1. NAME OF PROPERTY

Historic Name: **LAKE GUERNSEY STATE PARK**

Other Name/Site Number: Lake Guernsey Park, Guernsey Lake Park, Guernsey State Park

2. LOCATION

Street & Number: One Mile NW of Guernsey, WY Not for publication: ___

City/Town: Guernsey Vicinity: X

State: Wyoming County: Platte Code: 031 Zip Code: 82002

3. CLASSIFICATION

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

Number of Resources within Property

Contributing	Noncontributing
14	37 buildings
3	0 sites
43	9 structures
0	0 objects
60	46 Total

Number of Contributing Resources Previously Listed in the National Register: Park historic district listed in 1980, resources not enumerated

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

Lake Guernsey State Park is located in Platte County in southeast Wyoming, about 40 miles west of the Nebraska state line and about one mile northwest of the Town of Guernsey, Wyoming. Lake Guernsey, a Bureau of Reclamation reservoir on the North Platte River, was first filled in 1927. The reservoir is situated in the hills of the Hartville Uplift, a geological formation that forms a transition between the high plains to the east and the foothills of the Rocky Mountains to the west. The sometimes precipitous terrain of the uplift is rocky and dry, but receives enough moisture at its higher elevations (4,000-5,000') to be covered with scattered stands of ponderosa pine, juniper, and cedar.

Lake Guernsey State Park was developed beginning in 1934 on federal land that had been purchased for the North Platte River Project initiated by the Bureau of Reclamation in the first decade of the century. One of the first two Reclamation/Park Service/CCC projects initiated, the park soon was established as the showplace of state park design in Wyoming; it also became the most important early example of recreational development around a Bureau of Reclamation reservoir in the West. The park features a lakeshore drive and a skyline drive, an exceptional group of overlook and picnic shelters, and extensive original trails. An extraordinary museum, complete with original interpretive displays, is at the center of the more developed public area of the park.

Swimming, boating, and other forms of active recreation have been the principal activities in the park since it was created. An original nine-hole golf course was also built within the park during the historic period, although it has been abandoned and is overgrown. Of the two CCC camps in the park, one remains well preserved as a site, although most of the buildings have been removed. The quality of the architectural and site design at Lake Guernsey (overseen at first by CCC regional director Herbert Maier) made the park a flagship of the CCC state park program, although technically it was (and is) a Bureau of Reclamation property.

Overall the park retains extraordinary integrity to the historic period of its development. The park drives, picnic and overlook shelters, water fountains, trails, and even some original wooden signs have all been well preserved in part by the relatively cold and dry climate. Although one large developed beach area (Sandy Beach) has been added to the park, this addition was made away from the historic park development, and so constitutes a relatively minor impact on the park's integrity. The non-contributing buildings in the district are grouped closely together, and do no 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 mid-1930s. Almost all aspects of the historic park development, as represented in the historic master plans, retain excellent integrity.

The high number of noncontributing buildings in the park--which consists almost entirely of leased summer cabins--at first suggests a lack of integrity in the park overall. These private cabins (some of which have portions dating to the 1920s and 1930s, but most of which are predominantly postwar construction)
are restricted, however, to specific zones within the park, one of which was designated in the 1930s master plans. This was a highly unusual situation for a Park Service designed state

park, and was a direct result of earlier Bureau of Reclamation administration of the site. Although none of the buildings are considered contributing (because of their date or because of a lack of integrity), their combined impact on the overall park landscape is minimal.

In 1980, Lake Guernsey State Park was one of the first CCC-era state parks to be recognized for its architectural significance and placed on the National Register. The 3,760-acre historic district described at that time was intended to encompass the CCC-era architecture of the park, which is of particularly high quality and has maintained excellent integrity. The National Register District covered the entire eastern portion of the park, but did not enumerate individual contributing resources. The National Historic Landmark District described here includes the entire park (within the historic boundaries as of 1939), a total of 8,602 acres (6,227 land acres, 2,375 water). This larger district maintains excellent integrity, reflecting the original spatial organization, circulation, topography, and vegetation as depicted in the original master plans drawn up in the mid-1930s by Park Service landscape architects.

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 Lake Guernsey State Park was determined by the master plan initiated in 1934 by the National Park Service in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation. 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 state park authorities between 1933 and 1942.

For example, the park's master plan at first featured a single, controlled entrance. The plan 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, centered on the park museum, was situated near the main public arrival point. This arrangement allowed day use visitors easy access to the main area, while it prevented the flow of through traffic from disturbing campers, picnickers, and swimmers scattered elsewhere in the park. These are typical features of Park Service state park planning under landscape architect Conrad L. Wirth.

The master plans for Lake Guernsey also concentrated specific uses in specific zones of the park. The headquarters, utility area, and one of the CCC camps (BR-9), for example, were sited off Lakeshore Drive at the end of a short cul-de-sac, where these facilities were convenient to the main entrance but were also well separated from public areas. Leased summer cabins were also concentrated in a specific area along the lake (to the north), an arrangement that minimized their intrusion on the more public park areas, and that allowed vacationers in the cabins to remain undisturbed by daily park activities.

The basic spatial organization and zoning implied in the Lake Guernsey master plans (as in other Park Service plans) responded to the topography, vegetation, and other existing features of the site. The basic spatial sequence through the site began with the choice of Lakeshore Drive or Skyline Drive, the two main park roads, which offered complementary but very different experiences. To the west, the tight curves of Skyline Drive (nicknamed the Mae West Road by the CCC boys) climbed over 400 feet to the high bluff on the west side of the narrow canyon that was flooded to create the reservoir. The views from the high points in this area are the most expansive in the park, and vegetation tended to be sparser and the terrain more exposed. With fewer places to pull off along the climbing curves of the road, visitor activities tended to be concentrated at certain points where overlooks were developed.

To the east, Lakeshore Drive offered views with the reservoir in the foreground with the high bluffs to the west in the distance. The wider curves and flat grades of this road gave it a very different character. More sheltered and more heavily vegetated, Lakeshore Drive also offered many opportunities for easy access to the lake. The leased summer cabins located along a discrete portion of Lakeshore Drive were both secluded by the heavier vegetation and were convenient to lake access.

Leased summer cabins were not typical of Park Service master plans for either state or national parks; they were, rather, a legacy of Bureau of Reclamation management of the site and had been initiated between 1928 and 1934. There were other differences in the Lake Guernsey master plans of 1935 and 1937 that also indicated that the park was being treated somewhat differently from many other state parks designed by the Park Service. The principal developed

areas of the park, for example, are relatively decentralized. Each parking area or other stop along the two roads was defined in part by a building, picnic shelter, or other structure such as a swimming float or boat pier; and these features were sited somewhat continuously along the Lakeshore Drive corridor. This decentralized approach to siting park facilities differed from other state park plans, which more often concentrated development in discreet developed areas along a road corridor. Especially along Lakeshore Drive, however, the shore of Lake Guernsey was developed more or less as a continuous, large developed area, with multiple access points, picnic shelters, boat piers, and parking areas along the length of much of the route. This can be seen as a difference between reservoir "recreation area" development and the standard state park development the Park Service undertook elsewhere.

In terms of the overall zoning of uses for the park, however, the planners did concentrate the developed portions of the park in the eastern bays of the reservoir. The larger, western portion of the reservoir remained undeveloped in historic master plans, thus defining (implicitly if not explicitly) the "recreation" and "conservation" zones Conrad Wirth had advised. If the spatial organization of specific developed areas of the park differed from the design of similar areas in other state parks, the larger goal of balancing discrete "recreation" and "conservation" zones remained constant overall.

Just as clearly, however, at the reservoir site, the balance of conservation and recreation was shifted to include more recreational activities of all types. Even more recreational facilities were put forward in Richard Redell's 1937 master plan, and although many of those suggestions were not implemented, they clearly indicate that park planners thought it appropriate to concentrate more activities--especially swimming and boating--on a reservoir than they would have on a natural lake. Motorboats, in particular, were among the most popular recreations from the earliest days of the park, and the historic park plans were clearly intended to facilitate their use.

The overall spatial organization of Lake Guernsey State Park remains entirely intact within the historic developed areas. Two new developed areas have been opened in the park since the period of significance, at Sandy Beach and at Long Canyon. The Sandy Beach area has opened up the western portion of the reservoir to direct access, and so constitutes an alteration in the original land-use zones established in the 1935 and the 1937 master plans. The area remains an easily identified and discrete addition, however, since it is well away from the historic park development. The addition of the non-contributing road and developed area at Sandy Beach, therefore, does not represent an overly significant impact on the spatial organization of the park as a whole. The Long Canyon area, also developed in the early 1980s, is a smaller camping area near the north entrance of the park (opened circa 1939), and so similarly has avoided directly affecting the historic park development to its south.

Circulation

Circulation through the park was defined in the historic master plans by complementary and discrete road and trail systems. The road system presents a wonderful opposition of two classic types of park drives: the mountain road, Skyline Drive, and the valley road, Lakeshore Drive. The circulation pattern of the park, however, is somewhat idiosyncratic, with the two roads meeting only once, at the fork just beyond the park entrance, and otherwise extending as independent cul-de-sacs (originally) on either side of the lake.

Lakeshore Drive, which was originally planned as a cul-de-sac, by 1939 had been extended up Long Canyon, out of the park, to meet with the road to Hartville, Wyoming, and the Spanish Diggings region. This is another idiosyncracy, reflecting the unique situation of Lake Guernsey as a new "recreation area" in the heart of a region dense with historic and archeological sites. The extension of the road and the creation of a north entrance to the park indicate the desire to develop the lake less as an isolated unit in itself, and more as one of a series of connected regional attractions.

An aspect of the circulation plan at Lake Guernsey that was more typical of Park Service master plans for other state parks was the separation of foot and vehicle traffic. The trail system of the park is particularly extensive and well developed. The steep terrain and dramatic views of the park site offered great potential for hiking trails, and the CCC crews developed at least 10 trails in the park. In addition, the availability of good quality stone led to the construction of numerous stairs and other features along the trails. The relatively dry climate has preserved many trailside features, including several original wooden signs. Although overgrown in places, the trail system retains excellent integrity.

Overall, all road and trail 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 and trail structures are listed and described individually below. Minor structures--such as stairs, culverts, retaining walls, and guardwalls--are not listed individually, but are contributing portions of the road and trail 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.

Topography

The dramatic topography along the North Platte River Valley north of Guernsey explains the decision to locate first the dam and then the park at the site. The terrain of the Hartville Uplift is indeed picturesque in a classical sense: it features precipitous terrain, dramatic rock outcrops, and narrow canyons thick with tangles of pine and juniper. At 4,000-5,000 feet in elevation, the park site also commands views of the surrounding North Platte River Valley and adjacent plains. In the distance to the west, the peaks of the Laramie Mountains (a front range of the Rockies) are clearly visible.

Park planners obviously exploited the topographic conditions of the reservoir site in the design and location of virtually every park feature, especially roads, trails, and overlooks. A steep, narrow canyon, once called the "Narrows," was flooded when Guernsey Dam was built, resulting in high cliffs over the lake and perfect sites (such as Brimmer Point) to develop scenic overlooks. On the east side of the lake, the relatively level terrain made the eastern shores the logical areas to develop access points to the lake, and a level park drive along the shore.

The small bluff immediately north of the dam site also played a critical role in determining the park plan. First the CCC camp, and then the park museum, were located on the south and west slopes of the bluff. At these locations, the slope of the bluff flattened out in shelves, providing good building sites with impressive views. The CCC camp, which remains an identifiable site today, had views of the dam and powerplant, and also was easily accessible via Bureau of Reclamation construction roads. The museum site, nearby yet sufficiently isolated on the adjacent hillside, provided similarly convenient access and dramatic views of the reservoir and the mountains to the west. The museum itself was centered on the view to Laramie Peak, 30 miles to the west.

Vegetation

Since the hills of the Hartville Uplift are a bit cooler and moister than much of the surrounding region, they tend to be intermittently forested with pine, cedar, and juniper, unlike the plains below. This is especially true in many of the deep and narrow canyons. The forests of the Guernsey site, like the views and the terrain, attracted tourists long before the creation of the park.

The more exposed, open areas of the park are covered in shortgrasses and sagebrush. Mountain shrub communities also predominate in places, mostly between the conifer forests and open areas. In lower areas, especially along streams, significant numbers of cottonwoods and willows are established. The same deciduous species form thickets in places along the edges of the lake.

Forestry work was also done within the historic district during the CCC period. The forests and grasslands of the park were aggressively managed throughout the historic period through fire suppression and various pest eradication programs.

Large scale landscape work also made up many CCC projects, especially in the southeastern part of the park around the museum. 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.

Where necessary, plant growth was also managed to assure open views from overlooks and along roadsides.

Structures

All of the landscape structures in Lake Guernsey State Park share a unified architectural 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 Lake Guernsey State Park, roughly worked local sandstones were 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 and vertical 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.

The park roads include masonry retaining wall construction, as well as masonry headwall and wing wall construction for culverts. Parking areas, overlooks, and their associated masonry construction are included here as part of the road structures. There are over 30 culverts in the park, most four-feet square in cross section and made of corrugated pipe, concrete pipe, or dry laid stone with timber roofs. These are also contributing structures, but are counted as part of the road structures and not individually. Many of the original log guard rails along the park roads have deteriorated and have been replaced.

Contributing Structures

CS1. Structure: Guernsey Dam NR#:
Location: SE end of Lake Guernsey Date: 1925-27
Architect/Builder: Bureau of Reclamation
Guernsey Dam was the third major structure of the North Platte River project and the second largest. The dam was designed to produce electricity as well as to store water for irrigation. It is 940 feet wide at its base, 560 feet long at its crest, and 135 feet high. The dam is of earth fill, diaphragm-type construction, with two spillways, one an open sluice and one glory hole. The maximum water elevation is 4,420' above sea level.

CS2. Structure: Power Plant NR#:
Location: South of dam Date: 1925-27
Architect/Builder: Bureau of Reclamation
The powerplant contains two 2,400 kilowatt units and includes adjacent power transformers. It is located on the west side of the river near the base of the dam.

CS3-7. Structure: Wood Frame Sheds (5) NR#:
Location: West of Park Entrance Road Date: 1925-27
Architect/Builder: Bureau of Reclamation
The Reclamation headquarters area consists of a number of structures built during the original period of dam construction. These simple wood sheds continue to be used for storage and other utilitarian purposes by the Bureau of Reclamation.

CS8. Structure: CCC Rock Tank NR#:
Location: Below museum Date: 1934
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This rock tank was part of the original CCC waterworks for Camp BR-9.

CS9. Structure: Shop NR#:
Location: CCC Camp BR-9 Site Date: 1934
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This one story, wood frame structure is on of two that remain of the 22 structures that originally made up camp BR-9.

CS10. Structure: Park Entrance Road and Lakeshore Drive NR#:
Date: 1925-35
Location: East shore of reservoir
Architect/Builder: NPS/Reclamation/CCC
This 6.7-mile road extends from the park's original (south) entrance to the north entrance created ca. 1939. The entrance road connecting to State Highway 26 to the south was originally opened by the Bureau of Reclamation for dam construction. The road crosses the top of the dam, and then hugs the eastern lakeshore. It is characterized by smooth grades and open views of the lake and of the many bluffs and outcrops in the park.

CS11. Structure: Spotted Tail Bridge NR#:
Location: Lakeshore Drive Date: 1934
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Timber beam bridge with masonry abutments and wingwalls, 28' wide, 32' long, 6' high. About one mile north of dam. Steel treads and log guardwalls added in 1953; surface paved in 1974.

CS12. Structure: Fish Canyon Bridge NR#:
Location: Lakeshore Drive Date: 1934
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Timber beam bridge with masonry abutments and wingwalls, 20' wide, 24' long, 6' high. About two miles north of dam. Wood plank deck and log guardrails; surface paved in 1974.

CS13. Structure: Dead Man's Gulch Bridge NR#:
Location: Lakeshore Drive Date: 1934
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Timber beam bridge with masonry abutments and wingwalls, 20' wide, 24' long, 8' high. About three miles north of dam. Wood plank deck and log guardrails; surface paved in 1974.

CS14. Structure: Roadside Parking Area NR#:
Location: Above dam, L'Shore Dr. Date:1934
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This large overlook and parking area provides views of the dam and powerplant below.

CS15. Structure: Museum Road NR#:
Location: Museum area Date: 1934-35
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This half-mile spur road brings traffic up to the museum from Lakeshore Drive.

CS16. Structure: Skyline Drive NR#:
Location: West of reservoir Date: 1934-36
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This 3.7-mile road winds its way up to the highest elevations in the park, on the west side of the reservoir. The windy alignment earned it the nickname "Mae West Road." It was paved in 1992, a project which resulted in widening in some portions. Despite this alteration, the road remains a contributing structure in the district.

CS17. Structure: Newell Bay Drive NR#:
Location: Skyline Drive Date: 1934-35
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This 1.3-mile spur road brings traffic down from Skyline Drive to the Newell Bay shore of the lake. Originally a "regatta area" for viewing water sports, this area was later turned into the second (of two) leased summer cabin areas in the park.

CS18. Structure: Brimmer Point Drive NR#:
Location: Skyline Drive Date: 1934-35
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This 1.6-mile spur road, also known as the Powell Mountain Road, brings traffic from Skyline Drive out to Brimmer Point, also known as the Red Cloud Vista.

CS19. Structure: Davis Bay Drive NR#:
Location: Skyline Drive Date: 1934-35
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This half mile spur road brings traffic from Skyline Drive to lake access at Davis Bay.

CS20. Structure: Picnic Shelter NR#:
Location: Spotted Tail Area Date: 1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
A 12' by 12' log structure with a hipped roof, this shelter has a masonry floor and steps and shelters an original log drinking fountain. It is in the Spotted Tail picnic area along Lakeshore Drive.

CS21. Structure: Picnic Shelter NR#:
Location: Red Cloud Area Date: 1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
A stone and log structure with a hipped roof, with masonry walls, columns, and a fireplace, and two original picnic tables. It is in the Red Cloud picnic area along Lakeshore Drive.

CS22. Structure: Picnic Shelter NR#:
Location: Red Cloud Area Date: 1939
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

This second shelter at the Red Cloud area was built by another CCC camp, from Veteran, Wyoming. Of log construction with a gable roof, the tables and benches are attached to log uprights. The shelter has a capacity of 48 people.

CS23. Structure: Picnic Shelter NR#:
Location: Sitting Bull Area Date: 1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This picnic shelter along Lakeshore Drive is also of log and stone construction.

CS24. Structure: Stone Steps NR#:
Location: Museum parking area Date:ca. 1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
These particularly impressive sandstone steps are typical of many steps in the park. Massive sandstone, quarried locally, was artfully placed on site to create the irregular, rough work sought by the Park Service landscape architects. Other steps along the trail system are also contributing and are counted with the trail structure.

CS25. Structure: Rock Drinking Fountain NR#:
Location: Lakeshore Drive Date:ca.1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
A particularly interesting original drinking fountain, carved from a large boulder, along Lakeshore Drive. The feature earned a full-page in Albert Good's 1935 portfolio, Park Structures and Facilities.

CS26. Structure: Barbecue Pit NR#:
Location: Spotted Tail Pic. Area Date: 1934-39
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
An original barbecue pit in the Spotted Tail area, along Lakeshore Drive.

CS27. Structure: Powder Magazine NR#:
Location: Along Lakeside road Date: 1934
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
One of three stone magazines built into hillsides. Built of cruder masonry than public structures, these utilitarian structures were intended to minimize the likelihood (or the damage) of an accident involving the dynamite used extensively in road and other construction.

CS28. Structure: Powder Magazine NR#:
Location: Black Canyon Date: 1934
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
One of three stone magazines built into hillsides. Built of cruder masonry than public structures, these utilitarian structures were intended to minimize the likelihood (or the damage) of an accident involving the dynamite used extensively in road and other construction.

CS29. Structure: Detonator Cap Magazine NR#:
Location: Dead Man Gulch Date: 1934-39
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

One of three stone magazines built into hillsides. Built of cruder masonry than public structures, these utilitarian structures were intended to minimize the likelihood (or the damage) of an accident involving the dynamite used extensively in road and other construction.

CS30. Structure: Red Cliff Trail NR#:
Location: Red Cliff Date: 1934-39
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This 1.2-mile trail starts at the roadside parking area above the dam and runs east along the high bluff to the CC Camp BR-9 site. From there the trail turns west back to the museum.

As with all the original trails in the park, an average width of three feet is typical; all trails were routed specifically to exploit scenic views, while minimizing the potential impacts on scenery.

CS31. Structure: Trail Head Steps NR#:
Location: Red Cliff Date: 1934-39
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
A particularly notable set of trail steps at the trail head of the Red Cliff Trail.

CS32. Structure: Red Cloud Trail NR#:
Location: East of lake Date: 1934-39
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This .6-mile trail begins at the Red Cliff Trail near the museum and runs due north.

CS33. Structure: Roundtop Mountain Trail NR#:
Location: Roundtop Mtn. Date: 1934-39
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This .2-mile trail is a spur trail to the top of Roundtop Mountain.

CS34. Structure: Knight Mountain Trail NR#:
Location: Knight Mtn. Date: 1934-39
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This 2-mile trail connects the end of the Red Cloud Trail to Fish Canyon.

CS35. Structure: Foot Bridge NR#:
Location: Near Brimmer Point Date: 1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This log bridge with plank decking spans 48 feet. Substantial sandstone masonry abutments are at either end. The wooden portions of the bridge burned in the 1970s, but were replaced based on the original design drawings by E. S. Mosher (1935), and so the bridge is considered a contributing structure in the NHL District.

CS36. Structure: Brimmer Point Trail NR#:
Location: Brimmer Point Date: 1934-39
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This 2-mile trail runs from the CCC footbridge south to the footbridge south of Newell Bay.

CS37. Structure: Footbridge NR#:
Location: Spring Creek Cove Date: 1934-39
Architect/Builder: Jones-Redell/CCC
This footbridge is the terminus of the Brimmer Point Trail.

CS38. Structure: Brimmer Point Overlook NR#:
Location: Brimmer Point Overlook Date: 1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
The 8' by 10' observation platform is enclosed by low walls and is reached by a short flight of steps, all in the sandstone masonry typical of the park. The chain link fence mounted on the stone walls is original, and is a rare original example of the use of this material in a Park Service/CCC park.

CS39. Structure: Lakeview Trail NR#:
Location: between Brimmer Point and Marsh Mountain Date: 1934-39
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This 2-mile trail runs from the CCC footbridge north, to the Marsh Mountain Trail.

CS40. Structure: Marsh Mountain Trail NR#:
Location: Marsh Mountain Date: 1934-39
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This .6-mile trail is a loop around the top of Marsh Mountain.

CS41. Structure: North Bluff Trail NR#:
Location: North Bluff Date: 1934-39
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This .4-mile trail starts at the head of the Echo Cliff Trail and goes to the North Bluff developed area.

CS42. Structure: Echo Cliff Trail NR#:
Location: Echo Cliff Date: 1934-39
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This .3-mile trail is a short loop around the Echo Cliff formation.

CS43. Structure: Burlington Northern Railroad Tracks NR#:
Location: South shore of lake Date: Pre-WWII
Architect/Builder: Burlington Northern Railroad

Non-contributing Structures

NCS1.	Structure:	Sandy Beach Roads	NR#:
	Location:	South Shore of Lake	Date: ca. 1990
	Architect/Builder:	Wyoming Dept. of Commerce	
NCS2.	Structure:	Camp Loop Roads	NR#:
	Location:	Sandy Beach Area	Date: ca. 1990
	Architect/Builder:	Wyoming Dept. of Commerce	
NCS3.	Structure:	Picnic Shelter	NR#:
	Location:	Sandy Beach Area	Date: ca. 1990
	Architect/Builder:	Wyoming Dept. of Commerce	
NCS4-7.	Structure:	Restrooms (4)	NR#:
	Location:	Sandy Beach Area	Date: ca. 1990
	Architect/Builder:	Wyoming Dept. of Commerce	
NCS8.	Structure:	Restroom	NR#:
	Location:	Long Canyon Area	Date: ca. 1990
	Architect/Builder:	Wyoming Dept. of Commerce	
NCS9.	Structure:	Radio Tower	NR#:
	Location:	North of Museum	Date: ca. 1970
	Architect/Builder:	Bureau of Reclamation	

Buildings

The following buildings are contributing resources of the historic district. They 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.

Contributing Buildings

CB1.	Building:	Museum	NR#:
	Location:	East side of reservoir	Date: 1934-39
	Architect/Builder:	NPS/R. G. Pray/CCC	

The central public facility of the park, the Guernsey museum is one of the most distinguished of its type in the country. The single story, L-shaped building is built of massive sandstone blocks, laid in random courses. Battered walls, few windows, and massive timber and split shake gable roofs all are characteristic of the influence of Herbert Maier on Park Service trailside museum design. The interior displays, by John Ewer and the Berkeley museum staff, are perfectly preserved, and represent an invaluable legacy in themselves.

CB2.	Building:	Picnic Shelter (Also known as the "Castle.")	NR#:

Location: North Bluff Area Date: 1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

The most elaborate of the shelters in the park, the "Castle" serves as an overlook and a picnic shelter at the termination of Skyline Drive. About 50' long, 34' wide and 13' high, the structure is built mainly the sandstone masonry characteristic of the park. The square tower and circular stair ascending it give the platform the impression of a medieval fortification. A log and frame roof covers the central portion, and stone bulwarks at either end of the structure rise above the roofline. The interior features a stone fireplace and picnic tables. The "Castle" is one of the most remarkable buildings of its type built by the Park Service and the CCC.

CB3. Building: Comfort Station ("Million Dollar Biffey") NR#:
Location: North Bluff area Date: 1936
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

Described by Regional Inspector Kenneth Jones as the most extraordinary latrine he had seen built by the Park Service, the "million dollar biffey" indeed has few parallels. The rectangular building features walls of battered, massive blocks of sandstone, and a split shake gable roof. The battering of walls, and the massiveness of the stone blocks, give the building an exaggerated appearance.

CB4. Building: Comfort Station NR#:
Location: Newell Bay Drive Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

A small, wood frame structure for two occupants, with a dividing wall. One of two such buildings in the park.

CB5. Building: Comfort Station NR#:
Location: South of Spotted Tail Picnic Area Date: 1935
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC

A small, wood frame structure for two occupants, with a dividing wall. One of two such buildings in the park.

CB6-9. Building: Wood Frame Residences(4) NR#:
Location: Park HQ Area Date: 1925-27
Architect/Builder: Bureau of Reclamation

These simple, barracks-style wood frame residences were converted ca. 1935 for use as NPS headquarters buildings. They have been maintained for various administrative functions and storage for the park since then.

CB10-12. Buildings: Wood Frame Garages (3) NR#:
Location: Park HQ Area Date: 1925-27
Architect/Builder: Bureau of Reclamation

Wood frame garages associated with the former Reclamation residences in what is now the park headquarters area east of the damsite.

CB13. Building: Reclamation HQ NR#:
Location: West of Entrance Road Date: 1925-27
Architect/Builder: Bureau of Reclamation

The Reclamation administration building is a simple wood frame construction built during the period of dam construction.

CB14. Building: Ten-Stall Garage NR#:
Location: CCC Camp BR-9 Site Date: 1934
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
This ten-bay, one story, wood frame structure is one of two that remain of the 22 structures that originally made up camp BR-9.

Non-Contributing Buildings

NCB1-17. Building: Leased Cabins (17) NR#:
Location: Lakeshore Drive Date: 1928-75
Architect/Builder: Unknown
The first summer cabins probably appeared along what became Lakeshore Drive shortly after the reservoir was filled in 1928. The Park Service master plan limited the construction of these leased cabins to a discrete and specific area along the drive, and suggested that further leases be limited. Many of the cabins are postwar construction. Those with earlier original dates have been heavily modified by the leasers, who have altered and added to the small residences as they have seen fit. None of the leased summer cabins in the park are considered contributing buildings.

NCB18-37. Building: Leased Cabins (20) NR#:
Location: Newell Bay Date:ca.1960-75
Architect/Builder: Unknown
A second area of the park, along the west shore of the lake, was designated a leased summer cabin area by the Bureau of Reclamation ca. 1960. This area had originally been a "regatta viewing area" and a lake access point in the 1930s master plans. It is now a discrete, designated area for leased cabins. All of these cabins are of postwar construction. The Bureau of Reclamation and the State of Wyoming have agreed that no further summer cabin leases will be issued at Lake Guernsey State Park.

Sites

CSI1. Site: Golf Course NR#:
Location: West of museum Date: 1939
Architect/Builder: National Park Service
Although overgrown and abandoned, the nine-hole golf course designed by Richard Redell and built in 1939 remains in place. Many of the oiled sand greens and tee platforms are still identifiable. The course would require extensive restoration to be playable, however.

CSI2. Site: CCC Camp BR-9 NR#:
Location: Southwest of museum Date: 1934-39
Architect/Builder: National Park Service/CCC
Although 20 of the original 22 structures were removed after 1939, two buildings remain, and the remnants of trails, footings, and foundations (as well as a particularly rich dump area) make this site valuable for interpretive purposes.

CSI3. Site: Emigrant Trail Route NR#:
Location: North shore of lake Date:Mid-1800s
Architect/Builder: Unknown
A portion of the wagon routes known collectively as the Oregon Trail passed through what is now the northernmost portion of Lake Guernsey State Park.

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_ D_

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

NHL Criteria: 1, 4

NHL Theme(s):
III. Expressing Cultural Values
5. Architecture, Landscape Architecture, Urban Design

II. Creating Social Institutions and Movements
4. Recreational Activities

VII. Transforming the Environment
1. Manipulating the Environment and Resources
3. Protecting/Preserving the Environment

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

Period(s) of Significance: 1925-1939

Significant Dates: 1925, 1927, 1933, 1934, 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939

Significant Person(s): NA

Cultural Affiliation: NA

Architect/Builder: DeBoer, S. R.; Redell, Richard G.; Jones, Eldon C.; Pray, Roland G.; Dayton, Marshall

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

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

Summary

Lake Guernsey State Park is the most significant example with the highest degree of integrity of an early collaboration between the National Park Service and the Bureau of Reclamation in developing what came to be known as "recreation areas" around the reservoirs built in Western states by the federal government since 1905. In addition, Lake Guernsey State Park is also an extremely significant and well preserved state park of the period, and epitomizes the artistic quality and high aspirations held for the state parks designed by the Park Service and built by the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) during the 1930s. The park represents the highest achievements of the collaboration of the Park Service, the CCC, and local park authorities (in this case, the local project office of the Bureau of Reclamation) during the New Deal.

Many of the most significant results of National Park Service landscape architecture were initiated in 1933 as part of the 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 state parks developed during this period remain the core of regional park systems.

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. Among these showcase state parks of the New Deal, certain examples again stand out because of further distinctions. Certain parks, for example, were the prototypes for new kinds of parks, such as recreational demonstration areas (featuring organized group camps) and national recreation areas (featuring recreational development alongside reservoirs).

Lake Guernsey State Park, in addition to its outstanding integrity and excellence of design, was also a unique prototype for the national recreation area. Exceptional to begin with because of its fine and well preserved museum, park drives, and overlooks, Lake Guernsey also represents a historic step in the relationship between the Park Service and the Bureau of Reclamation. By the 1920s, the Bureau of Reclamation recognized the tremendous recreational potential of reservoirs built primarily for the purposes of crop irrigation and power production. In 1934, Reclamation began collaborating with the Park Service to develop new kinds of parks that emphasized active recreational pursuits, especially swimming, fishing, and boating. This type of park development later resulted in some of the most massive and popular developments the Park Service ever attempted, such as Lake Mead National Recreation Area, as well as scores of state and local park developments around lakes and reservoirs.

The Lake Guernsey 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, including that of Wyoming. 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, local park authorities, and the Bureau of Reclamation in the 1930s.

The Lake Guernsey 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, local park authorities, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

The period of significance extends from the beginning of construction of Guernsey Dam in 1925 to the end of CCC activities at the site in 1939. Other important dates include 1927, when Guernsey Dam was completed; 1933, when the initial Park Service reconnaissance of the site began; 1934, when the CCC arrived at the park and the first Park Service plans were drawn up; 1936, when the park museum and other important facilities were completed; and 1937, when a comprehensive master plan for the park was finalized and many of the park structures were completed.

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 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]

---

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

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

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

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

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]

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

---

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

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

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

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

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]

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

[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.

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 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

---

[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.

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, "From the moment it was realized that the CCC could legitimately be utilized to perform Emergency

---

[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.

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] All of this diversification was enabled and symbolized by the full regionalization of the Park Service that was implemented in the summer of 1937.

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."[30] The 1936 act validated the "cooperation" between both levels of government and legitimized the Park Service's official

---

[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.

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

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. The architect Albert Good served as editor and compiler, and the new work, Park and Recreation Structures, attempted to provide a comprehensive introduction to Park Service architecture and planning. Good embellished his dimensioned drawings and collected photographs with memorable commentary. In certain observations, Good reiterated the basic requirements of Park Service rustic architecture. The museum building at Lake Guernsey State Park in Wyoming, in particular, adhered to "many of the principles proclaimed for a widely appropriate park architecture."[31]

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.[32]

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 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

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

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

inconspicuous as possible themselves."[33] 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.[34]

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.[35] 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.[36]

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 program had encouraged state governments to acquire over one million acres of new parkland since 1933.[37] From 1933 on, the Park Service planned a plethora of new parks--and new kinds

---

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

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

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

[36]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).

[37]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.

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; 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.[38]

Some of the greatest new opportunities in recreational development, however, were to result from innovative collaborations between the Park Service and another bureau within the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Reclamation. The reclamation of semiarid Western lands had been a federal concern at least since Theodore Roosevelt announced in his first message to Congress in 1901 that the construction of dams, reservoirs, and irrigation canals in the Western states would be one of his main priorities. The Federal Reclamation Act of 1902 created a Reclamation Service within the United States Geological Survey, and in 1907, with the continued support of Western Congressional delegations, the Bureau of Reclamation was made a separate bureau within the Department of the Interior.[39]

Immediately following the 1902 Reclamation Act, the Secretary of the Interior began large withdrawals of land in the public domain to become future reclamation projects. In 1903, the first six of these projects were authorized, including the North Platte project in Wyoming and Nebraska. Over the next 20 years, the Bureau of Reclamation achieved great success in planning and managing major land reclamation projects. By 1925, over 2,300,000 acres of Western land were being irrigated through Bureau of Reclamation projects, and the value of crops being raised on the irrigated lands exceeded $130,000,000 annually. In 1928, Congress acknowledged this signal success by authorizing the Boulder Canyon Project (Hoover Dam), by far the bureau's most ambitious irrigation and hydroelectric development, which called for the construction of what would be the highest dam in the world on the Colorado River between Nevada and Arizona.[40]

Also in 1928, the commissioner of reclamation, Elwood Mead, published a short treatise titled *Federal Irrigation Reservoirs as Pleasure Resorts*. Among the other useful products of Western reclamation projects, Commissioner Mead was acutely aware of their social and economic importance as centers of recreation for growing towns and cities in the West. Located often in arid or semiarid regions, the new lakes quickly became recreational meccas.

---

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

[39]William E. Warne, *The Bureau of Reclamation* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973), 13-14, 27.

[40]Warne, *Bureau of Reclamation*, 64, 256.

The reservoirs, Mead noted in 1928, "are entering increasingly into the life of the people as pleasure resorts and playgrounds, as bird sanctuaries, and as excellent fishing grounds." In some cases, private entrepreneurs were well underway providing resort accommodations and services along new reservoirs. The Southern Pacific Railroad, in particular, had been actively promoting tourism to the Salt River reservoirs near Phoenix; the railroad built a hotel and rented boats on Theodore Roosevelt Lake, which had begun filling in 1911. Day trippers in automobiles also flocked to the lakes wherever they could, for "picnicking, swimming, fishing, and boating." People in cities like Boise, Idaho, and Redding, California, discovered nearby reservoirs and by 1928 were arriving by car in large numbers on summer weekends.[41]

Believing that recreational uses had "a unique advertising value" which would "aid materially" in the future expansion of federal reclamation activities, Mead was anxious to find ways to expand the public's use and appreciation of the new lakes. His chief engineers, however, reporting on the recreational potential of the 16 existing reclamation projects, offered few insights other than to note that people happily made use of the reservoirs wherever regulations and adequate roads made it possible to do so. Camping, boating, and fishing were widespread, but few specific plans for the provision of public facilities (beyond the conversion of buildings and sanitary facilities left over from construction camps) were presented by the reclamation engineers.

Among the reservoirs available for public recreational use in 1928, however, several stood out for their particular potential as future centers for outdoor recreation. Accessibility to urban populations, for example, and the scenic qualities of their surrounding landscapes, were bound to make certain reservoirs more attractive for recreational development. The North Platte Project, in eastern Wyoming and Nebraska, was described in these terms in Mead's 1928 publication. Three reservoirs had been created since the project had been authorized in 1903: the Pathfinder Dam (1910) in central Wyoming, the Guernsey Dam (1927) in eastern Wyoming near the Nebraska border, and a smaller impoundment in western Nebraska called the Minatare Dam (1915). The Pathfinder Dam, which was one of the first dams ever completed by the Bureau of Reclamation, was listed on the National Register for its engineering significance in 1971. The North Platte Project overall, which irrigated an area 100 miles long and 25 miles wide, was one of the earliest and most successful of the bureau's reclamation projects.[42]

Elwood Mead also had a long association with the North Platte Project--and the Guernsey site in particular--that preceded his appointment as commissioner of reclamation. While serving as the territorial (then the state) engineer for Wyoming from 1888 to 1899, Mead had surveyed the area around Guernsey, Wyoming with the town's founder, a local rancher, miner, and politician named Charles A. Guernsey. With Mead's help, Guernsey had even been granted a permit for the storage of water on the site of the reservoir in the 1890s, but apparently was unable to finance the work. In 1903 the new Reclamation Service withdrew the area of Mead's surveys as part of the North Platte Project. The Pathfinder Dam, one of the earliest and most

---

[41]Elwood Mead, *Federal Irrigation Reservoirs as Pleasure Resorts* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1928), ii, 1, 6-11.

[42]Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, *North Platte River Projects: Wyoming-Nebraska,* pamphlet (Washington, DC: Bureau of Reclamation, n.d.), 3-4, 15.

ambitious Reclamation projects, was completed by 1910. The Guernsey project, however, did not receive appropriations until 1924, when Elwood Mead (who in the meantime had served as the water commissioner for Victoria, Australia) returned to the United States and later was appointed reclamation commissioner. That year Congress appropriated over $12,000,000 for the construction of Guernsey Dam, which was completed over the next three years under Mead's direction. So in 1928, when Mead wrote on the character and potential for tourism of the North Platte Project and the new Lake Guernsey in particular, he knew the subject well.[43]

The Pathfinder Dam, however, was remote from populations and was unlikely to become a major recreational destination in the near future. (The reservoir was later surrounded by the Pathfinder Bird Refuge.) The Minatare Dam, in the heart of the new farming districts of western Nebraska, was described in 1928 as "more readily accessible," and plans were already underway for a locally sponsored small "public park and community playground" on the western shore of the lake to accommodate the already large numbers of tourists and vacationers who patronized the spot. But the larger Lake Guernsey, first filled in 1927, held particular potential for more ambitious recreational development, as Mead recognized.

Situated roughly between Rapid City, South Dakota, and Cheyenne, Wyoming, significant urban populations were well within 100 miles of the lake. The growing populations of the irrigated farm districts along the North Platte were even closer. Just as importantly, Lake Guernsey possessed "the most beautiful setting of any of the reservoirs" on the North Platte, according to H. C. Stetson, the project superintendent. "The shores are rough and rugged," he observed in 1928, "and covered with many cedar and pine trees." Although still somewhat remote for large numbers of day trippers, Stetson suggested that "the beauty of this setting," of Lake Guernsey, "offer[ed] many inducements for the construction of cabins and summer cottages" through lease arrangements of the type the Forest Service employed.[44] If the Pathfinder Dam was too remote and the Minatare Dam was surrounded by flatter, relatively uninspiring scenery, the Guernsey Dam was reasonably close to populated areas and was surrounded by picturesque rock outcrops, narrow wooded canyons, and small peaks that provided excellent views.

Local boosters and businessmen, such as the Cheyenne oil lawyer George E. Brimmer, also recognized that, in addition to its scenic attractions, a number of historical sites in the area put the new lake in the center of a tourist district that might even have national park potential. The site of Old Fort Laramie, for example, was less than 20 miles away (and was designated a National Monument in 1938). The Oregon Trail ran along the North Platte through the area, and the reservoir had even submerged a pioneer cemetery alongside one of the trail's routes. In several locations nearby, soft rock formations had become important records of the 19th century migrations along the Oregon Trail. The Register Cliffs, where passing emigrants carved their names, as well as wagon ruts, cut into soft stone, both were in the immediate vicinity of the Town of Guernsey. Scott's Bluff, the famous landmark on the Oregon Trail, was just across the border in Nebraska, and had been proclaimed a National Monument in 1919. Fort Fetterman (later a state historic site) was 20 miles to the west along the North

[43]Warne, *Bureau of Reclamation*, 239.

[44]Mead, *Federal Irrigation Reservoirs*, 24.

Platte. And a famous archeological area known as the Spanish Diggings, the sites of early Native American quarries, was located immediately to the north.[45]

Visitors had already begun arriving at Lake Guernsey, in fact, as soon as it was filled. The setting of the reservoir was indeed particularly scenic, with stands of pine and cedar scattered among dramatic outcrops and precipitous terrain. The terrain of the Hartville Uplift, on which the reservoir was sited at an elevation of about 4,400 feet, offered dramatic views of Laramie Peak (10,272 feet), 25 miles to the west, as well as the surrounding farmland, the North Platte River Valley, and Register Cliffs, all of which are visible from points around the reservoir. If the many attractions of the area were evident to Commissioner Mead and local park advocates, however, the Bureau of Reclamation, which was busy undertaking the ambitious Boulder Dam project, did not implement significant park development for any of its reservoir sites in the 1920s.

That situation soon changed, however, as the New Deal programs transformed the federal government in the spring of 1933. At the Bureau of Reclamation, Elwood Mead soon discovered that even Boulder Dam (now the Hoover Dam) would be eclipsed by ever larger reclamation projects. Secretary of the Interior Ickes, administrator of the PWA, poured money into the Bureau of Reclamation projects, hastening the completion of Hoover Dam (1936) and initiating, among many other new projects, the massive Grand Coulee Dam in Washington, the largest project of its type ever planned.

After 1933, the CCC also offered the Bureau of Reclamation the means to develop the recreational potential of its reservoirs. The bureau proceeded cautiously, however, well aware that its own organization was not immediately prepared to undertake large park development projects. But Commissioner Mead's long established interest in recreational uses of Western reservoirs would not allow him to miss the opportunity the CCC represented for long. In 1934, the Bureau of Reclamation was assigned nine CCC camps for the third six-month enrollment period of the CCC. Of this total, six were assigned to "drought relief" work; but three camps were assigned specifically to park development projects: one camp at the Elephant Butte Reservoir near Truth or Consequences, New Mexico, and two camps at Lake Guernsey, Wyoming. Lake Minatare was soon included as well, and was assigned a CCC camp of World War I veterans. But of all the early Reclamation/CCC projects, Lake Guernsey State Park today remains the largest example, with the greatest artistic significance, and the highest level of integrity.[46]

The arrangement that allowed the Bureau of Reclamation to use the CCC to develop its reservoirs into parks also required that the Park Service provide technical assistance and supervision for the projects. This arrangement implied that, since Reclamation was not getting into the park development business directly, the bureau would eventually manage the new

---

[45]Brimmer, who was also a figure in local Republican politics, was particularly active promoting the tourist potential of the Guernsey area in the 1930s. George E. Brimmer, "Development of Lake Guernsey and the Establishment of National Monuments Urged," *The Guernsey Gazette*, February 7, 1936.

[46]Mark Junge, "National Register of Historic Places Nomination for Guernsey Lake Park," 1980, p. 5. National Register nominations are available at the National Register of Historic Places, National Park Service, 800 North Capitol Street, Washington, DC.

parks either through cooperative arrangements with local state park authorities or by transferring jurisdiction over the land around the reservoirs to the Park Service. But in 1934, when the CCC boys began arriving at Lake Guernsey, Wyoming had virtually no state parks or state park authority. Only one state reservation had been set aside, a one square mile section of land around the Big Horn Hot Springs, adjacent to the town of Thermopolis. Congress granted the land to the state in 1897 with the stipulation that the springs remain accessible to the public. The Wyoming State Board of Charities and Reform then build a bathhouse, and the City of Thermopolis developed public campgrounds; but the development of the hot springs (now Hot Springs State Park) hardly constituted a state park movement.[47]

In any case, the Park Service planners at Lake Guernsey were at first cooperating with the Bureau of Reclamation, a fellow bureau of the Department of the Interior, not a local park authority. (Specifically the planners worked with the reclamation engineers of the North Platte Projects Office.) This unusual situation put the 1934 Reclamation/Park Service/CCC projects into their own category: federal park projects being developed on federal land for what were essentially state park purposes, but without (at first) even the nominal involvement of a state park authority.

The cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation that began in 1934 also implied that the Park Service would be planning new kinds of federal reservations that were not predicated on the preservation of existing features as much as on exploiting new recreational opportunities associated with massive dam construction. As the pace of dam construction accelerated in the West, historian Barry Mackintosh notes that the development of new "national recreation areas" met with "some displeasure . . . when the Park Service joined forces with the dam builders" rather than fighting to preserve unspoiled canyons, which were often near or adjacent to existing national parks. Nevertheless, cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation expanded quickly after 1934. In 1936, the Park Service assumed responsibility for the land around the new reservoir behind Hoover Dam, which was slowly filling at the time. The reservoir, soon named for Elwood Mead, eventually had 550 miles of shoreline, offering extensive opportunities for every kind of water-related activity. The first national park of its type, the area was later designated the Lake Mead National Recreation Area and now covers 1,500,000 acres. The even larger Franklin D. Roosevelt Lake, behind the Grand Coulee Dam completed in 1941, was designated a national recreation area in 1946.[48] The project initiated at Lake Guernsey in 1934, if dwarfed by the Hoover and Grand Coulee projects, nevertheless provided an important precedent and presaged the kind of planning and development that would later be considered appropriate for the new national recreation areas.

The Guernsey project was clearly of a scale typical of contemporary CCC state park developments, however, even if it was under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation. But since no local park authority was involved in the project, in 1934 it was referred to as simply the "Lake Guernsey Park" project, leaving the matter of its classification ambiguous. By 1936 the project was known as "Lake Guernsey State Park," an apparent indication that the

---

[47]Raymond H. Torrey, *State Parks and Recreational Uses of State Forests in the United States* (Washington, DC: The National Conference on State Parks, 1926), 258-259.

[48]Unrau and Williss, *Expansion of the Nation al Park Service in the 1930s*, 153-155; Mackintosh, *Shaping the System*, 55-56.

park had been categorized as such--at least by the Park Service planners. But the State of Wyoming still had not been identified as the official cooperating local park authority, as states typically were for regular state park projects, and Wyoming would not officially assume the management of the park until 1957.[49] Until that time Lake Guernsey was in essence a state park, but in fact remained a kind of national park devoted to outdoor recreation. In this sense, Lake Guernsey was a unique link between Park Service state park planning, and the planning soon underway (also in Conrad Wirth's branch of planning) for Lake Mead and other national recreation areas. The history and the state of preservation of Lake Guernsey State Park today make it a unique and extremely significant record of the earliest cooperation between the Park Service and the Bureau of Reclamation, as well as a unique early example of Park Service "recreation area" planning and design for Western reservoir sites.

The first CCC enrollees at Lake Guernsey, Camp BR-9 (Company 844), arrived on May 21, 1934, under the supervision of camp superintendent J. H. Coffman, who would oversee most of the work in the park over the next five years. The camp was set up on a bluff north of the dam, and the boys were kept busy most of the season building the barracks and other facilities for the camp itself. That July they were joined by Camp BR-10 (Company 1855), which set up a camp on the west side of the reservoir. The Lake Guernsey shoreline was still largely undeveloped (although it was already frequented by the public) apart from the powerplant and some construction buildings near the dam. A shoreline drive, extending north from the dam along the reservoir, had also been begun as part of an early Civil Works Administration work relief project at the site.[50]

Park Service landscape architects had already begun planning for the site, however, in 1933. Landscape architect S. R. DeBoer had visited Guernsey that fall, and was given what must have been an enthusiastic tour by George Brimmer. The first comprehensive plans for the park were dated November 1934, about the time recruits had finished camp construction. The schematic plan at one inch to 2,000 feet was drawn by Park Service landscape architect Richard G. Redell, who went on to be the chief planner of the park. The initial 1934 plan for the park, which located the major park features in approximately the locations they were later built, was approved by Park Service district inspector Kenneth F. Jones.[51] Redell was soon joined in these efforts by another landscape architect, C. Eldon Jones, a recent graduate of the landscape program at Iowa State. By 1935, architects Roland G. Pray and E. S. Mosher had also been hired to contribute to the design effort at the park, most notably in the design of the park museum and overlook structures. Marshall Dayton was the project engineer, and was most active designing the park road system.[52]

---

[49] John F. Mahoney and Jeff Hauff, *Guernsey State Park Master Plan* (Cheyenne: Department of Commerce, State Parks & Historic Sites, 1994), 1, 14; Good, *Park and Recreation Structures*, 181.

[50] "CCC Reports from the Bureau of Reclamation," file from the Guernsey Museum Archives. Thanks to museum curator Jim Snyder for making these files available.

[51] "General Development Plan, November 21, 1934," drawing signed by R. G. Redell, Wyoming Department of Commerce, State Parks & Historic Sites, Cheyenne. Many of the original planning and design drawings for Lake Guernsey State park are conserved by Wyoming State Parks & Historic Sites, 2301 Central Avenue, Cheyenne, Wyoming.

[52] Mahoney and Hauff, *Guernsey State Park Master Plan*, 13.

By the spring of 1935, the early plans had been brought together in a "master plan," drawn by Redell and Eldon Jones, that clearly delineated major park roads, trails, overlooks, shelters, and other facilities. The park boundaries were shown in the plan as the boundaries of the "U.S. Reserved Land" acquired earlier in the century as part of the North Platte River Project. In addition the plan called for about 1,900 acres to be added to the federal property through the "submarginal land" acquisition program of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration.[53] By 1939, the new parcels of land had been added to the Bureau of Reclamation land, and with only very minor changes these are the statutory boundaries of Lake Guernsey State Park today.

The framework of the 1935 master plan was the construction of two park roads: Lakeshore Drive on the east side of the lake, to be lined with picnic areas and piers; and a skyline drive that would ascend the high bluffs on the west side of the reservoir, leading to scenic overlooks and picnic shelters. The park plan featured a single entrance (as per Park Service policy) on the southern edge of the property. The entrance road then forked immediately after the entry into the two main park roads. Both roads were depicted as long cul-de-sacs, but the potential for connecting Lakeshore Drive to a larger circuit through the Spanish Diggings archeological area (outside the park) to the north had already been discussed. The skyline drive, to the west, featured three spur roads that led to the lakeshore and to high overlooks. The skyline drive terminated at one of the most important overlook sites in the park.

The extent of park development shown in the 1935 master plan did not extend beyond the eastern bays of the lake, which were those nearest the dam and power station. The larger portion of the 14-mile long reservoir, upstream and to the west, was depicted in 1935 as an undeveloped area, well separated from the heavily developed recreation area, reflecting the general policy promulgated by Conrad Wirth and his branch of planning regarding the emphatic separation of "conservation" and "recreation" areas.

Other sheets of the master plan, drawn at a more detailed scale (one inch to 200 feet) depicted plans for the southeastern shore of the reservoir, which became the most developed portion of the park. This part of the lakeshore was near the dam and powerhouse sites, and so was accessible, or nearly so, from existing construction roads. It was also a logical area to site swimming and boat piers, since it featured a long and relatively level shoreline. The planned center of the development for this area of the park was a 4,700' hill north of the dam site, from which the dam, the reservoir, and much of the rest of the park could be seen. The first CCC camp had been sited on the west side of this hill, and in the 1934 plan a park museum was proposed for a shelf on the northern slope of the hill.

The museum site, accessible by spur road from Lakeshore Drive, was also shown as the center of an extensive trail network, which was a particularly emphasized aspect of the 1935 master plan. Foot trails in fact constituted a complete circulation system in the park, connected hill tops, overlooks, the park museum, the CCC camp, and other features. The steep topography and plentiful local building stone (including red and white sandstone, grey limestone, and red

[53] "Lake Guernsey Park, May 29, 1935," drawing signed by C. E. Jones, Wyoming Department of Commerce, State Parks & Historic Sites, Cheyenne.

shale) led to the construction of a large number of particularly well executed steps along the trail system and elsewhere in the park.[54]

The area around the museum and the CCC camp clearly received great attention from the park designers in 1934 and 1935. The area included the Park Service headquarters buildings, which were adjacent to (but not directly part of) the CCC camp. Plans for the area also located lots for the construction of leased vacation homes along the lake shore (a policy authorized earlier by the Bureau of Reclamation) as well as a superintendent's residence. Along the lake, various shelters and piers were proposed, and above, overlooks and trail shelters were suggested at viewpoints. In April 1935, C. Eldon Jones even drew up a planting plan for this overall area around the park museum. The plan (as much a vegetation management plan as a planting plan) indicated vistas to be kept open, as well as areas to be planted with native shrubs and trees. Carefully designed signs, picnic tables, and other

[54]"Lake Guernsey Park, Roads and Trails, April 11, 1935," drawing signed by C. E. Jones, Wyoming Department of Commerce, State Parks & Historic Sites, Cheyenne.

features, as well as the elaborate trail system, made this area on the southeastern shore of Lake Guernsey the most carefully and thoroughly designed in the park, as well as its hub of official activity.[55]

Public activity in the park was planned to be centered around certain attractions, notable the lake itself and the high overlooks around it. The shore of the lake, along Lakeshore Drive, was to be developed with picnic areas, pullouts for parking, and a series of shelters, drinking fountains and other facilities. On the opposite side of the lake, the skyline drive featured two main overlooks and picnic areas at two of the highest points in the park. In addition, the park's trail system offered an alternate means for the public to access and experience all of these sites. Construction on overlook shelters, fireplaces, picnic shelters, piers, water fountains, trails, comfort stations, and other park facilities was in full swing in 1935.

Central to all visitor facilities being constructed that year, however, was the most important building planned for the park, the park museum. Designed early in 1935, this exceptional building was the work of one of the resident architects, Roland G. Pray. Built entirely by the CCC crews (with help from "local experienced men") out of locally quarried buff and white sandstones, it was evident by 1936 that the museum would be an architectural highlight of the entire CCC state park effort.

Park Service architect Albert Good, the editor of *Park and Recreation Structures* (1936), included seven museums in that portfolio of outstanding Park Service design work. As through much of the volume, Good was influenced in his choice of examples by the architect Herbert Maier, one of Conrad Wirth's regional CCC directors, who was also the unofficial chief architect of the Park Service branch of planning. The first three museums depicted in the volume, for example, were the Fishing Bridge and Madison Junction museums (Yellowstone National Park) and the Yavapai Point Museum (Grand Canyon National Park) all designed by Herbert Maier in the late 1920s and early 1930s, when he had been a consulting architect to the Park Service. The next museum included was the "Lake Guernsey State Park" building, still under construction, but which was clearly executed in the style of Maier's classic trailside museums. Good felt the Lake Guernsey Museum 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."[56]

The low profile and battered walls of massive, randomly coursed sandstone blocks gave the Guernsey museum the particular appearance that Good--and Herbert Maier--encouraged for park structures in general, but especially for park museums and other interpretive structures. The main elevation, facing away from the hill and toward the distant view west, featured a single great arched portal, appearing from the distance almost like an opening in the hillside

---

[55]"Lake Guernsey Park, Planting, April 21, 1935," and "Lake Guernsey Park, Signs, June 24, 1935," drawings signed by C. E. Jones, Wyoming Department of Commerce, State Parks & Historic Sites, Cheyenne.

[56]Good, *Park and Recreation Structures*, 181. The last three museums were the Custer State Park museum, and two examples of adobe construction at Boulder Dam State Park, Nevada, and Petrified Forest National Monument.

itself. Centered on the view to Laramie Peak 30 miles to the west, the museum functioned (like several of Maier's museums) as an overlook shelter as well as a museum. The interior beams were of exposed oak, and the floor was Florida "pecky" cypress; the woodwork was complemented by oversize wrought iron light sconces and door handles designed by Pray and crafted in the CCC camp.

By 1939, the simple exhibition space, L-shaped in plan, was filled with display cases, models, artifacts, and interpretive panels designed by a team of Park Service exhibit designers, headed by John Ewers, from the Berkeley museum planning staff. The themes of the exhibits concentrated on regional history, Native Americans, geology, and agricultural development. The displays, as well as the museum building, received a great deal of attention from the Park Service for their exemplary design. In 1940, the Department of the Interior published a booklet, *The Museum at Guernsey, Wyoming*, which presented the completed facility as "one of the most beautiful small museums in the West."[57] Incredibly, the museum exhibits designed and built by John Ewers and his staff in 1939 survive today--like virtually every other aspect of the Guernsey museum--in perfect original condition.

Pray's Lake Guernsey museum did capture the ideal Maier had set for park museum design, and today represents the finest example of a trailside state park museum, with the highest degree of integrity, built by the CCC in the particular "rustic" style associated, above all, with Herbert Maier. Maier himself designed no specific projects for the Park Service after 1933, but did influence the style and character of the entire state park effort through his administrative positions. Maier was also able to directly influence the design of the Guernsey museum, since early in 1935 Wyoming was still part of Maier's "District III," an enormous area stretching from the Dakotas to Texas and New Mexico. In February 1935, Maier's regional "inspector-at-large," Frank H. Culley, reported that he had been to Lake Guernsey and spent an entire day with E. S. Mosher, one of the park architects. "I used the portfolios of standard designs and photographs," Culley reported to Maier, "and am sure he derived much that was valuable from them."[58]

The portfolios and photographs Culley referred to depicted work by Maier (especially his trailside museums), and other work that he had chosen to guide designers in his district. The report offers an insight into how Maier's central office in Oklahoma City controlled the style and character of individual CCC architectural projects over a broad area.[59] As the CCC districts became more numerous (and were renamed "regions") in March of 1935, however, Maier's direct responsibilities were limited to the southern states of his original district, and no

---

[57]Department of the Interior, *The Museum at Guernsey, Wyoming* (Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1940).

[58]Frank H. Culley, "Semi-Monthly Report, February 1-14, 1935," Entry 40, Reports of Regional Officers and Inspectors Concerning State Park Emergency Conservation Work, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[59]One of Maier's "photographic handbooks," the precursors of Good's published portfolios, is conserved at the National Archives. Herbert Maier, "Inspector's Photographic Handbook," n.d. [1935], Entry 127, Photographs of Engineering Activities, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

longer included the Wyoming project (which became part of a new "Region VI").[60] Maier's influence on architectural design in Conrad Wirth's branch of planning, however, continued to extend well beyond his official capacity as a regional CCC director.

The two CCC camps at Lake Guernsey were extremely busy through the winter of 1934 and in 1935, and the park was soon the showcase of CCC activity in Wyoming. By the spring of 1935, regional inspector Kenneth Jones reported that construction on the museum, park trails, shelters, and other projects was progressing well, and that "the appearance of energy shown by the enrollees is greater than in any other camp I know."[61] Events in the park were followed closely by the Town of Guernsey and, as usual, the visit by the CCC regional inspector warranted a story in the Guernsey Gazette, which also published Roland Pray's rendering of the park museum as well as status reports on other projects underway in the park.[62]

By 1935, several major structures (in addition to the park museum) were being built by the two CCC camps, now well established on either side of the lake. While the first (and longer lived) Camp BR-9 continued work on the museum and other projects on the east side of the lake, Camp BR-10 had furthered road construction on the skyline drive and was building picnic shelters and other structures at designated points. Architect E. S. Moser, assigned to Camp BR-10, provided designs for a combination picnic and overlook shelter, a comfort station, and picnic facilities for what was called the North Bluff area at the terminus of the skyline drive. The picnic shelter, soon christened the "Castle," constituted a small but complex structure, with an observation platform above and a covered picnic area below. Also built in the buff limestones quarried locally by the CCC boys, the shelter continued the excellent standard of architectural design for the park; and the random ashlar masonry, square tower, and winding stairway of the "Castle" indeed did impart a slightly medieval impression. The nearby comfort station, executed in massive sandstone blocks piled in heavily battered walls, inspired Regional Inspector Jones to remark that it was the best . . . latrine he had ever run into in the National Park Service," according to the Guernsey Gazette.[63] By the fall of 1935, Thomas Tucker, the superintendent of Camp BR-10, reported that the North Bluff comfort station was complete and the picnic shelter was well underway. Another lookout was constructed at Brimmer Point, and numerous road and trail projects were continuing.[64]

That January, however, as the CCC program contracted nationally, the western camp at Lake Guernsey (BR-10) was "withdrawn," or discontinued. The remaining camp in the park came under the supervision of a new regional inspector as well, Halsey M. Davidson. Davidson noted that several projects had been left incomplete by the camp, but would be taken up by

---

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

[61]Kenneth Jones, "April Report, 1935, Region VI," Entry 40, Reports of Regional Officers and Inspectors Concerning State Park Emergency Conservation Work, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[62]Clippings from the local paper were included by Kenneth Jones in his reports to his regional director.

[63]"News from Camp 1858," *The Guernsey Gazette*, September 13, 1935.

[64]Thomas Tucker, "Narrative Report, November 30, 1935," Entry 41, Project Reports on CCC Projects, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

Camp BR-9, adding that the "excellence of the work being done" by that camp was "commendable."[65] Despite the loss of one camp, the CCC at Lake Guernsey experienced a halcyon summer in 1936. Superintendent Coffman reported that museum and other major stone structures in the park were "98% complete" by that fall, and the recruits were moving on various smaller projects, such as log guardrail construction, as well as "guide and contact station work," greeting visitors and gathering information on them.[66]

Park visitation, in fact, had continued through the years the CCC had been at work. That summer, well over 4,000 visitors registered at the park museum, including the Governor of Wyoming, the state's Congressman, and assorted Park Service officials, especially from the museum and education divisions. Over 90% of the park visitors were from the surrounding towns and counties of Wyoming and Nebraska, and the overwhelming majority arrived on weekends in their own automobiles. Coffman guessed that average Sunday attendance during the peak season was about 800. People came to picnic, hike and especially to swim; but by 1936 motorboats were already an established tradition as well. Coffman counted up to nine motor boats at a time on the lake in 1936 (in addition to unmotorized craft). Motor boat racing and related activities were also at the heart of the most remarkable public events at Lake Guernsey during these years, the annual Water Carnival sponsored by the Lake Guernsey Boat Club. On August 11, 1935, for example, 20,000 people (the number was estimated and possibly inflated) descended on the park to see "hydro-plane" boats race for cash prizes, as well as boat jumps, "surf-board riders" towed by the boats, and "bathing beauties galore," according to the *Guernsey Gazette*.[67]

By the end of 1936, the park museum and many of the other projects initiated in 1934 were nearing completion. In 1937, landscape architect Richard Redell began drawing up another master plan indicating further park development projects for Lake Guernsey. The lake, and now the park, had obviously proven to be major regional attractions. As Redell put in the text of his second master plan, the park had "been designed in recognition of the need in this region for an intermediary development between the National Parks and the smaller community, or municipal parks: a week-end area."[68]

Some of the recommendations in the 1937 plan called for widening park roads from their 16-foot widths, expanding parking areas and creating new parking areas, and expanding the trail system. Many of these improvements were made in 1937 and 1938. Redell also envisioned new developed areas, recognizing the need for facilities to accommodate the growing numbers of visitors. For the principal developed area, around the park museum, Redell proposed a new "lodge" built along the lines of the museum, "to provide a meeting place for clubs, scout troops . . . and other local organizations." He also proposed a "Week-end cabin group," a common

---

[65]Halsey M. Davidson, "January Report, 1936," Entry 40, Reports of Regional Officers and Inspectors Concerning State Park Emergency Conservation Work, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[66]J. H. Coffman, "Narrative Report, November 30, 1935," Entry 41, Project Reports on CCC Projects, RG 79, National Archives, Washington, DC.

[67]" Some Features to Offer Thrills at the Water Carnival," *The Guernsey Gazette*, August 2, 1935.

[68]A transcribed text of the 1937 master plan by Richard G. Redell is in the Guernsey museum archives.

feature of Park Service state park plans of the period, to be built near the museum. In addition, Redell proposed a stone "bathhouse" for the convenience of swimmers, which was to be sited near the popular swimming float near the southeast corner of the lake. None of these more ambitious projects were undertaken, however, before the last CCC boys left the park in 1939. One of the most interesting new features proposed by Redell in 1937 was a nine-hole golf course, which required oiled sand greens in the dry climate. The course was built to the east of the museum area in 1939, but since then has been abandoned and is now overgrown.

Redell also suggested that the total park acreage, 8,640 acres (including optioned land), should be expanded. Although the optioned land was soon acquired, more ambitious expansions were never made (in fact the park has been slightly reduced in size, to 8,602 acres). But what Redell had in mind was the proposed extension of Lake Guernsey State Park "to include interesting historic land marks which dot the Guernsey area."

Richard Redell was not alone in seeking the creation of an expanded historical/recreational park, with Lake Guernsey at its center. As early as 1931, local boosters had suggested some kind of national park status for the scattered historic sites around the Town of Guernsey. In 1935, these suggestions became part of an ambitious park proposal, the "Oregon-Mormon-California-Overland Trails Historical Park," which would have linked 11 states with an intermittent park made up of individual units along the 19th-century emigrant routes. The plan had originally been a "Wyoming-Nebraska scheme," according to the *Denver Post*, put forward by the Wyoming Congressman, Paul Greever. An important advocate for Lake Guernsey State Park, Greever arranged for the 11-state park plan to be unveiled in the Town of Guernsey in April of 1935. A local version of the plan was being boosted simultaneously by the Wyoming Department of Commerce, which hoped to see Lake Guernsey at the center of an "Oregon Trail National Park," incorporating the historic sites nearby in Wyoming and Nebraska.[69]

Although echoes of plans for an "Oregon Trail National Park" continued into the 1960s, Lake Guernsey State Park became a state park in fact as well as in name when the Bureau of Reclamation finally entered into a cooperative agreement with the state Department of Commerce in 1957. Since that time, Lake Guernsey State Park has been conscientiously maintained, with few major alterations to the park since construction ended in 1939. The State of Wyoming has always recognized the historic importance of the park, and in 1980, Lake Guernsey became one of the first CCC-era parks to be placed on the National Register for its architectural significance.

Today, the park persists as solid evidence of the degree of craftsmanship, design, and planning that the CCC, the Park Service, and cooperating authorities attained between 1933 and 1942. As significant as Lake Guernsey State Park is in this regard, it also is unique in that it is the best surviving evidence of the early cooperation between the Bureau of Reclamation, the Park Service, and the CCC that lead to the development of new kinds of "recreation areas" around the federal reservoirs that proliferated in the 1920s and 1930s.

---

[69]"Eleven States Urged to Boost Missouri-to-Coast Park Plan," *Denver Post*, April 30, 1935; "Oregon Trail National Park Commission Will Meet at Lake Guernsey on Sunday," *The Guernsey Gazette*, April 26, 1935.

9. MAJOR BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

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

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

_____. *Summary Report of the Director of Emergency Conservation Work on the Operations of Emergency Conservation Work, April 1933 to June 1935*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1935.

Evison, Herbert. "The Civilian Conservation Corps in State Parks." In *American Planning and Civic Annual*, Harlean James, ed. Washington, DC: American Planning and Civic Association, 1934.

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

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

Lewis, Ralph H. *Museum Curatorship in the National Park Service, 1904-1982.* Washington, DC: Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1993.

Mackintosh, Barry. *The National Parks: Shaping the System*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1991.

Mahoney, John F., and Jeff Hauff. *Guernsey State Park Master Plan*. Cheyenne, Wyoming: Department of Commerce, State Parks & Historic Sites, 1994.

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

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.

Story, Isabelle F. *The National Parks and Emergency Conservation*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1933.

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

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

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

_____. *The Museum at Guernsey, Wyoming*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1940.

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.

Warne, William E. *The Bureau of Reclamation*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973.

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

Primary Location of Additional Data:

___ State Historic Preservation Office
X Other State Agency (State Parks & Historic Sites)
X Federal Agency
_ Local Government
_ University
_ Other (Specify Repository): National Archives, Record Group 79

10. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

Acreage of Property: 8,602 acres

UTM References:

	Zone	Easting	Northing		Zone	Easting	Northing
A	13	520460	4685220	**B**	13	520460	4681580
C	13	519760	4680780	**D**	13	518160	4680810
E	13	516000	4683220	**F**	13	514440	4683200
G	13	513130	4684780	**H**	13	511600	4686000
I	13	510710	4687260	**J**	13	510710	4688350
K	13	511520	4689160	**L**	13	512660	4689160
M	13	513920	4688360	**N**	13	513940	4687960
O	13	515940	4688000	**P**	13	518440	4686840
Q	13	519250	4685620				

Verbal Boundary Description:

The boundary of the Lake Guernsey State Park NHL District is defined by the park's statutory boundary as shown by the Wyoming State Parks and Historic Sites plan (shown on the accompanying plan provided by the Wyoming Department of Commerce).

Boundary Justification:

The boundary corresponds to the historic park boundaries developed by the National Park Service's master plan in cooperation with the North Platte Project Office of the Bureau of Reclamation during the park's period of significance.

The NHL District described constitutes an expansion of the existing National Register District. This expansion is necessary because the original park master plans addressed the land around the entire reservoir (roughly today's park boundaries), not just one area of the park. Although the National Register District adequately encompassed the historic architecture of the park, the NHL District is being nominated in the theme of Park Service landscape architecture and planning, and so must include the entire area considered in the historic park master plans.

11. FORM PREPARED BY

Name/Title: 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