes 21 & 71 Not for publication: N/A

City/Town: Bastrop Vicinity: X

State: TX County: Bastrop Code: 021 Zip Code: 78602

## 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 | Non-contributing |
|---|---|
| 17 | 10 buildings |
| 1 | 0 sites |
| 48 | 4 structures |
| 0 | ___ objects |
| 66 | 14 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

Bastrop State Park is located in Bastrop County just east of the town of Bastrop between state highways 21 and 71. The town of Bastrop, chartered by the Republic of Texas in 1837, is located on the banks of the Colorado River about 30 miles east of Austin. In 1978 a large number of buildings in the town, including the Opera House (1881) and the Bastrop County Jail (1891), were placed on the National Register. The entrance to Bastrop State Park is one mile east of town. None of the historic resources of the park have been listed on the National Register, although the park as a whole (except the tract of land added to the park in the 1970s) was declared eligible for such designation in 1995. The approximately 2,054-acre National Historic Landmark District described here (the park itself today is 3,504 acres) has the same boundaries as that portion of the park declared eligible for the National Register.

Bastrop State Park preserves a significant portion of the remaining "Lost Pines" of the region. The name of this isolated forest refers to the fact that, although extensive pine forests exist 80 to 100 miles to the east, the pine forest around Bastrop is an anomaly in the generally drier and less wooded hill country of central Texas. The park terrain consists of broken ground with bluffs just over 500 feet in elevation. Several streams, notably the Copperas Creek, drain the heavily wooded area. Loblolly pines predominate, but various species of oaks and live oaks, as well as mesquite and other understory trees and shrubs, are also well represented.

Bastrop State Park was developed beginning in 1933, in part on land that had been developed earlier (somewhat unsuccessfully) as a private resort. An early project for the CCC, it soon was established as the showplace of state park design and construction in Texas. The park features a loop drive, overlooks, and trails. A large refectory and swimming pool-bathhouse group make up the central day use area near the park entrance. Group camp and other camping facilities are located behind these main buildings. Most of the park facilities were built by the CCC recruits, although the swimming pool and golf course were Works Progress Administration (WPA) projects, and so employed local laborers. In either case, the work came under the supervision of the Park Service planners and landscape architects.

To the north, a small lake was enlarged, and although never an adequate swimming facility, it was a popular fishing spot and its shores provided the sites for an extraordinary group of tourist cabins. An original nine-hole golf course was also built within the park during the historic period, and it remains one of the finest and best preserved golf facilities of its type. In general, the quality of the architectural and site design at Bastrop, overseen by CCC regional director Herbert Maier, made the park not only a showcase of the CCC state park program in Texas, but an important early model for CCC parks in other states as well.

Overall the park retains excellent integrity to the historic period of its development. In the 1970s, 1,450 acres were added to the eastern side of the park, but this area is not included in the historic district described here. Perhaps the most significant alteration to the park to date has been the addition (ca. 1950) of the group camp site east of the bathhouse area. The six non-contributing buildings in this area (NCB 1-6) are grouped closely together, however, and do not affect the major public spaces, circulation patterns, views, and other facilities of the park. Overall, the park visited today is the park that was planned and built during the first

years of the New Deal. In particular the park architecture--the exceptional cabins, refectory, bathhouse, and other buildings--retain excellent integrity.

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

Spatial Organization
Circulation
Topography
Vegetation
Structures
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. Buildings are defined as structures intended to shelter a human activity. Sites are defined as discrete areas designed for a specific use, such as cemeteries or golf courses. No archeological resources have been considered in this survey.

**Spatial Organization**
The overall spatial organization of Bastrop State Park was determined by the master plan initiated in 1933 by the National Park Service in cooperation with the Texas State Parks Board. 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.

For example, the park's master plan featured a single, controlled entrance, defined by a small gatehouse and low walls extending on either side. The plan also delineated a road system that extended to reach the key facilities and viewpoints of the park, but which minimized the intrusion of road construction and automobiles as much as possible. A central developed area (or day use area), defined by the refectory, bathhouse, and picnic grounds, was situated near the main arrival point. 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.

Like the day use area, other developed areas of the park were well defined and discrete. The maintenance area, for example, was sited off the main park loop to the south, on a short cul-de-sac where it was convenient to the main entrance and day use area, but was also well separated from public areas. The maintenance buildings, arranged orthogonally, defined a utility yard typical of Park Service planning of the period. To the north, the tourist cabin area on the lakeshore also was accessed by a spur road off the main park drive. This arrangement allowed vacationers in the cabins to remain undisturbed by daily park activities. 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 three smaller cul-de-sacs at the end of the spur road, formed a small, semi-private community somewhat independent of other park activities. The backs of the cabins (cars arrive at the fronts) established communal spaces between the cabins, set apart from the more completely public areas of the park.

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. The basic spatial sequence through the site began with the main road between the entrance and the refectory. This entrance drive bisected the relatively level area at the west end of the park site. This more lightly wooded forecourt to the main portion of the park was developed as a golf course, and so the open, level character of the landscape presented a marked contrast to the more precipitous, wooded terrain of the park proper.

The relatively straight entrance road was terminated by the impressive and stable facade of the refectory building, which occupied a commanding site in the plan. The refectory, both spatially and functionally, served as the transition and entrance to the main public activity areas of the park. A long U-shaped driveway to the front entrance of the building further reinforced its central position, analogous to that of the main residence in a private estate design. The floor plan of the refectory, with a central "lounge" and connecting terraces at both the front and back, integrated the floor plan into the overall park circulation plan.

The bathhouse and the adjacent long narrow parking area north and east of the refectory established a northern edge to the central, rectangular activity area. This area was defined on the west by the back of the refectory, and on the east by the swimming pool. East of the swimming pool, the adjacent picnic ground was nearby, yet secluded in a wooded area. This configuration of spaces and facilities made up the main day use area of the park. Although the pool has been reconstructed and a portion of the picnic ground has been abandoned and overgrown, the overall integrity of the area is excellent. The 1950 group camp buildings and campsites to the east, although non-contributing resources of the NHL District, do not directly detract from the spatial definition and character of the central day use area.

The rest of the park, typically more wooded with more rugged terrain, was accessed via a park loop road (Park Road 1A) that begins and ends at the refectory building. Several high bluffs along the loop provided views at scenic overlooks. The road was located along one shore of the lake (at the dam), an arrangement that allowed views and automotive access to the lake, while minimizing the disturbance of it. The spatial character of the loop road was defined by enclosed spaces in heavily wooded areas, alternating with more open views from highpoints and along the lake.

**Topography**

The artificial lake along the Copperas Creek, originally dammed in 1914, was a known attraction in the area and was an important element for planners to include in park plans. The high bluffs and broken terrain of the park's interior offered views and picturesque woodland scenery. The relatively level area at the entrance to the property was naturally conducive to development of a golf course. The topographic division between the western, level area near the entrance to the park, and the rugged terrain of the park proper, marked the principal topographic division of the park site.

The master plan 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 southern portion of the park loop road, for example, followed the natural right-of-way of the Copperas Creek and one of its tributaries. Scenic overlooks and the water tower were, of course, sited on the highpoints of the terrain. The lake on the Copperas Creek, originally built by private resort developers, took advantage of a suitably confined portion of the creek valley. CCC crews excavated the lake site further, and built a new dam and spillway to enlarge the lake.

**Vegetation**

The Lost Pines themselves, which had been extensively logged in the 19th century, were a scenic attraction already in the early 20th century. The sometimes thick forests of the park included live oaks and other oak species, willows, and cottonwoods. The preservation of this remnant of the Lost Pine forest of the region was a principal consideration in the creation and planning of the park.

A great deal of landscape and forestry 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. This planting typically enhanced a new building's elevation (rather than obscuring it), and also served to erase scars of construction.

Roadside plantings were done along the park entrance road and elsewhere at Bastrop. The golf course developed along the entrance road called for extensive management and planting of vegetation. The nine-hole course was in use by 1936, and today these nine holes retain their original locations.

Another major consideration at Bastrop was the sometimes degraded condition of the Lost Pines forest itself. Extensive logging in the 19th century had decimated much of the forest, and the park was created in part to assure that the significant remaining stands within the park would be preserved. CCC recruits engaged in various forestry activities at Bastrop, including reforestation and blight and insect control. Like much of the landscape work, however, this work was directed in the field. Precise plans showing exactly where forestry activities occurred do not seem to exist, although these activities are described in monthly progress reports.

**Circulation**

The patterns of visitor circulation through Bastrop again constitute an early and significant example of Park Service state park planning. There is only one automotive entrance to the park, an arrangement that was considered desirable to control traffic. More entrances would have also required more roads to connect them together, leading to excessive road construction.

The park loop road is a classic park circulation diagram. The loop made it possible to reach all the major attractions in the park, including the lake, scenic overlooks, and numerous trailheads connecting to trails in different areas of the park. The spur roads connecting to the cabin area and the maintenance area were dead ends, eliminating through traffic in these areas and

enhancing their separation from the more public loop road. The day use area (and adjacent group camp and campground areas) was also a dead end spur off the main loop. This eliminated the possibility of through traffic in this busy area.

The road to nearby Buescher State Park (Park Road 1C) was an original feature of plans for Bastrop. The development of Buescher was underway shortly after the work of Bastrop began, and the connecting "parkway" was recognized as an enhancement for both park plans. The connection allowed Buescher State Park to be less developed than Bastrop, since a duplication of major facilities so close together was not considered desirable. Only the initial portion of the Buescher road is within the historic district described here, however, since the NHL District is based strictly on the plans and design of Bastrop State Park itself.

Overall, all road construction 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 sandstone masonry found in the rest of the park. Guardwalls are also of sandstone, and in places feature crenelated top courses. The "rustic" construction and stylistic uniformity of the smaller elements of road construction are important aspects of these contributing resources.

Another aspect of the circulation plan at Bastrop, typical of Park Service master planning, was the separation of foot and vehicle traffic. This was achieved in this case by the system of foot trails that connected the developed areas in the park (mostly through the park interior) while the vehicular loop drive circled around the park, closer to the park's boundaries. The main park trail, connecting the eastern campground and the main day use area, was relatively heavily developed with foot bridges, water fountains, fire rings, and picnic tables. These structures, and the importance of the trail in the overall circulation pattern of the park, give the trail a unique character: more developed than a backcountry trail, yet more remote and wild than a developed picnic or campground.

**Structures, Buildings, and Sites**
**Note:** "HRIS" numbers refer to the Historic Resource Inventory Site numbers assigned by the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department. If left blank, no number has been assigned. Information on buildings and other structures in the park has been taken from Ralph Edward Newlan, "Bastrop State Park Cultural Resources Report," a 1993 unpublished report prepared for the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department in Austin.

All of the landscape structures in Bastrop 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 Bastrop State Park, roughly worked local sandstone was the material of choice. Masonry joints are typically fairly thick, but deeply struck. Lower courses of walls and some buildings tended to be made up of larger stones than the upper courses. Unbroken horizontal joints were usually avoided. Masonry walls are

typically load bearing, and roofs were typically framed with heavy timbers or peeled logs, and clad with heavy shakes.

Masonry construction in different areas of the park also received different treatments. The gatehouse at the entrance and the structures in the main day use area are of relatively refined, random ashlar with rusticated finishes. Structures in more remote areas, such as roadside overlooks, are of rubble and boulder construction, or are laid in a random ashlar pattern. Wood construction follows a similar pattern, employing larger and less worked elements in the more remote areas of the park. The golf course "forecourt" of the park and the main day use area feature the most regular, or refined architectural treatments, while structures in the more remote guest cabin area or along the park loop road have an increasingly irregular, or "rustic," appearance. This range of construction techniques may also relate to a stylistic development between earlier and later structures in the park, and to the involvement of different designers for some of the earliest park structures.

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 and Herbert Maier at the National Park Service. All the buildings in the park, like the smaller structures, are outstanding and seminal examples of "NPS Rustic" style as adapted to state park development beginning in 1933.

**Park Entrance and Day Use Area**

CS1. Structure: Gate House HRIS#: 25
Location: Park Entrance Date: 1934
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC/Arthur Fehr

The sandstone gatehouse was one of the first structures completed in the park. The random ashlar masonry has a rusticated finish and thin masonry joints. Deeply recessed semi-circular arched openings contain the one door and two windows. The upper parapet is pierced by vertical openings, reinforcing the impression of a small fortification.

CS2. Structure: Sandstone Walls HRIS#: 52
Location: Park Entrance Date: 1934
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

Opposite the gate house, a matching (but smaller) stone pylon marks the other side of the gate. Low sandstone walls extend about 1,000 feet along the park boundary in either direction. The rusticated, random ashlar sandstone masonry matches the gate house and pylon.

CS3. Structure: Park Entrance Road HRIS#:
Location: Date: ca. 1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

The entrance road extends about two thirds of a mile from the entrance to the intersection with the park loop road at the refectory building. The short bypass around the checking station is non-contributing. This approach road is relatively straight, bringing visitors directly to the day use area. Bisecting the nine-hole golf course, the road gives open views of fairways and belts of mature pines and other trees. The straight alignment and open views are in marked contrast to the park loop drive.

CS4. Structure: Refectory Driveway HRIS#:
Location: Date: ca. 1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
The "U"-shaped drive leading to the front of the refectory building is aligned with either arm of the wye intersection between the entrance road and the loop road. This unusual (and original) intersection configuration enhances the already unique and imposing position of the refectory in the overall park plan. Functioning primarily as a drop off, the refectory driveway is little used.

CS5. Structure: Swimming Pool HRIS#: 16
Location: Day Use Area Date: 1937
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/WPA
This oval concrete swimming pool was built with Works Progress Administration funds, and so was not a CCC project. It is surrounded by sandstone retaining walls, terraces, stairs. Although the pool walls have been resurfaced and a new filtration plant has been added, the pool remains a central and well used facility with good integrity to the historic period.

CS6. Structure: Pool Shelter HRIS#: 17
Location: Day Use Area Date: 1939
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC Arthur Fehr
The pool shelter at the southern end of the pool is a one story pavilion with sandstone corner supports, log columns, and a shake roof. Curving stone terraces extend from the pavilion, which are bordered by a low sandstone wall.

CS7. Structure: Parking Lot HRIS#:
Location: Day Use Area Date: ca. 1937
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
The linear parking lot west of the refectory serves the refectory and the swimming pool area. The parking lot also defines the western edge of the central day use area.

CS8. Structure: Sandstone Fence HRIS#: 49
Location: Day Use Area Date: 1940
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
The fence extending from the refectory to the bathhouse along the edge of the parking lot is constructed of regularly spaced sandstone piers on a continuous sandstone curb. Between the piers the fence consists of concrete posts and rails.

CS9. Structure: Stone Curb HRIS#: 50
Location: Day Use Area Date: 1937
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This sandstone curb borders a section of the parking lot. It is comprised of 15-inch sandstone blocks and has a seven-inch reveal.

CS10-14. Structure: Picnic Tables (5) HRIS#: 48
Location: Picnic Ground near Day Use Area Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

These remarkable picnic tables consist of stanchions and benches of sandstone masonry laid in irregular courses, topped by precast concrete tabletops and bench seats. Their durability both (physical and aesthetic) has proved to be remarkable. The picnic tables are built in place.

CS15. Structure: Water Fountain HRIS#: 48
Location: Picnic Ground near Day Use Area Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

Like other water fountains in the park, this fountain is constructed of sandstone laid in an irregular ashlar pattern. The fountain's bowl is carved from a block of sandstone, and the structure is stepped on one side.

CS16-18. Structure: Fire Rings (3) HRIS#: 48
Location: Picnic Ground near Day Use Area Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

The fire rings in the picnic area are roughly U-shaped, and built of stacked sandstone slabs. These fire rings are built in place.

CB1. Building: Refectory HRIS#: 18
Location: Day Use Area Date: 1935-38
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC

The refectory continues to serve groups of day use visitors to the park for a variety of functions. The walls are load bearing, sandstone masonry laid in a random ashlar pattern, with a rusticated finish. The massive pitched roofs are sheathed in wood shingles. The linear plan of the building is centered around a public "lounge," with terraces projected to the front and back. Some alterations were made to the refectory in 1938. Overall the building retains excellent integrity to the historic period. The building was designed in the Park Service central design office in Austin before Arthur Fehr was assigned to the park. Fehr then supervised construction and designed some of the construction details.

CB2. Building: Bath House HRIS#: 15
Location: Day Use Area Date: 1936
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC Arthur Fehr

This one story, wood frame building is clad in dark, "waney-edged" weatherboard over a sandstone masonry foundation. The pitched roof is covered in wood shingles and the floors are of poured concrete. The building continues to function as the swimming pool bath house and has excellent integrity.

**Park Loop Road**

CS19. Structure: Park Loop Road (1A) HRIS#:
Location: Date: ca. 1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

The approximately three-mile park loop road accesses the main park facilities and brings motorists to a number of the finest views in the park. But this single park road also leaves most of the park accessible only by foot trails. The two-lane road features

three pull offs with parking areas and nearby trail heads. A number of culverts carry intersecting streams under the road. Headwalls are typically cast concrete veneered in sandstone masonry, and retaining walls and guardwalls are of sandstone masonry. The roadside overlook areas, culverts, retaining walls, and other minor structures along the road are included here as part of the road structure.

CS20. Structure: Vehicle Bridge HRIS#: 40
Location: Park Loop Road at Copperas Creek Date: 1934
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

This bridge (actually a large culvert) features sandstone masonry guardwalls and abutments. The steel culverts that carry the Copperas Creek under the park loop road at this point have been replaced, and portions of the guardwall are missing; otherwise the bridge is in good condition.

CS21. Structure: Scenic Overlook Shelter HRIS#: 27
Location: Park Loop Road Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC Arthur Fehr

This shelter consists of six heavily battered round columns built of irregularly coursed sandstone. The shelter has a sandstone floor and a hexagonal, hipped roof of heavy timber framing and shakes. This is the only shelter directly associated with the automotive sequence through the park.

CS22. Structure: Water Storage Tank HRIS#: 35
Location: Park Loop Road Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

This concrete water storage tank is located at a high point (600 feet) near the intersection of the park loop road and the Buescher road.

**Cabin Area**

CS23. Structure: Cabin Spur Road(1B) HRIS#:
Location: Date: ca. 1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This longer (about one third of a mile) spur road includes two branches that access the cabins clustered above the western shore of the park's lake.

CS24. Structure: Retaining Wall HRIS#: 45
Location: Cabin Area Date: 1935-6
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This "gully stopper" dam crosses a wash in the cabin area of the park as a check on soil erosion. The wall is built of sturdy sandstone, laid in a random ashlar pattern.

CS25. Structure: Creek Retaining Wall HRIS#: 46
Location: Cabin Area Date: 1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This retaining wall along a creek bank north of cabin #14 is one of many such structures in the park. Built of sandstone masonry, its purpose is to control erosion. Although not enumerated here, other similar structures in more remote locations of the park were built by the CCC for the same purpose, and should be considered contributing features of the historic district.

CS26. Structure: Foot Bridge HRIS#: 44
Location: Cabin Area Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This foot bridge is located in the cabin area between Cabin no. 6 and Cabin no. 9. It consists of sandstone abutments at either end of the crossing and wooden decking and rails, portions of which have been replaced over the years as needed. Despite this necessary maintenance, the original abutments of massive sandstone blocks, and the location and character of the structure make it a contributing resource of the historic district.

CS27. Structure: Sewer Line Bridge HRIS#: 36
Location: Cabin Area Date: 1937
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This elevated cast iron sewer pipe carries the cabin area sewer over a western inlet of the park lake near the cabin area spur road. Five tapered, concrete piers carry the pipe, maintaining the necessary elevation.

CB3. Building: Cabin #12 HRIS#: 1
Location: Cabin Area Date: 1939
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC Arthur Fehr
Cabin 12 is a one story wood frame, asymmetrical plan cabin for overnight visitors. The siding is dark, "waney-edged" weatherboard over a concrete foundation. This larger, L-shaped building was added to the earlier, original "Pioneer Village" group of cabins, and was sited somewhat apart from the main group.

CB4. Building: Cabin #1 HRIS#: 2

Location: Cabin Area Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC Arthur Fehr
Cabin 1 is a one story, load bearing masonry, asymmetrical plan cabin for overnight visitors. The lower courses of the battered walls are composed of more massive sandstone blocks, while the upper courses are composed of slightly smaller stones. The foundation is a stone footing type, and the building features a massive, battered chimney.

CB5. Building: Cabin #5 HRIS#: 3
Location: Cabin Area Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC Arthur Fehr
Cabin 5 is a one story, load bearing masonry, asymmetrical plan cabin for overnight visitors. The lower courses of the battered walls are composed of more massive sandstone blocks, while the upper courses are composed of slightly smaller stones. The foundation is a stone footing type, and the building features a massive, battered chimney. Cabin 5 is a mirror image of Cabin 1.

CB6. Building: Cabin #4 HRIS#: 4
Location: Cabin Area Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC Arthur Fehr
Cabin 4 is a one story, load bearing masonry, asymmetrical plan cabin for overnight visitors. The lower courses of the battered walls are composed of more massive sandstone blocks, while the upper courses are composed of slightly smaller stones. The foundation is a stone footing type, and the exterior features a massive, battered chimney.

CB7. Building: Cabin #3 HRIS#: 5
Location: Cabin Area Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC Arthur Fehr
Cabin 3 is a one story, load bearing masonry, asymmetrical plan cabin for overnight visitors. The lower courses of the battered walls are composed of more massive sandstone blocks, while the upper courses are composed of slightly smaller stones. The cabin features a massive, interior chimney, and the gable roof ends are clad in "waney edged" siding.

CB8. Building: Cabin #13 (storage) HRIS#: 6
Location: Cabin Area Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC Arthur Fehr
Cabin 13 is a one story, load bearing masonry, asymmetrical plan cabin now used for storage. The lower courses of the battered walls are composed of more massive sandstone blocks, while the upper courses are composed of slightly smaller stones. The battered walls are extended to provide privacy screens at the entrances.

CB9. Building: Cabin #2 HRIS#: 7
Location: Cabin Area Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC Arthur Fehr

Cabin 2 is a one story, load bearing masonry, asymmetrical plan cabin for overnight visitors. The gable ends are clad in board and batten siding.

CB10. Building: Cabin #6 HRIS#: 8
Location: Cabin Area Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC Arthur Fehr

Cabin 6 is a one story wood frame, asymmetrical plan cabin for overnight visitors. The siding is dark, "waney-edged" weatherboard over a stone footing foundation. The rear elevation includes an inset porch with stone steps. The building spans a dry wash, and so assumes the appearance of a covered bridge.

CB11. Building: Cabin #7 HRIS#: 9
Location: Cabin Area Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC Arthur Fehr

Cabin 7 is a one story wood frame, asymmetrical plan cabin for overnight visitors. The siding is dark, "waney-edged" weatherboard over a stone footing foundation. The linear building has multiple, offset gabled roofs.

CB12. Building: Cabin #8 HRIS#: 10
Location: Cabin Area Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC Arthur Fehr

Cabin 8 is a one story wood frame, asymmetrical plan cabin for overnight visitors. The siding is dark, "waney-edged" weatherboard over a stone footing foundation. The front elevation includes an entrance set under a shed roof porch, and a massive sandstone chimney.

CB13. Building: Cabin #9 HRIS#: 11
Location: Cabin Area Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC Arthur Fehr

Cabin 9 is a one story wood frame, asymmetrical plan cabin for overnight visitors. The siding is dark, "waney-edged" weatherboard over a stone footing foundation. The cabin features a shed roofed porch and a massive interior sandstone chimney.

CB14. Building: Cabin #10 HRIS#: 12
Location: Cabin Area Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC Arthur Fehr

Cabin 10 is a one story wood frame, asymmetrical plan cabin for overnight visitors. The siding is dark, "waney-edged" weatherboard over a stone footing foundation. The cabin features an inset porch and a massive exterior sandstone chimney.

CB15. Building: Cabin #11 HRIS#: 13
Location: Cabin Area Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC Arthur Fehr
Cabin 11 is a one story wood frame, asymmetrical plan cabin for overnight visitors. The siding is dark, "waney-edged" weatherboard over a concrete foundation. The cabin features a large concrete terrace bordered by a low sandstone wall, and a massive exterior sandstone chimney.

CB16. Building: Cabin #14 HRIS#: 14
Location: Cabin Area Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC Arthur Fehr
Cabin 14 is a wood frame structure with a sandstone veneer that gives the impression of load bearing masonry walls. It was originally designed as the "keeper's cabin," but now is used for overnight accommodations.

**Maintenance Area**

CS28. Structure: Maint. Spur Road HRIS#:
Location: Off Park Loop Road Date: ca. 1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This short spur road includes a circular terminus that defines a maintenance yard. The utility area is well separated from the more public loop road.

CS29. Structure: Buescher Road (1C) HRIS#:
Location: Date: ca. 1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Only the first mile of this "parkway" connecting Bastrop and Buescher state parks is included in the historic district.

CS30. Structure: Mill/Warehouse HRIS#: 19
Location: Service Area Date:1935
Architect/Builder: Texas State Parks
This CCC warehouse is a one story, wood frame building in the park service area. Dark, "waney edged," rough cut siding is employed, and the foundation in this case is a combination of wood piers and a concrete slab. The hipped roof is covered in wood shingles, and heavy timber posts support a porte-cochere.

CS31. Structure: Paint Storage Shed HRIS#: 20
Location: Service Area Date:1941
Architect/Builder: Texas State Parks/National Youth Administration
The paint storage shed in the service area is a wood frame, weatherboard clad building with a metal roof. It occupies the site of an earlier CCC shed, which it replaced. The storage shed remains a contributing structure of the historic district, since it dates to the period of significance and continues to serve its original function.

CS32. Structure: Lumber Storage Shed HRIS#: 21
Location: Service Area Date: ca. 1940
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC Arthur Fehr
The lumber storage shed in the service area is a wood frame, rectangular plan building also used for storage. It also features weatherboard siding and a metal roof. Like the paint shed, the lumber storage shed occupies the site of an earlier CCC storage shed. It contributes to the historic district since it dates to the period of significance and continues to serve its original function, and it also houses the park woodshop.

CS33. Structure: Pump House HRIS#: 22
Location: Service Area Date: 1936
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC Arthur Fehr
The pump house is a one story sandstone masonry structure. The load bearing walls are laid in a coursed fieldstone pattern. It is currently used as a storage facility.

**Park Lake and Other Resources**

CS34. Structure: Lake and Dam HRIS#: 47
Location: Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
An existing lake created by a group of real estate entrepreneurs in 1914 was excavated and expanded by the CCC recruits. The enlarged lake includes a new dam and spillway built of concrete veneered in masonry. The spillway is flanked by sandstone retaining walls laid in a random ashlar pattern. A pipe rail fence protects the concrete spillway opening.

CS35. Structure: Wellhead HRIS#: 37
Location: South of Park Loop Road Date: 1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Built originally to cover an existing well, this structure originally included a wooden roof. Since the massive sandstone portion of the structure remains and the wooden portion could easily be restored, it remains a contributing structure in the historic district.

CS36. Structure: Scenic Overlook Shelter HRIS#: 28
Location: Corner of Park Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC Arthur Fehr
This structure has suffered a fire which destroyed the timber and shake roof and its log columns. The sandstone walls, steps and floor remain, however, and since the wooden portions of the structure could be replaced, it remains a contributing structure in the historic district.

CS37. Structure: Trail HRIS#:
Location: East and West Campgrounds Date: ca. 1934
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
The most important foot trail within the historic district follows the Copperas Creek from the parks eastern campground to the western campground near the day use area. The trail is about two miles long, including two spurs that lead to the campground areas. A number of footbridges, water fountains, and other structures are located along the Copperas Creek and are accessed by this trail.

CS38. Structure: Water Fountain HRIS#: 42
Location: Along Trail Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Like other water fountains in the park, this fountain is constructed of sandstone laid in an irregular ashlar pattern. The fountain's bowl is carved from a block of sandstone, and the structure is stepped on one side.

CS39. Structure: Picnic Table HRIS#:
Location: Along Trail Date: 1937
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This picnic table is located just past the eastern campground along the Copperas Creek trail. The picnic table is built in place.

CS40-41. Structure: Fire Rings (2) HRIS#: 55
Location: Along trail Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
The fire rings, like those in the picnic area, are roughly U-shaped, and built of stacked sandstone slabs. Located along Copperas Creek, these are overgrown. The fire rings are built in place.

CS42. Structure: Picnic Shelter HRIS#: 26
Location: Copperas Creek Date:1937
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC Arthur Fehr
The Copperas Creek Picnic Shelter is a combination wood frame and sandstone masonry open structure with a shake roof. A massive sandstone chimney opens on three sides.

CS43. Structure: Foot Bridge HRIS#: 39
Location: Copperas Creek North of Park Loop Road Date: 1934
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This foot bridge over the Copperas Creek consists of sandstone abutments at either end of the crossing and wooden decking and rails, portions of which have been replaced over the years as needed. Despite this necessary maintenance, the original abutments of massive sandstone blocks, and the location and character of the structure make it a contributing resource of the historic district.

CS44. Structure: Foot Bridge HRIS#: 41

Location: Copperas Creek Date: 1934
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

This foot bridge over the Copperas Creek (north and west of CS25) also consists of sandstone abutments at either end of the crossing and wooden decking and rails, portions of which have been replaced over the years as needed. Despite this necessary maintenance, the original abutments of massive sandstone blocks, and the location and character of the structure make it a contributing resource of the historic district.

CS45. Structure: Waterfall/dam HRIS#: 38
Location: Copperas Creek Date: 1935
South of Park Loop Road
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

The waterfall/dam is one of the many landscape structures along Copperas Creek that increased the interest and variety of the trailside landscape. Massive blocks of sandstone are laid in mortar beds to create a naturalistic rockwork dam. The creek falls over the rockwork, creating a picturesque effect. Yaupons and cedars were planted around the dam, which was designed by park landscape architect Norfleet Bone.

CS46. Structure: Water Fountain HRIS#: 54
Location: Copperas Creek Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

This water fountain, near the banks of Copperas Creek, is made of sandstone laid in a rough rubble pattern.

CSI1. Site: Golf Course HRIS#:
Location: Date:1936-39
Architect/Builder: NPS/WPA/CCC

The nine-hole golf course at Bastrop was in use as early as 1936. Like the golf club house, construction was at least partially funded through WPA funds, and so employed labor other than the CCC. Progress reports describe the construction of the lake, rockwork features, pedestrian bridges, and the transplanting of many small trees and shrubs in 1934 and 1935, however, and so the CCC was active in this early site work, at least. Comparison to historic plans today shows that the original nine holes of the course are in their original locations. This is one of the finest and best preserved golf courses built with New Deal funds. Nine holes have recently been added to the course, but this was done in a manner to preserve the locations of the original holes.

CS47. Structure: Golf Course Lake (Lake Mina) HRIS#: 51
Date:1934
Location: Golf Course
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC

The shoreline of the small golf course lake built in 1934 (near the park entrance) is lined with sandstone rockwork. A small stone terrace features sandstone benches as well. This was one of the earliest projects completed in the park, and was criticized as

appropriate more to a private landscape design than a public park. Built by the CCC, it was then incorporated in the golf course.

CS48. Structure: Golf Course Storage HRIS#: 23
Location: Golf Course Date:1936
Architect/Builder: NPS/CCC Arthur Fehr
This caddy shack near the first tee is built of battered sandstone walls, the lower courses of which are massive slabs while the upper courses are a more restrained random ashlar. The heavy timbers of the roof are exposed at the ends under the wood shingles.

CB17. Building: Golf Club House HRIS#: 24
Location: Golf Course Date:1938-39
Architect/Builder: NPS/WPA
This one story, wood frame building has a gabled roof with projecting wings that have shed roofs. The siding is dark, "waney-edged" weatherboard over a concrete slab foundation. A large sandstone masonry chimney is located at the joint between the gable roof and one of the shed roofed wings. The building, like the golf course it serves, was probably a WPA project. Although the building has had several minor alterations, it retains excellent integrity.

Non-Contributing Structures and Buildings:

NCS1. Structure: Campground Loop Roads HRIS#:
Location: Near Day Use Area Date: ca. 1975
Architect/Builder: Texas State Parks

NCS2. Structure: Campground Loop Roads HRIS#:
Location: Eastern Camp Ground Date: ca. 1975
Architect/Builder: Texas State Parks

NCS3. Structure: Radio Tower HRIS#:
Location: Along western boundary of NHL District Date: Ca. 1970
Architect/Builder: Unknown

NCS4. Structure: Radio Tower Road HRIS#:
Location: From Buescher Road to Radio Tower Date: Post WWII
Architect/Builder: Unknown

NCB1. Building: Group Camp Office HRIS#: 29
Location: Central Area Date: ca. 1950
Architect/Builder: Texas State Parks

NCB2. Building: Group Camp Dormitories HRIS#: 30
Location: Central Area Date: ca. 1950
Architect/Builder: Texas State Parks

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| NCB3. | Building: | Group Camp Dormitories | HRIS#: 31 |
| | Location: | Central Area | Date: ca. 1950 |
| | Architect/Builder: | Texas State Parks | |
| NCB4. | Building: | Group Camp Dormitories | HRIS#: 32 |
| | Location: | Central Area | Date: ca. 1950 |
| | Architect/Builder: | Texas State Parks | |
| NCB5. | Building: | Group Camp Dormitories | HRIS#: 33 |
| | Location: | Central Area | Date: ca. 1950 |
| | Architect/Builder: | Texas State Parks | |
| NCB6. | Building: | Group Camp Hall/Kitchen | HRIS#: 34 |
| | Location: | Central Area | Date: ca. 1950 |
| | Architect/Builder: | Texas State Parks | |
| NCB7. | Building: | Checking Station/Park H.Q. | HRIS#: |
| | Location: | Entrance Road | Date: ca. 1975 |
| | Architect/Builder: | Texas State Parks | |
| NCB8. | Building: | Comfort Station | HRIS#: |
| | Location: | Eastern Campground | Date: ca. 1975 |
| | Architect/Builder: | Texas State Parks | |
| NCB9. | Building: | Comfort Station | HRIS#: |
| | Location: | Eastern Campground | Date: ca. 1975 |
| | Architect/Builder: | Texas State Parks | |
| NCB10. | Building: | Ranger Residence | HRIS#: |
| | Location: | South of Refectory | Date: ca. 1975 |
| | Architect/Builder: | Texas State Parks | |

## 8. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

Applicable National Register Criteria: A X B_ C X D_

Criteria Considerations (Exceptions): A__ B__ C__ D__ E__ F__ G__

NHL Criteria: 1, 4

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

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

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

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

Period(s) of Significance: 1933-1942

Significant Dates: 1933, 1934, 1935, 1937, 1939, 1942

Significant Person(s): N/A

Cultural Affiliation: N/A

Architect/Builder: Maier, Herbert; Henry, A.R.; Fehr, Arthur; Bone, Norfleet

NHL Comparative Categories:
XVI: Architecture, Y Rustic

XVII: Landscape Architecture

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

**Summary**

Bastrop State Park in Texas is one of the finest illustrations of the legacy and influence of architect Herbert Maier's work as a regional CCC director--and as the leading spokesperson on park architecture for the Park Service state park effort--during the 1930s. Bastrop State Park is also an extremely significant and well preserved park of the period, and epitomizes the artistic quality and high aspirations held for state parks designed by the Park Service during the 1930s. Bastrop represents some of the highest achievements resulting from the collaboration of the Park Service, the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), and local park authorities during the New Deal.

Bastrop was also a showcase of the Texas state park system, which was one of the most extensive and significant state park systems developed during the New Deal. In 1923, Texas had only five small state parks; by 1933, the state legislature had still not appropriated significant funds for state park development. By 1942, however, the state boasted a well-developed system of 31 new parks built by the CCC and visited by over 1.7 million people annually. Up to 27 CCC camps had been active building parks in the state since 1933; overall Texas had one of the highest concentration of CCC camps of any state in the union.

Many of the most significant results of National Park Service landscape architecture were initiated in 1933 as part of Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal. During this unique period, Park Service landscape architects, in cooperation with local park authorities, designed hundreds of state and local parks, most of which were developed with CCC labor. By 1942, when CCC activities came to a halt, the Park Service and the CCC had made remarkable and unprecedented progress in the development of state park systems nationwide. To this day, in many states the regional and state parks developed during this period remain the core of their park systems. Texas fully exploited the potential not only of the CCC, but the Works Progress Administration (WPA), the National Youth Administration (NYA), and other New Deal programs to expand and enhance its state park system; Bastrop State Park stands out as the most significant single example of this important chapter in Texas history.

Among the many parks and park systems that make up the legacy of this period, certain examples are particularly significant because of their extensive complement of period development, the exceptional quality of their original design and planning, and their excellent historic integrity and physical condition. Bastrop State Park was an important early model for Park Service state park development. The master plan for the park, worked out initially in the Park Service central design office set up in Austin in 1933, was an influential example for later parks. The park also represents an important early result of the collaboration between the Park Service, the CCC, the WPA, and local park authorities. Bastrop became a successful demonstration of the balance that could be achieved between recreational uses and conservation of natural resources. Located near the state capital in Austin, it also was a showcase of the kind of useful and permanent work the CCC soon proved itself capable of. Bastrop was particularly convincing in this regard because of the ambitious construction work undertaken by the boys. The NYA was also very active in Bastrop, training young recruits in a full range of trades, including furniture manufacturing, sawyering, and blacksmithing.

Bastrop State Park, in addition to possessing outstanding integrity and excellence in its original design, can also claim to be an extremely important example of the influence of Park Service architect Herbert Maier. Maier, who was appointed the Region III CCC director for the Park Service in 1933, oversaw many state park developments in Texas, Oklahoma, the Southwest, and initially in the Northern Plains states as well. Maier's work for the Park Service had begun earlier, however, as the designer of national park museums in Yosemite, Yellowstone, and Grand Canyon. More than any other architect, Maier defined what became known as Park Service Rustic architecture of the 1930s. And although Maier did not design the buildings of Bastrop State Park (or any other state park during this period), he was in charge of the overall CCC planning and design efforts for the region, and the buildings of Bastrop are excellent representations of the extremely high quality of architectural design and site planning he successfully upheld for the projects he administered.

The Bastrop 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 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. The Bastrop 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 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 NYA activities in the park in 1942. Other significant dates include 1934, when architect Arthur Fehr arrived at the park; 1935, when landscape architect Norfleet Bone arrived at the park; and 1937, when the park was dedicated and the first CCC camp left the park; and 1939, when the last CCC camp left the park.

**Historic Context**

One of the first pieces of New Deal legislation passed by Congress funded the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC). Within two months of Franklin D. Roosevelt's inauguration in the spring of 1933, 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. The great opportunity presented by "emergency conservation work" appropriations was matched only by the great threat such activities held for public lands as well: the CCC, over 300,000-strong by 1935, needed things to do, whether planners and supervisors had prepared plans for productive activities or not.

The National Park Service and the USDA Forest Service, as the "technical agencies" in charge of planning and supervising most CCC projects, immediately hired as many landscape architects and foresters as they could find. By 1933, chief landscape architect Thomas C. Vint and his atelier of Park Service designers and engineers were in a unique position to offer technical support for New Deal programs. Since 1927, the closely knit group of up to 16

professionals had been growing in number and refining its procedures. The Landscape Division's authority within the Park Service had been steadily enhanced as Park Service Director Horace Albright and other officials came to recognize the usefulness and efficiency of the park "master planning" process. The compilation of master plans proved be a particularly significant activity in the early 1930s. Besides safeguarding parks from excessive or poorly coordinated road construction and other development, the master plans also detailed at a six-year program of prioritized construction activity. Updated annually, by 1933 the master plans completed or underway represented a considerable reservoir of schematic and partially developed designs that could be quickly converted into construction projects if the opportunity arose.[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 new program. Ickes named Horace Albright to represent the Department of the Interior; Albright in turn brought Thomas Vint, chief engineer Frank A. Kittredge, and chief forester John D. Coffman from California to Washington to help determine what the new army of youths could accomplish in the national parks.[2] Once the CCC legislation was signed into law at the end of March, several government bureaus took on new responsibilities. The Department of Labor screened and selected recruits, and 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

---

[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.

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

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]

---

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

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

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

[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.

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

The outdoor recreation movement had been flourishing since before World War I; the creation of the Park Service, as well as numerous state and local park commissions, was evidence of the growing influence of mostly middle class tourists, mostly in automobiles, getting "back to nature" in the early 20th century. The "astonishing increase in motor travel" to national parks described by Albright in 1917 had shaped the activities of the Park Service from its inception.[9] 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.[10]

---

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

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

[10]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.

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."[11] The conference resulted in the creation of a cooperative association of national, state, and local groups working together to coordinate "national policy" on recreational planning for all categories of public lands. But the creation of such policy remained far beyond the mandate of any federal bureau. Mather's encouragement of state park planning, like the formation of the National Conference on Outdoor Recreation, relied on the spirit of cooperation for effectiveness and on private charity for most funding. Individual planners, such as Benton MacKaye or Warren Manning, who advocated their own national recreational plans in the early 1920s, did so largely at their own expense. By 1933, no truly coordinated policy for national recreational planning yet existed. Individual state and federal land management agencies pursued park plans independently, without the benefits or drawbacks of a centralized planning authority.

By the late 1920s, however, several 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."[12] 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.[13]

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

---

[11]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.

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

[13]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.

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.[14]

Once the CCC camps were operational, however, it was soon evident that the recruits would be able to successfully undertake demanding construction and park development projects, in addition to their forestry activities. Trepidations regarding the quality of masonry and wood construction the young men would be capable of soon were assuaged, and the Park Service began to employ CCC labor in more ambitious park projects. There were a number of reasons why the CCC program was so successful. A number of "local experienced men," for example, were hired at each camp and provided vital guidance and training while laboring with the recruits. The construction projects, like the camps themselves, were also extremely well supervised. The silver lining of the Depression was soon revealed: the unemployed condition of thousands of professionals, scientists, and educators made them available and eager to participate in the CCC and other New Deal programs. Landscape architects, in particular, were hired to work in state and national park CCC camps, but many other unemployed professionals were hired as supervisors and foremen as well. In a CCC camp in Keosauqua, Iowa, landscape architect Kenneth F. Jones worked as a "landscape foreman," supervising work crews of about 20 boys apiece. Each crew, he reported, had a "working foreman" with professional training: a landscape architect, an architect, a civil engineer, an agricultural engineer, a forester, a forest pathologist, and an entomologist.[15] 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.[16] As Herbert Evison, the executive secretary of the National Conference on State Parks, later observed,

---

[14]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.

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

[16]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.

"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."[17]

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. 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 park master 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.[18] 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. Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr., had 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.[19]

---

[17]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.

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

[19]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 over the next eight years.

Herbert Evison 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, located at first in Denver.[20] 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.[21] 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.

---

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

[21]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.

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. The state park departments 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.[22]

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.[23]

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

---

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

[23]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.

Service at the time than were not.[24] 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.[25]

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

---

[24]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.

[25]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.

administer state park and national park CCC projects. Considering the size and scope of the state park operations, Director Cammerer decided in 1936 that Conrad Wirth should assume the administration of both state and national park CCC work, taking over chief forester John Coffman's responsibilities. All CCC planning (for national as well as state parks) would then be administered out of the CCC regional offices Wirth had set up.[26] 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.[27] 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. 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.[28] The 1936 act marked the high point of the CCC's promise, and therefore of the Park Service's role as a national recreational planning authority.[29]

The Park Service planned a plethora of new parks--and new kinds of parks--to meet outdoor recreational needs at every level. The national park system acquired some of its most extensive "wilderness" parks during the 1930s, including Everglades, Big Bend, Kings Canyon, and Olympic national parks. At the same time, Conrad Wirth's planners, 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, 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;

---

[26]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.

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

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

[29]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.

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.[30]

All of this diversification was enabled and symbolized by the full regionalization of the Park Service that was implemented in the summer of 1937. Four new regions were established under new regional directors who administered all Park Service activity (not just the CCC work funded through emergency appropriations). In the East, Carl P. Russell was named director of a region that extended from Maine to Mississippi. Russell, who had many years of experience as a park naturalist and an administrator with the Park Service, was headquartered in Richmond (Region I). Thomas J. Allen, who headed the Midwest region in Omaha (Region II), had begun his career with the Park Service as a ranger during the Mather era and had been superintendent of several parks. In the West, chief engineer Frank Kittredge, still in San Francisco, took on a new assignment as a regional director (Region IV). Cammerer wanted to avoid the appearance that the CCC organization had grown to engulf the old-line Park Service, and in all three cases he had chosen regional directors with longtime Park Service experience, not experience with Wirth's branch of planning. Wirth's CCC regional officers now became "associate regional directors" under the new appointees in their respective regions.[31] The exception was in the Southwest (Region III), where the architect Herbert Maier, who had been the CCC regional officer in the area since 1933, was kept on in the new organization as an "acting regional director." Maier's regional headquarters, at first located in Denver, had been moved to Oklahoma City, and now relocated to Santa Fe.

Maier was a native San Franciscan who, like Vint and numerous other Park Service designers, had graduated from Berkeley and then, following service in World War I, worked for various California architectural firms.[32] In the early 1920s, he began an association with Ansel F. Hall, who had been a key figure in the rapidly developing education programs fostered by the Park Service. Interpreting parks for visitors had been one of Park Service director Stephen Mather's strongest enthusiasms, and in 1923 he asked Ansel Hall, then the park naturalist at Yosemite, to oversee the development of interpretive programs in all the parks.[33]

---

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

[31]Wirth, Parks, Politics, and the People, 128; Unrau and Williss, Expansion of the Park Service in the 1930s, 259-265.

[32]"Herbert Maier," Mather Collection, Entry 135, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[33]Harold C. Bryant and Wallace W. Atwood, Research and Education in the National Parks (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1936), 48-50; C. Frank Brockman, "Park Naturalists and the Evolution of National Park Service Interpretation Through World War II," Journal of Forest History 22, no. 1 (January 1978),

Ansel Hall and Herbert Maier may well have known one another since college days; in any case Hall, who graduated from Berkeley with a degree in forestry in 1917, had asked the architect to provide illustrations for his Handbook of Yosemite National Park in 1921.[34] In 1922, he persuaded Maier to provide sketches (at no charge) for a proposed new museum building at Yosemite. The Yosemite museum had been a special cause for Hall; as a park ranger he had personally established the park's first museum in 1921 by converting an artist's studio in the old village. In his efforts to raise private funds for a new museum, Hall appealed to Chauncey J. Hamlin, a Buffalo philanthropist who in 1923 became the president of the American Association of Museums. Hamlin, who had been impressed by Hall's work during his visits to Yosemite, in turn secured funds for a new museum through the Laura Spelman

Rockefeller Memorial. Hall was placed in charge of the Yosemite museum project, and he immediately hired Herbert Maier to design the new museum building, which was completed in 1925.[35]

Maier's Yosemite museum was one of the first buildings specifically dedicated to an educational function built in a national park.[36] The young architect moved cautiously, however, designing a simple rectangular building that Thomas Vint helped to site on the plaza of the new Yosemite Village. Rough granite boulders veneered the concrete of the lower level, and darkly stained shakes covered the second story; the building nicely complemented Myron Hunt's nearby administration building. Chauncey Hamlin must have been pleased, because at his request the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial funded an expanded program of park museum construction, and in 1926 Herbert Maier moved to Washington, DC, to design and administer the construction of two more model museum projects for the American Association of Museums.[37]

Maier's next two museum buildings were as different from one another as they were from the Yosemite museum. On the south rim of the Grand Canyon, Maier designed the Yavapai Point observation station, which opened in 1928. Perhaps because the station was to be sited on the very edge of the rim (about two miles east of Grand Canyon Village) Maier again responded to the work of a great park architect whose work had preceded his, in this case Mary E. J. Colter. Like Colter's Lookout Studio and Hermit's Rest also on the south rim, Maier's Yavapai museum was cloaked in native stone. Like Colter, Maier also referred to Native American

---

24-43.

[34]Maier complied with the request for chapter heading illustrations of park scenes. Ansel F. Hall, ed., Handbook of Yosemite National Park (New York: Knickerbocker Press, 1921).

[35]Ralph H. Lewis, Museum Curatorship in the National Park Service, 1904-1982 (Washington, DC: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1993), 7-8, 31-34.

[36]The roughly contemporary Mesa Verde museum was built in the Pueblo style and was also paid for by the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial. John D. Rockefeller, Jr.'s interest in Mesa Verde had initiated the involvement of that charitable foundation in park museum construction. The Mesa Verde museum, which is part of the Mesa Verde National Historic Landmark District, was remodeled and expanded in the 1930s. Harrison, Architecture in the Parks, 214-215.

[37]Lewis, Museum Curatorship, 38.

building traditions in architectural details. Amorphous in plan, the building was set as low and as deep in the canyon rim as possible; heavy foundation plantings camouflaged what would otherwise be a prominent location. Maier explained that the elevation was "designed to conform as nearly as possible to the vertical front of the cliff and the horizontal line of the rim."[38] The building frankly acknowledged the architectural standards Colter had set for "rim zone" development.

In the other museum he designed at this time, however, Maier initiated what would become his own contributions to national and state park architecture. His Bear Mountain museum, built for the Bear Mountain section of the Palisades Interstate Park, became what historian Ralph H. Lewis describes as "the prototype of trailside museums."[39] Maier's architecture, and the displays of local geological and historical significance contained within, emphasized the role of the park museum as it was being defined by Maier and by park educators such as Ansel Hall: to encourage visitors "to consider the park itself as the museum."[40]

The potential for park museum architecture suggested at Bear Mountain came to fruition at Yellowstone. In 1928 the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial again responded to the request of the American Association of Museums, this time to fund a series of museums in the country's largest national park. Initial plans for a centralized facility were soon abandoned in favor of a decentralized scheme of trailside museums (in this case roadside would be more accurate) designed by Maier and sited at strategic points along the Grand Loop road system. The first, at Old Faithful, was open already in 1928; three others followed, at Madison Junction (1929), the Norris Geyser Basin (1929), and on Yellowstone Lake near the Fishing Bridge (1931). All the museums featured large terraces and nearby amphitheaters that encouraged outdoor extensions of museum activities.[41] At Yellowstone, the park museum became a park museum system; the main trailside museums were to be supplemented by a series of smaller exhibit panels, called "nature shrines," that interpreted individual features at roadside overlooks.[42] Heavy projecting eaves and massive shakes typically completed these unique visions of park architecture that programmatically, visually, and structurally, became inseparable from the function of trailside park interpretation.

After 1933, as a CCC regional officer, Maier helped determine the character and quality of state park architecture not only in the Southwest, but also in other regions where park architects emulated the work Maier administered in Region III. This was because of his

---

[38]Herbert Maier to Thomas Vint, July 28, 1927, Records of the Field Headquarters in San Francisco, Entry 29, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[39]Lewis, Museum Curatorship, 39.

[40]Lewis, Museum Curatorship, 38-39, 48.

[41]The original site development around the Old Faithful, Norris, and Madison museums has been significantly altered. At Fishing Bridge, however, Maier's original amphitheater and naturalist's residence, as well as the slightly later parking lot, all have been retained and together are a unique example of trailside museum site planning of the period.

[42]The Obsidian Cliff Nature Shrine (1931) at Yellowstone was the first (and remains the best) example of such a roadside display. In this case the adjacent road, parking area, and planted island are also well preserved.

unofficial role as the chief architect of Conrad Wirth's planning division at the park Service. As Wirth undertook the massive state park design initiative in 1933, no challenge loomed more ominously than that of assuring consistently high standards in the selection and development of state parks. In a rapidly organized program of breathtaking scope, graft, political patronage, and simple incompetence all threatened to undermine the quality of state park projects. Thomas Vint and his seasoned landscape division, overwhelmed with the simultaneous expansion of the national park system, were in no position to assist overseeing the state park effort as well.

Early in the summer of 1933, Wirth began issuing "State Park Bulletins" that included instructions for the district officers appointed that May. In the first bulletin, he instructed his officers to submit detailed weekly reports, covering all aspects of their work, including details on the progress of all construction activities. The district officers in turn relied on their district inspectors, who ceaselessly roamed from one construction site to the next making detailed reports illustrated with photographs. In his first weekly report to Wirth that July, Herbert Maier, the district officer for Region III, included photographs and descriptions of "the progress of conservation projects and of the contacts made by the district officer and his inspectors" up to that point. But Maier also indicated he planned to report on "the administrative problems of the various parks, their park policies, the scenic and scientific calibre of each area, historical values, relation to nearby urban centers, etc."[43] All aspects of park selection, planning, development, and to some degree management were overseen by the Park Service district officers, their inspectors, and Conrad Wirth and his staff in Washington.

But assuring consistent policies and standards nationwide required more than vigilance and organization. Almost all of the hundreds of planners engaged in state park work needed some sort of introduction to Park Service landscape architectural planning. The atelier system Vint had instituted to train new personnel in San Francisco was out of the question. Wirth realized that he immediately needed some kind of textbook, or at least an architectural patternbook, that could be distributed to the district offices and local park authorities. In 1933 he turned to Dorothy Waugh, daughter of Frank Waugh, who was a landscape architect and accomplished illustrator with a particular interest in national park work. Waugh, apparently the only woman landscape architect to find work with the Park Service at this time, collected plans and elevations of park structures from a wide range of state and local park commissions and illustrated them in a standard format for reproduction and distribution to Park Service planners and architects in 1934.[44]

Wirth also exploited the fact that one of his district officers, Herbert Maier, was perhaps the most accomplished park architect of the day. By 1934, Maier had assembled his own patternbook, consisting largely of photographs of the park museum buildings he had designed for Bear Mountain, Yosemite, Grand Canyon, and Yellowstone. Maier also included views of

---

[43]Herbert Maier, "Weekly Report, July 1 1933," Reports of District Officers and Inspectors Concerning State Park Emergency Conservation Work, 1933-35, Entry 39, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[44]The original artwork for Dorothy Waugh's "Portfolio of Park Structures and Facilities" is conserved at the National Archives (Manuscripts and Illustrations for Publications Concerning Emergency Conservation Work, 1933-38, Entry 43, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC). See also: Wirth, Parks, Politics, and the People, 204; McClelland, Presenting Nature, 253-255.

some of the early park projects being completed in his region, such as Wintersmith Metropolitan Park and Turner Falls State Park (Oklahoma) and Boulder Mountain State Park (Colorado). The architect did not restrict his examples to park buildings, but also included photographs of Trail Ridge Road in Rocky Mountain National Park, showing details of crenelated guardwall construction and properly graded roadsides and swales. Examples of trailside shelters, footbridges, culverts, museums, and amphitheaters were all featured. Maier's remarks and observations on park architecture, site planning, and road design, together with the photographs of actual construction, turned out to be a powerful tool for quickly introducing new state park planners to the basics of Park Service landscape architectural design.

The commentary Maier wrote for the handbooks also set a tone and vocabulary for discussing state park design. Commenting on his Norris Geyser Basin museum at Yellowstone, he advised that the "heavy scale" was suitable only in "mountainous areas where forests abound." In less mountainous areas, the same type of construction should be "lighter in scale," and presumably employ smaller logs and boulders and less exaggerated proportions. But every effort needed to be made to "steer clear of the `twig' type of architecture which flourishes under the name of 'rustic.'"[45] Again and again Maier explained--usually using his own work as examples--that "the use of native materials, such as rocks, logs, and shakes causes the building to blend with, and become part of, its surroundings." Warm brown and driftwood gray were preferred stain colors, with window frames and other details painted in lighter tones. The desired effect of building and surrounding site work was described repeatedly as "natural" and "harmonious." In "wilderness areas," all building was to avoid "sharp right angles and rigid straight lines," whether the construction was a dam spillway, a guardwall, or a trailside museum.

Maier of course had been an important figure in national park architecture since the 1920s; his architectural style in fact had been tailored to the programmatic and aesthetic requirements of national park interpretation and planning. Maier's influence was now spread throughout Wirth's CCC state park program, and the verbal and formal vocabulary of "rustic" architecture that "blended" with its surroundings became standard for state park planning.[46]

Early in 1935, Maier's position as an unofficial chief architect for the state park effort was made clear at a conference Wirth organized in Washington to assembled state park officials from all over the country. Although Wirth's branch of plans had already funnelled $15 million into state parks during the previous two years, this was the first time the local park authorities had been assembled as a group. The Park Service had to avoid the appearance of dictating park planning decisions to local governments, and Wirth's careful tone reassured the group that by "cooperation" with state park departments, the Park Service meant exactly that. "We are going to try to give you our ideas," he confessed, but more importantly, "we want to know what you know; we want to absorb as much information as we can from the field; and in order to perfect our organization, we want to work out our procedures and cut down some of them."

---

[45]Herbert Maier, "Inspector's Photographic Handbook," n.d. [1935], Photographs of Engineering Activities, Entry 127, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[46]Herbert Maier, "Inspector's Photographic Handbook," n.d. [1935], Photographs of Engineering Activities, Entry 127, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC. See also: McClelland, Presenting Nature, 234-243.

On the subject of "Park Structures," Herbert Maier addressed the group not as a regional officer, but as a national authority on park architecture.

The architect had learned well through his years of experience with landscape architects Daniel Hull, Thomas Vint, and other Park Service officials. He noted that developing scenic areas as state parks in order to "conserve" them at first appeared to be an "anomaly," since park development could never "`improve' the picture" presented by outstanding scenery. "But on further investigation," he continued, "such areas are, on account of their superior natural make-up, subjected by trespassing by vacationists, squatters, picnickers and hikers . . . as a result of which a continuous fire hazard exists, sanitation considerations are sometimes unhealthful, and the uncontrolled use of the areas is unfavorable to wildlife conservation." Preserving scenic areas as parks, he observed, required the introduction of "a moderate number of roads, trails, picnic units and various concession buildings . . . in order that the original purpose of the area could be attained by controlling the circulation and activity of the visitors."[47]

Maier also took the opportunity offered by the 1935 conference to further describe and promulgate his design guidelines for park architecture. Most of his descriptions and examples came directly out of the photographic handbooks he had developed to assure consistent design in Region III. "In the treatment of exteriors," he repeated to the assembled state park officials, "the proper use of indigenous native materials is perhaps the happiest means of blending the structure with its surroundings, and this is what has largely resulted in the popular use of what is known as rustic architecture." Maier also noted that an extensive research project was underway in the Park Service to identify and document the "close to one hundred types of indigenous frontier construction" that were supposed to exist. The "tools of the frontiersman consisted usually only of an ax, a pick and a shovel, and a pair of hands," the architect suggested, "and this absence of precision tools resulted in a freehand architecture with an absence of rigidly straight lines . . . . We find that construction which is primitive in character blends most readily with primitive surroundings and is thereby less outstanding and has an intriguing craftsmanlike appearance."[48]

Maier's comments at the 1935 state park conference were the most thorough explication of "rustic" park architecture yet made. Maier had also already begun an important collaborative effort with another architect, Albert H. Good, who had moved from Ohio to Washington to assist in the state park CCC effort. Good was chosen essentially to replace Dorothy Waugh and assemble a comprehensive portfolio more along the lines of Maier's handbooks. Good was a talented draftsman, and had already designed the buildings for Virginia Kendall, an Akron metropolitan park.[49] The architect also had a gift for vivid, if overwrought, prose, and he and Maier collaborated on an "apologia" for park structures which they submitted to Harlean James, the executive secretary of the American Planning and Civic Association (as the

---

[47]Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Proceedings of the National Park Service Conference of State Park Authorities in the Auditorium of the Interior Building, Washington, DC, February 25, 1935, unpublished minutes (Washington, DC: Department of the Interior, Main Interior Library), 1, 79, 83.

[48]Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Proceedings of the National Park Service Conference of State Park Authorities, 85.

[49]McClelland, Presenting Nature, 256-262.

American Civic Association was now known), who published it that year. The ideas were those Maier had already expressed; the belletristic excess can be attributed to Good. "Lamentable is the fact," the authors began, "that during the six days given over to Creation, picnic tables and outdoor fireplaces, footbridges and many other of man's requirements, even in natural surroundings, were negligently and entirely overlooked . . . . Man, confronted with this no less than awesome task of assuming to supply these odds and ends undone when the whistle blew on Creation, may well conclude, pending achievements of greater skill and finesse, that only the most persistent demands for a facility shall trap him into playing the jester in Nature's unspoiled places." Maier and Good advised, as American landscape park designers had since the 1850s, that buildings be designed as subordinate elements in perceived landscape scenes, and that necessary facilities be kept to a minimum: "Since the primary purpose of setting aside these areas is to conserve them as nearly as possible in their natural state, every structure, no matter how necessary, can only be regarded as an intruder."[50]

Good also drew plans, elevations, and sections to go with the photographs to produce an expanded portfolio of park architecture which was published later in 1935 as Park Structures and Facilities. Dorothy Waugh's involvement in the project had not ended, however, since she was part of the committee that selected the examples to be included in the 1935 volume. The other members of the committee were Thomas Vint, Herbert Maier, engineer Oliver G. Taylor, Midwestern regional director Paul Brown, and landscape architect Norman Newton. The project was paid for with state park CCC funds and so was overseen by Conrad Wirth. The volume included the "apologia" for park structures, further edited by Good. The publication made enormous progress towards the standardization of park architecture, not only in state and national parks, but in some municipal parks as well. The examples chosen by the committee (like those chosen by Waugh earlier for her "Portfolio") included county, state, and national park structures, often all on the same page. What drew the examples together was that they all came from what Good described ambiguously as "natural parks," which he distinguished from "naturalistic or formalized city parks." Structures from municipal and other local parks could be included, however, if "their expression would be equally at home in a completely natural environment."[51]

Maier and Good reinforced, in their own way, the appropriateness of naturalistic construction details in large parks and scenic reservations. If contemporary architectural styles (such as California Arts and Crafts and bungalow architecture) influenced the architects in specific designs, the choice of those stylistic precedents was determined by premises of American landscape park design and planning that had been established at least since the 1880s. Since that time, necessary construction in large scenic reservations had preferably been both minimized and of "rustic" inspiration. Good's other recommendations for suitably "rustic" architectural design were directly drawn from the planning policies of Park Service landscape architects Daniel Hull and Thomas Vint. Good advised, for example: "Every structural undertaking in a natural park is only part of a whole. The individual building or facility must bow before the broad park plan, which . . . determines the size, character, location and use of

---

[50]Herbert Maier and Albert H. Good, "Structures in State Parks--An Apologia," in American Planning and Civic Annual, Harlean James, ed. (Washington, DC: American Planning and Civic Association, 1935), 171-175.

[51]Albert H. Good, ed., Park Structures and Facilities (Washington, DC: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1935), 2, 7.

each and every structure . . . . The structures necessary in a park are naturally less obtrusive if they are reasonably unified by a use of one style of architecture."[52]

Good also described specific architectural features and qualities, such as "native" materials, muted colors, and low silhouettes, that created "the desirable and appropriately rugged, handcrafted character of park structures." By 1935, architectural construction for "natural" parks (which could be any large park, whether under national, state, or local jurisdictions) quickly moved towards a common standard of "rustic" construction. That standard was being set by hundreds of Park Service designers, and Good's catalog of their work further consolidated their planning and design activities nationwide. But Park Service Rustic architecture, which Good later described simply as a style that "achieves sympathy with natural surroundings and with the past," adapted constantly to its landscape context; if rigorously maintained in every state park that the Park Service planned, the style nevertheless yielded a great diversity of individual structures. In 1935, Good warned against using his publication as a patternbook. "If an existing structure is so admired that it persuades duplication," he explained, "careful analysis will inevitably demonstrate that admiration springs from a nice perfection of the subject within one circumstantial pattern. As that pattern changes so must the structure change."[53] Park Service architects attempted to conform to regional traditions and regional landscape character in each case. Huge boulders and logs were only appropriate to landscapes of rugged terrain clothed in ancient forests; traditional adobe construction appeared in desert parks, while milled lumber and more conventional outlines were typical in the East. Native American and "pioneer" construction techniques (real or imagined) provided inspiration everywhere.

The impressive scope of Park Service planning under Conrad Wirth increased further after the Park, Parkway and Recreational-Area Study Act was passed in 1936. As part of the federal government, the Park Service had been theoretically restrained from becoming too directly involved in determining individual state park plans. As Herbert Evison put it, "the relationship between the States and the Service had been entirely unofficial."[54] The 1936 act validated the "cooperation" between both levels of government and legitimized the Park Service's official role as a state park planner. The act also justified greater resources to complete the national recreational plan. One of many results from this increased activity was an expanded portfolio of park structures and facilities, which was published in three volumes in 1938. Albert Good still served as editor and compiler, but the new work, Park and Recreation Structures, attempted to provide a more comprehensive introduction to Park Service architecture and planning. The first two volumes (introduced again by another version of the "apologia" for park structures) were based on the categories and examples of the 1935 Park Structures and Facilities, catalog. The first volume, entitled "Administration and Basic Service Facilities," included an expanded number of illustrations of park entrance structures, administration buildings, maintenance facilities, fire lookouts, trail and vehicular bridges, culverts, drinking

---

[52]Good, ed., Park Structures and Facilities, 6.

[53]Albert H. Good, Park and Recreation Structures 3 vols. (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1938), vol. 1, p. 5; Good, ed., Park Structures and Facilities, 8. Park and Recreation Structures was reprinted by Graybooks (Boulder, Colorado) in 1990.

[54]Evison, "The Civilian Conservation Corps in State Parks," 185.

fountains, and comfort stations. The second volume, "Recreational and Cultural Facilities," featured picnic tables and fireplaces, refectories and concession buildings, trailside shelters, dams and bathhouses, museum and nature shrines, outdoor amphitheaters, and examples of "historical preservations."

Good again embellished his dimensioned drawings and collected photographs with memorable commentary. Texas state parks, in the heart of Herbert Maier's Region III, took some good natured ribbing. Good described a somewhat whimsical administration building at Longhorn Cavern as "an extraordinary creation for a park setting, doubtless transported here by Magic Carpet." At Palmetto State Park, a particularly rugged refectory with a palmetto thatched roof was "no uninspired rehash of a forerunning park building . . . but probably commemorative of some circuitous route between the Congo and the Emerald Isle that must have once passed through Texas." In other comments, Good reiterated the basic requirements of Park Service rustic architecture. The museum building at Lake Guernsey State Park in Wyoming, for example, adhered to "many of the principles proclaimed for a widely appropriate park architecture--low structure, predominantly horizontal lines and coursing of masonry, and the featuring of few openings by the contrasts of plain, sweeping surfaces." The aggregate effect of the museum's low, rugged outline, rusticated masonry, and heavy shake roofs, Good suggested, was "that intangible factor--personality."[55]

The principles of appropriately "rustic" architectural design, however, were more easily illustrated and distributed than those of Park Service landscape architectural planning. Albert Good's few, tentative sketches of site plans did not even begin to instruct state park planners in the basic procedures of Park Service master planning. Good's publications only cataloged, as their titles made clear, exemplary park structures. The Park Service landscape architects and planners designing state parks received their education in overall park planning through the direct supervision and review of their plans by Wirth and his regional representatives. As Herbert Evison described the arrangements, the "first requirement for any park work undertaken," was "a general development plan." The general plans received preliminary approval from the regional directors, who with their roving inspectors "mostly ran the show." Washington exercised considerable direct authority as well, since "major policies" as well as all budgets and construction contracts were "valid only when approved in Washington." Personnel appointments (with minor exceptions) were also made at the Department of the Interior.[56]

In addition to setting broad planning policies for state park plans, the Park Service also made very specific demands regarding master plans for individual parks. Isabelle F. Story, who had been in charge of public information for the Park Service since the Mather era, in 1933 wrote a brochure in order to explain the role of the Park Service in the CCC program. In her explanation of "what the landscape architects and engineers do," Story observed that "the landscape process begins with selecting locations which do not tear up the landscape or obtrude into important views . . . . When a general scheme of development has been arrived at, a so-called `master plan' is prepared by the landscape architects on which is charted an outline

---

[55]Good, Park and Recreation Structures, 84, 111, 181.

[56]Evison, "The Civilian Conservation Corps in State Parks," 182-183.

of all future construction work. Using this master plan as a guide, designs are then worked out for the individual items, such as roads, buildings, parking areas, bridges, trails, and numerous miscellaneous projects." Story quoted an anonymous landscape architect who suggested that "the reverse of the famous principle of the ostrich generally is followed . . . roads, trails, and buildings all should provide a maximum of scenic view, at the same time being as inconspicuous as possible themselves."[57] The process was essentially the same for state parks. In one of his state park program brochures, Wirth explained his priorities for state park development: "The object is first to conserve and protect the entire area . . . then to develop only necessary facilities for the enjoyment of each park feature without interfering with the use of other features. The cardinal principle governing all of this is that park areas are to be kept as natural as possible." Of course in state parks, "those whose fancy calls for more active recreation" were more liberally provided for. "The CCC has provided artificial lakes . . . [with] beaches, bathhouses, and docks for boating. All state parks have their picnic groves which have been equipped with tables and benches, fireplaces, and water and sanitary facilities. Usually a picnic area has a shelter for retreat from sudden showers. Nearby are parking areas . . . [and] in many regions, state parks offer thrilling winter sports." In addition roads, guard rails, retaining walls, and bridges were built, stream and erosion control projects were undertaken, and public forests were aggressively managed through insect and fire control as well as reforestation.[58]

The master plans that described all of the work for individual state parks were prepared in the field by resident landscape architects, architects, and engineers, working with local park managers. Once the Park Service regional inspector and the local park authority agreed on a general outline for a particular park, the plan was sent to the regional director for review. The landscape architects and other technical staff in the regional office assured that the master plans "solved planning problems on the basis of general information and planning methods and practices which have been developed in the regional office and which . . . conform to National Park Service policies and standards." Once the regional director and the local park authority were in agreement on a master plan, it was sent to Washington for further review and final approval.[59] Exemplary master plans were distributed to the states and regions, not in Good's architectural catalogs, but in Wirth's Yearbooks of "park and recreation progress," separate annual reports on the activities of the branch of planning that Wirth began publishing in 1938.[60]

Once the New Deal gained momentum after 1933, the Park Service CCC state park program seized the initiative of the American park movement. By 1939, Wirth reported that his

---

[57]Isabelle F. Story, The National Parks and Emergency Conservation (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1933), 15-16.

[58]Department of the Interior, National Park Service, The CCC and Its Contribution, 9-13.

[59]Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1937 Yearbook: Park and Recreation Progress (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1938), 1-3.

[60]The Yearbooks reported on some national park planning projects as well as on the progress of the Park, Parkway and Recreational-Area Study. The first volume, covering the year 1937, was published in 1938. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Yearbook: Park and Recreation Progress (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1938-42).

program had encouraged state governments to acquire over one million acres of new parkland since 1933.[61] Among the state parks designed between 1933 and 1942 (the years the CCC program remained active) hundreds of examples continue to serve the people of virtually every state and territory of the United States. Fewer, however, retain perfect or near perfect integrity to the period of their construction. In many cases, pressures to expand recreational and other facilities, as Wirth feared, compromised the preservation of scenery and natural resources. In recent decades, state legislatures, strapped for cash to fund the operation of park systems, have come to see their Depression-era parks not as reservations, but as potential resort sites that, when further developed with golf courses, conference centers, or other facilities, not only pay for their own operation, but turn a profit. All that is lost in the bargain are the fundamental aspirations originally advanced for state parks: goals, like scenic preservation, that profoundly differ from the purposes of any private resort.

There are still numerous examples, however, of state parks of the period with extraordinary physical integrity. These come in all sizes and types, from simple "waysides" along state highways, to major scenic reservations of thousands of acres. Almost every state park system developed during the 1930s had one or two parks on which extra attention was lavished. These flagships of the state systems, although not officially designated as such, clearly served as showplaces of the finest scenic, recreational, and design standards. One such park was Bastrop State Park, outside Austin, Texas, in the heart of Herbert Maier's CCC Region III.

Up until 1923, Texas had only five, small state parks that principally were battlefields and other historic sites. Until that time these reservations had received little funding from officials or attention from the public. That year, however, Governor Pat M. Neff planned a major expansion of the state park system, which he hoped to achieve primarily through gifts of land to the state. The Texas State Parks Board was created, headed by D. E. Colp, and by 1926 the board had received 51 gifts of land (totalling 30,000 acres), which were awaiting formal acceptance and funding by the state legislature. Governor Neff's motivation for developing a system of state scenic reservations was typical of many state park campaigns of the 1920s. Hoping to provide places where "the people of Texas . . . may go and forget the anxieties, the strife, and the vexations of life's daily business grind," he also hoped to promote automotive tourism in the state, which had become a major economic factor in Texas, as it had elsewhere.[62] Despite Governor Neff's important success in acquiring state parkland, funds to develop and manage parks remained difficult to pry from cautious legislators. As a result, a system of modern and accessible state parks for Texas remained more a desired goal than a reality.

The situation of course changed dramatically in 1933. Hard hit by the Depression and soon the Dust Bowl, Texas needed and got a high concentration of CCC camps. Up to 14,000 recruits were at work in the state in 1935 building state parks, managing state forests, and preventing soil erosion. Texas also had a state park board that for years had nurtured plans for parks, without being able to coax appropriations out of state legislators. D. E. Colp, in particular, had

---

[61]Conrad L. Wirth, "Federal Aid for State Parks--The NPS," in American Planning and Civic Annual, Harlean James, ed. (Washington, DC: The American Planning and Civic Association, 1939), 168-173.

[62]Quoted in 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), 236-237.

been laying plans for state parks for 10 years.[63] The subsequent results of CCC state park construction in Texas were dramatic. Throughout the state, up to 27 CCC camps of 200 recruits apiece built 31 state parks.[64] The CCC-era parks of Texas today make up the heart of the state park system, as they do in many states, particularly in the South and the Midwest. Few states, however, have as extensive a system of CCC parks with such a high degree of integrity.

Another remarkable feature of the Texas state parks of the period is their high degree of artistic accomplishment. This can be attributed in large part, as already suggested, to the fact that Herbert Maier oversaw all design and construction in the region from his headquarters in Oklahoma City. Maier also assembled a particularly capable professional staff. Throughout the 1930s, Maier's chief regional inspector was a landscape architect from Minnesota named George L. Nason. Nason had studied engineering at the University of Minnesota and received his Master's in Landscape Architecture from Harvard in 1914. In 1924 he was appointed superintendent of parks for St. Paul, Minnesota, just across the river from the imposing Theodore Wirth (Conrad's father), the famous Minneapolis parks superintendent.

The position of the Park Service regional inspector was critical to the Park Service collaboration with local park authorities. From Washington, it would be impossible for Conrad Wirth and his associates to have much influence on individual state park projects thousands of miles away. Even from the rapidly established Park Service regional offices, maintaining a presence in local state park design offices and at specific construction sites demanded that trustworthy and capable inspectors remain almost constantly on the road, making detailed reports back to the regional officer, who in turn could keep Washington apprised of how individual projects were faring. George Nason proved a valuable collaborator for Maier, and the regional director gave his chief inspector considerable discretion regarding his activities and itineraries. It also was an indication of the importance of the Texas state parks--and Bastrop in particular--that Nason's base of operations was in Austin.[65]

According to historian James Wright Steely, D. E. Colp, George Nason, and Herbert Maier were the "guiding personalities behind the creation and appearance of Texas parks of the 1930s."[66] The work in Texas state parks generally exemplified the goals set by Conrad Wirth and the Park Service for site planning and architectural design; but the scope of the CCC program in Texas, combined with the individual attention of Maier, the contributions of his chief inspector, Nason, and the long cherished plans of the park board chairman, Colp, made Texas a particularly successful situation. Many of the photographs and plans published in Albert Good's portfolios of park structures, for example, depicted the work going on in Herbert

---

[63]James Wright Steely, The Civilian Conservation Corps in Texas State Parks (Austin: Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 1986), 4-5.

[64]James Wright Steely, "Rustic Style in Depression Texas: Federal Architecture in the State Parks, 1933-1941" (Master's Thesis, University of Texas at Austin, 1985), 12-13.

[65]Steely, "Rustic Style in Depression Texas," 18-20.

[66]Steely, The Civilian Conservation Corps, 8.

Maier's Region III; of those, many were examples of the work being done for Texas state parks.

Of the 31 state park projects undertaken in that state, Bastrop clearly received an extra degree of attention regarding planning and design. There were many reasons for this, involving possibly its proximity to the state capital in Austin, but probably having more to do with the great opportunity offered by the natural beauty of the area. The "Lost Pines" region around the town of Bastrop had been suggested as a state park site as early as 1931, but had a much longer history as a well known scenic area. The name of this isolated forest refers to the fact that, although extensive pine forests exist 80 to 100 miles to the east, the pine forest around Bastrop is an anomaly in the generally drier and less wooded hill country of central Texas. The park terrain consists of broken ground with bluffs just over 500 feet in elevation. Several streams, notably the Copperas Creek, drain the heavily wooded area. Loblolly pines predominate, but various species of oaks and live oaks, as well as mesquite and other understory trees and shrubs, are also well represented.

D. E. Colp identified the area as one of great natural beauty and unfulfilled promise as a public resort. The land was part of a large tract that the town of Bastrop sold in 1910, and which then had been advertised as a large subdivision called the "Bastrop Town Tract." Since the developers hoped to attract well-to-do buyers to 10-acre, wooded lots, they formed a club, the Bastrop Country Club, which developed the site by creating a lake along the Copperas Creek. By 1915, the lake was full, was stocked with fish, and had become a popular scenic attraction in the area. Although the country club and the ambitious subdivision around it apparently failed to achieve sustained success in the 1920s, the developers had succeeded in establishing the scenic and recreational potential of the Lost Pines around Bastrop. Colp, for one, had taken notice.[67]

The first planners to consider the development of the site as a state park, then, were attracted by the pine forest itself, the slightly rugged terrain that offered scenic vistas, and the existing use of the area as a resort both by "country club" members and others. The initial planning and design work for the park took place in a hastily organized "central design office" set up by the Park Service in Austin in 1933. The Bastrop area was immediately identified as a highly desirable location for CCC state park development. As was the case in many states, the prospect of bringing in CCC camps and other federal funds encouraged the Texas legislature to cooperate by acquiring parkland. By the summer of 1933, the land for Bastrop State Park was being acquired, and in the fall of 1933, CCC company 1805 arrived at the promising site, even before its acquisition had been completed. They were joined that January by Company 1811.[68]

By 1934, George Nason and D. E. Colp had recruited a University of Texas graduate named Arthur Fehr to become the park architect and construction supervisor for Bastrop State Park. At 30 years old, Fehr had been practicing for nine years, both in New York City and in San Antonio. He had maintained a close relationship with his professor at Texas, Samuel Edward Gideon, an early champion of historic and regional Texas architecture. Gideon's influence on

---

[67]Ralph Edward Newlan, "Bastrop State Park: Cultural Resources Survey Report," unpublished report (Austin, Texas: Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 1993), 7-10.

[68]Newlan, "Bastrop State Park," 10.

Fehr, and Fehr's own work in historic preservation at San Antonio, would prove to be important influences on the architectural designs Fehr completed for Bastrop State Park between 1934 and 1937.[69] Fehr was soon joined at Bastrop by a landscape architect, Norfleet Bone, whose previous experience had mostly been with the military, in particular in the design of airfields.[70]

The progress of work at Bastrop is particularly well documented, as is the case for many CCC parks, through the many weekly and monthly reports filed by park managers, regional inspectors, and regional officers. Many of these reports are conserved by the National Archives in Washington, DC. In the case of Bastrop, Arthur Fehr's own "daybooks" are also preserved at the Texas Historical Commission in Austin. Early in 1934, the new superintendent at Bastrop, A. R. Henry, speaking on behalf of the CCC camp recruits and staff, reported that "shortly after we arrived to this park, we became aware that here was an opportunity that may never occur again . . . . This Park has great possibilities." Henry noted that the site included a nucleus of about 460 acres of "virgin pine" together with a far larger area of cutover forest, "which if properly handled will in five years be a thing of beauty, and in years to come will be a beautiful pine forest."[71]

Work at the site began immediately in 1933, implying that the original master plans, and also the architectural plans for the refectory building and entrance gate, had been drawn up and approved by Maier in Oklahoma City almost immediately. Since park architect Arthur Fehr only arrived the following January, the initial design work probably was done in the regional office by members of Maier's immediate staff, or in the Austin office of the State Parks Board. The standard procedure for submitting park plans for approval was later described at the first state-wide conference of Park Service and Texas State Parks Board officials held at Davis Mountains and Big Bend state park in 1934. By that time, the procedure called for all plans to be submitted to the state office, where the originals would be kept. Prints were forwarded from there to Herbert Maier, who requested necessary changes and secured approval from Washington. All plans therefore were technically in the hands of the State Parks Board, but no work proceeded without the approval of Park Service officials.[72]

Initial work at Bastrop in 1933 concentrated on establishing the CCC camp, rough grading of the entrance road, and getting underway on the refectory building. The refectory was initiated entirely by the CCC boys, who quarried and logged the building material locally, and were responsible, according to Henry, for "all the work from the foundation to the roof." The superintendent also described some of the landscape development underway. "The entire idea of planting on this project," he asserted, "is to use the material we have on hand." He counted

---

[69]Steely, "Rustic Style in Depression Texas," 31, 79.

[70]Newlan, "Bastrop State Park," 10.

[71]A. R. Henry, "Report Period Ending March 31, 1934," Entry 41, Project Reports on CCC Projects, Texas, Record Group 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[72]"National Park Service--Texas State Parks Board, Superintendents' Conference, Davis Mountains State Park and Big Bend State Park, Sept. 1-3, 1934," Entry 37, State Park File, Texas, Record Group 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

50 species of native shrubs and trees that could be (and were) transplanted from nearby to achieve ornamental effects.[73]

One of Maier's inspectors, Harry L. Dunham, confirmed the proud assertions of Superintendent Henry. By the spring of 1934, the entrance gate was virtually complete and "an excellent piece of work." The main park loop road had been graded to 75 percent of its length, and "of excellent construction." Work on the refectory was "especially commendable," and landscape work had been "prosecuted vigorously." The small ornamental lake near the park entrance (Lake Mina) was 60 percent complete, and hundreds of "youpon and other plants" had been moved into the park area. By the end of the summer, Donald C. Obert, one of Maier's roving inspectors, reported that the CCC crews at Bastrop were "making a good showing, as usual," under landscape foreman Hirsh and later landscape architect Norfleet Bone. In 1935, George Nason himself observed that Bastrop was "one of the continually rather successful camps," and was going to be "one of the most successful of the Texas state parks."[74]

The work at Bastrop had, in fact, attracted too much attention. That July, local labor unions had demonstrated and stopped the construction work on the refectory building. Inspector Obert, in particular, was dismayed, noting that the CCC boys had shown great industry and enthusiasm, and were now idled and discouraged. The project was only stalled temporarily, however, and in the meantime a number of other projects were underway. Truck trails and foot trails, in addition to the automotive loop road, were being surveyed, graded, and surfaced. The park boundaries were fenced in "dog-proof" fencing. Trees were removed from around the existing lake on the Copperas Creek, and a new dam was built, enlarging what was the major water feature of the plan to 32 acres. By the fall of 1934, Superintendent Henry reported that the small lake and ornamental bridge near the entrance were completed, although he criticized it as more an "`ESTATE' type than . . . a piece of National Park Service development." Henry also reported that transplanted trees suffered a less than 15 percent mortality rate.[75]

In addition, since Arthur Fehr's arrival in the park work had begun on a group of tourist cabins sited on a bluff on the western shore of the enlarged lake. By the spring of 1935, four of these remarkable "cottages" had been completed by CCC recruits working with "local experienced men," or skilled labor hired to instruct the crews on the job. Fehr was particularly skilled in the design of furniture, and the CCC furniture shop became the most important facility of its type in Texas. For the cabin interiors, skilled cabinet makers were employed by the state as

---

[73]A. R. Henry, "Report Period Ending March 31, 1934," Entry 41, Project Reports on CCC Projects, Texas, Record Group 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[74]Harry L. Dunham, "Inspector's Report, April 16 to 30, 1934"; Donald C. Obert, "Inspector's Report, August 15 to August 31, 1934," Entry 39, Reports of District Officers and Inspectors; George Nason, "Semi-Monthly Regional Report, March 1935," Entry 40, Reports of Regional Officers and Inspectors, Texas, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[75]A. R. Henry, "Detailed Report of Work Done at Bastrop State Park, April 1 to September 30, 1934," Entry 41, Project Reports on CCC Projects, Texas, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

well.[76] The cabins, which Fehr claimed were inspired by regional pioneer architecture, were described as "Pioneer Village." The first five of this group, built of local sandstone in heavily battered, randomly laid courses, were finished by the summer of 1935. The next group of six were planned to employ more wood framing and sandstone veneer, because of the relatively high cost of the initial buildings. Completed by the end of the year, the wooden cabins as well were deemed highly successful prototypes.[77] With their remarkable masonry construction and superbly finished wood trim, paneling and furniture, there is no finer set of state park tourist cabins that survive from the CCC era.

The landscape architect Norfleet Bone, who arrived at the park after Fehr, was also soon busy designing and supervising the construction of built features along Copperas Creek. This work included a "naturalistic" dam, judged highly successful by Inspector Obert, as well as picnic facilities and foot bridges. Bone also oversaw the work on the two overlook structures which were completed in 1935. By the spring of that year, the refectory building was complete, and work was underway on the stone terraces and other site work in the area.[78]

By the end of 1935, a new inspector, Albion A. Blinks, reported that the park was nearing completion, and that "during the past year this area [had] developed into one of the outstanding landscape parks of Texas." The road and trail system was complete, and most of the architectural features of the park were as well. Drinking fountains, latrines, "park seats," and the sewer system were still under construction. Paid for with Works Progress Administration (WPA) funds, the golf course was under construction and expected to be ready for play the next spring. A swimming pool near the refectory building was also underway with the help of the WPA. But the park, Blinks reported, was "already popular with the public," and was expected to become more so as the pool and golf course opened in 1936.[79]

Bastrop State Park also became an important center for craft and trade training not only for the CCC, but for the National Youth Administration (NYA) as well. The NYA was created as part of the WPA and was intended to complement the opportunities (and hopefully the success) of the earlier CCC program. The NYA, however, accepted youths of both sexes, and concentrated more on education and trade apprenticeships.[80] The NYA was active in Bastrop until 1942, and its furniture shop in particular became a great success eventually supplying furniture for not only for Bastrop, but for other state parks as well. The NYA programs continued many of the training activities begun at Bastrop under the CCC. Under the NYA,

---

[76]Donald C. Obert, "March 1935 Report," Entry 40, Reports of Regional Officers and Inspectors, Texas, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[77]A. R. Henry, "Narrative Report, February and March, 1935," Entry 41, Project Reports on CCC Projects, Texas, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[78]Donald C. Obert, "March 1935 Report"; idem, "Monthly Report, May 1935," Entry 40, Reports of Regional Officers and Inspectors, Texas, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[79]Albion A. Blinks, "December Report, 1935," Entry 40, Reports of Regional Officers and Inspectors, Texas, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[80]John A. Salmond, The Civilian Conservation Corps, 1933-1942: A New Deal Case Study (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1967), 76.

furniture design, iron work, and other crafts continued to be overseen by Park Service designers who used the products of these shops in both Bastrop and in other Texas state parks. The NYA crafts shops were active in Bastrop until 1942.

In the meantime, Superintendent Henry, an irrepressible booster of his park, proclaimed in the spring of 1936 that Bastrop was now "the logical place for the headquarters of the state park system." Among the accomplishments of the CCC crews and their supervisors were the fine buildings and facilities of the park; in addition, "several thousand" native trees and shrubs had been transplanted with "very low loss." Bastrop, the superintendent noted, had won the "Best Camp" award for three years running, and the Park Service inspectors had consistently ranked it "with the best."[81]

Arthur Fehr, the architect of the "Pioneer Village" cabin group and other structures in the park, also was proud of the work that had been accomplished. In 1936, he recorded a visit (one of many that had been made over the last two years) by Herbert Maier. Maier was accompanied by George Nason and Inspector Obert, and the group was impressed. "This was one of those Red Letter Days," Fehr confided to himself, that a person "needs now and then to keep going in architecture." Maier was particularly taken with the cabin group, and offered to send Fehr up to Oklahoma where he could exchange ideas with other parks.[82]

By March of 1937, the park was ready for its opening dedication, an event attended by thousands. Shortly afterwards, CCC Company 1805 left for Wyoming, its work at Bastrop complete. Work after that point concentrated mainly on nearby Buescher State Park, and then in 1939, CCC Company 1811 departed Bastrop as well.[83]

---

[81]A. R. Henry, "CCC Accomplishments--Oct. 1933 to March 31 1936," Entry 41, Project Reports on CCC Projects, Texas, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[82]Arthur Fehr, "Day Books," Manuscript at the Texas Historical Commission, Austin.

[83]Newlan, "Bastrop State Park," 13.

## 9. MAJOR BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

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

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

Good, Albert H., ed. Park Structures and Facilities. Washington, DC: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1935.

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

Maier, Herbert, and Albert H. Good. "Structures in State Parks--An Apologia." In American Planning and Civic Annual, Harlean James, ed. Washington, DC: American Planning and Civic Association, 1935.

McClelland, Linda Flint, Presenting Nature: The Historic Landscape Design of the National Park Service, 1916-1942. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1993.

Newlan, Ralph Edward. "Bastrop State Park: Cultural Resources Survey Report." Unpublished Report. Austin: Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, 1993.

Olsen, Russ. Administrative History: Organizational Structures of the National Park Service 1917-1985. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1985.

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.

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

Steely, James Wright. The Civilian Conservation Corps in Texas State Parks. Austin: Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, 1986.

_____. "Rustic Style in Depression Texas: Federal Architecture in the State Parks, 1933-1941." Master's Thesis, University of Texas at Austin, 1985.

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

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

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

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

_____. The Emergency Relief Program of the National Park Service. Unpublished report. Washington, DC: Department of the Interior, Library of Congress, 1938.

_____. History of the Civilian Conservation Corps. Unpublished report. Washington, DC: Department of the Interior, Main Interior Library, 1938.

_____. Procedure for Park, Parkway and Recreational Area Study. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1937.

_____. Yearbook: Park and Recreation Progress, 1937-1943. 5 vols. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Vint, Thomas C. "National Park Service Branch of Plans and Design, San Francisco." Landscape Architecture 24, no. 1 (October 1933): 31-32.

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].

_____. Civilian Conservation Corps Program of the United States Department of the Interior, March 1933 to June 30, 1943. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1944.

_____. 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.
X Previously Determined Eligible by the National Register.
___ Designated a National Historic Landmark.
___ Recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey: #_____
___ Recorded by Historic American Engineering Record: #_____

Primary Location of Additional Data:

X State Historic Preservation Office

___ Other State Agency
___ Federal Agency
___ Local Government
___ University
___ Other (Specify Repository):

## 10. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

Acreage of Property: Approximately 2,054 acres

UTM References:

| | Zone | Easting | Northing | | Zone | Easting | Northing |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **A** | 14 | 668880 | 3332900 | **B** | 14 | 667160 | 3331020 |
| **C** | 14 | 667000 | 3330380 | **D** | 14 | 665280 | 3331120 |
| **E** | 14 | 664320 | 3332080 | **F** | 14 | 665740 | 3333040 |
| **G** | 14 | 666840 | 3334100 | **H** | 14 | 667540 | 3333900 |

Verbal Boundary Description:

The boundaries of the district are based on the historic statutory boundaries of the park and are defined by the following: on the west, the western boundary line of the park as indicated on the USGS map (following State Route 21 to just south of UTM reference point G); on the north, the portion of the northern park boundary line (marked on the map) extending west of UTM reference point A; on the south, that portion of the southern boundary line extending west of UTM reference point C; on the east, by a straight line running in a southwesterly direction from UTM reference point A to point B, and by a straight line running in a south-southwesterly direction connecting UTM reference points B and C.

Boundary Justification:

The boundary corresponds to the historic park boundaries during the park's period of significance. The boundary excludes the eastern tract of land later added to the park after the period of significance.

## 11. FORM PREPARED BY

Name/Title: Ralph Edward Newlan, James W. Steely, 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 6, 1997