

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942
Name of Multiple Property Listing

California
State

Table of Contents for Written Narrative

Create a Table of Contents and list the page numbers for each of these sections in the space below.

Provide narrative explanations for each of these sections on continuation sheets. In the header of each section, cite the letter, page number, and name of the multiple property listing. Refer to *How to Complete the Multiple Property Documentation Form* for additional guidance.

	Page Numbers
E. Statement of Historic Contexts	
(If more than one historic context is documented, present them in sequential order.)	
Introduction	E-1
California State Park Development 1933-1942	E-2
Park Rustic Architecture and Landscape Design in California State Parks 1933-1942	E-11
F. Associated Property Types	
(Provide description, significance, and registration requirements.)	
Service Facilities	F-29
Visitor Facilities/Public Use Buildings	F-32
Campgrounds and Day Use Facilities	F-36
Circulation Systems	F-39
CCC Camp Facilities	F-42
G. Geographical Data	
State of California	N/A
H. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods	
(Discuss the methods used in developing the multiple property listing.)	
	H-44
I. Major Bibliographical References	
(List major written works and primary location of additional documentation: State Historic Preservation Office, other State agency, Federal agency, local government, university, or other, specifying repository.)	
	I-46

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement: This information is being collected for applications to the National Register of Historic Places to nominate properties for listing or determine eligibility for listing, to list properties, and to amend existing listings. Response to this request is required to obtain a benefit in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 U.S.C.460 et seq.).

Estimated Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this form is estimated to average 250 hours per response including time for reviewing instructions, gathering and maintaining data, and completing and reviewing the form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate or any aspect of this form to the Chief, Administrative Services Division, National Park Service, PO Box 37127, Washington, DC 20013-7127; and the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reductions Project (1024-0018), Washington, DC 20503.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 1

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

STATEMENT OF HISTORIC CONTEXTS

Introduction

Emergency Conservation Work (ECW) in state parks was one of the major public works programs of the New Deal. The Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) was established to carry out the work of the ECW and became the name by which the program was commonly known. The CCC employed thousands of young men and put them to work carrying out conservation projects in the nation’s forests and parks in the 1930s.¹

In California the CCC renovated and developed twenty-nine existing and newly acquired state parks. The new state park system, while rich in land resources, was poorly equipped to accommodate visitors or provide for recreational use. Although the Park Commission made great progress in the area of land acquisition between 1928 and 1934 and the park system expanded from fourteen state parks and monuments to forty-nine state parks and eleven historic monuments, there were almost no resources with which to open the parks to the public. The creation of the CCC by federal legislation in 1933 suddenly provided both the funding and the manpower to make the park system one of the major recreational resources in the state.

The development of the California State Parks during the Great Depression was a joint effort among the CCC, the National Park Service, and the state park authorities. Under Criterion A of the National Register of Historic Places the extant national-state park and CCC work in California State Parks represents one of the largest and most successful examples of the New Deal park planning and development. The designed landscapes of the CCC national-state park cooperative program are a legacy that recalls the crucial founding era in state park history.

Working together the CCC, National Park Service, and California State Parks crafted a highly recognizable architectural and landscape architectural legacy through the buildings, roads, bridges, and campgrounds that they designed and constructed. All of the state park development work that was undertaken in California was carried out within a well defined aesthetic and design tradition. This style, known as Park Rustic, had been developed in the previous decade by the National Park Service specifically to harmonize visitor and administrative facilities with the natural environment and to enhance park visitor’s enjoyment of nature. For many generations the Park Rustic style has shaped the public’s expectations of what a national or state park should look like. Under Criterion C the state park units developed through the national-state park cooperative program and the CCC in the 1930s represent an extensive and fine example of this distinctive architectural style.

The role of the CCC as a part of the Depression era public works program of the federal government and of the national-state park cooperative program has been documented in several excellent historical and architectural historical studies. Notable among these is Linda Flint McClelland, *Building the National Parks: Historic Landscape Design and Construction* (1998), Ethan Carr, *Wilderness by Design* (1998), Phoebe Cutler, *The Public Landscape of the New Deal* (1985), Neil Maher, *Nature’s New Deal: The Civilian Conservation Corps and the Roots of the American Environmental Movement* (2008), and John Paige, *The Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Park Service, 1933-1942: An Administrative History* (1985). The origins and legacy of Park Rustic architecture in the National Parks is treated at length in McClelland and Carr and by Harvey Kaiser

¹ Although the CCC designation was only officially adopted later in the program, for purposes of clarity, it is henceforth referred to in this text by its more popular and better known title, without reference to its official designation as the ECW.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 2

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

in *Landmarks in the Landscape: Historic Architecture in the National Parks of the West* (1997). The background portion of this context statement relies most heavily on the comprehensive studies of McClelland and Carr. These works are footnoted only where specific facts or statements are directly derived from their text. More general background information on the origins of the Park Rustic style and the general development of the CCC and New Deal national-state park program is not directly cited.

Information on the national-state park cooperative program and the CCC within the California State Parks is drawn from primary resources within the collections of the California State Archives, National Archives, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, and the files and records of the California Department of Parks and Recreation, Sacramento, California.

California State Parks Development 1933-1942

The CCC and Parks

Franklin Delano Roosevelt took the oath of office on March 4, 1933. On March 31, 1933, he signed into law an act “for the relief of unemployment through the performance of useful public work,” thus creating the Emergency Conservation Work program, the largest peacetime mobilization in the history of the U.S. The CCC was part of the administration’s plan to relieve the massive unemployment brought about by the Great Depression. Roosevelt’s concept of the CCC was also deeply rooted in his strong interest and commitment to the environment. At his own estate in Hyde Park he had experimented with erosion control and reforestation. As a New York senator he had sponsored a number of conservation bills including one for the regulation of timber harvest on private land in the Adirondacks. As Governor he supported initiatives for soil conservation and reforestation, later both important components of the CCC program.

Reflecting Roosevelt’s emphasis on forests and parks as a centerpiece of CCC efforts, it is not surprising that the CCC was quickly dubbed Roosevelt’s “tree army.” Under the CCC legislation single men between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five were to be recruited to work on reforestation, soil conservation, and recreational development projects throughout the country. The vast majority of these recruits were to be drawn from the large pools of unemployed and largely unskilled workers in major American cities.² During the course of its existence (1933-1942) approximately twenty-six of the enrollees in the CCC were deployed in park and recreation work, with the remainder of recruits assigned to the forest services.³

The mobilization of such an immense work program in such a short period of time was an undertaking that brought to bear the full energies of several government agencies.⁴ The Department of Labor was charged with implementing a nationwide recruitment effort, the Department of War assumed responsibility for conditioning and transporting recruits, while the Park Service (Department of the Interior) and the Forest Service (Department of Agriculture) were charged with operating work camps and supervising work assignments. It was quickly

² John Paige, *The Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Park Service, 1933-1942: An Administrative History*, (Washington DC: National Park Service, 1985, 15. This age limitation was subsequently modified to provide for the hiring of Native Americans, what were known as “locally employed men,” who were older, often skilled, individuals and unemployed veterans of World War I.

³ Neil Maher, *Nature’s New Deal: The Civilian Conservation Corps and the Roots of the American Environmental Movement*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), #49.

⁴ *Ibid.* Roosevelt’s goal was to enroll 250,000 men nationally by the end of the first enrollment period (September 30, 1933).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 3

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

realized that that neither the Park Service nor the Forest Service had the manpower or facilities to house and operate work camps for the enrollees. This responsibility was transferred to the Army which had equipment and experience more suited to the task. To oversee this joint intergovernmental effort Roosevelt's CCC Director, Robert Fechner, established an Advisory Council made up of high level officials from the involved agencies, including Horace Albright, Director of the National Park Service.⁵

The National Park Service (NPS) was a key administrator of the CCC program as well as one of its largest beneficiaries. Through the CCC thousands of workers were provided to carry out development programs in national and state parks. In addition to developing a work program for National Parks, NPS was given responsibility for assisting the states in establishing state parks and in providing the infrastructure and amenities that would make these parks recreational resources for the public.

While NPS had been a participant in the State Park Movement of the 1920s and had strongly supported the concept of states setting aside natural preserves and recreation areas, the Park Service had no institutional structure for assisting states or carrying out state park development. The CCC program suddenly placed NPS in an authoritative leadership role in developing state parks throughout the country. The design offices that Thomas Vint had established in San Francisco provided a model for planning and developing state parks. The Master Plan program he had institutionalized, with its long term identification of park needs and proposed construction, set the standard for all park development. Vint's offices, while staffed with seasoned landscape architects, was not large enough to undertake the immense new program initiated by the New Deal legislation. Vint's office continued to focus on development within the National Parks, which vastly accelerated as a result of the New Deal program.⁶

To administer state park development an entirely new office was established within the National Park Service. NPS Director Horace Albright appointed Conrad Wirth to head a newly created State Park Division within NPS that was headquartered in Washington, D.C. Wirth, a landscape architect, was quite literally born into his involvement with parks and park design. The son of the Superintendent of Minneapolis' municipal parks, he studied landscape architecture with Frank Waugh.⁷ As the newly appointed head of the program of cooperation with state parks, one of Wirth's first acts was to regionalize the administration of state park work by setting up four offices. The offices were located in Washington D.C. for the eastern U.S., Indianapolis for the Midwest, Denver for the Rocky Mountains, and San Francisco for the Pacific Coast.

San Francisco was an obvious choice for the western office since Thomas Vint had already located NPS' design offices there in 1927. A branch office was quickly established in Glendale in southern California to deal with work in that part of the state. Lawrence Merriam was appointed director of the new San Francisco office. Like Wirth, Merriam was no stranger to park design and development. A forester by training, Lawrence was the son of John C. Merriam, an eminent paleontologist and long-time leader of the Save the Redwoods League.

⁵ Paige, 14.

⁶ Ethan Carr, *Wilderness by Design: Landscape Architecture and the National Park Service*. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 258. To handle this accelerated work pace the design branch within NPS increased its staff of landscape architects and engineers from sixteen in 1933 to one hundred and twenty in 1934.

⁷ Newton, 594-595. In 1951 Wirth became the Director of the National Park Service, a position he held until his retirement in 1964.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 4

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

The CCC camps were administered by state authorities and operated by the army. State park officials initially formulated their own work programs which were submitted to the National Park Service for approval. The CCC workers, assigned to camps within the park units, were overseen by a camp superintendent who had authority over direct project management. He coordinated and supervised engineering, construction, and maintenance for a single camp and managed the expenditure of government funds for the work projects of several camps.⁸ Depending on the size of the camp and scope of its work projects, each camp employed a number of foremen, often early enrollees who rose to a position of authority, and local employed men who provided expertise and skill training for the CCC crews.

Various organizational changes and consolidations modified this administrative structure over time with major consolidation occurring in 1934 when both National Park and state park work were placed under Wirth's control in Washington. In 1937 legislation was passed that changed the formal name of the CCC program to the Civilian Conservation Corps, the name by which this program was popularly known and usually referred to in the press.

The CCC program grew rapidly. By March, 1934, a year after its founding, there were sixty-one camps in National Parks and two hundred and thirty-nine state camps in thirty-two states.⁹ Despite its success and popularity, the expansion, reduction, and permanent institutionalization of the program remained a highly political issue. Initiated as an emergency measure to provide immediate relief to the unemployed, there was a wide range of opinion regarding its longer term purpose and necessity. Organized labor remained skeptical of what it saw as a program of low wage employment. Conservationists such as Aldo Leopold and Bob Marshall raised questions regarding the impact of extensive CCC development on natural and wilderness values in parks.¹⁰ The need for annual legislative funding reauthorization placed the fate of the CCC within the larger context of support and opposition for New Deal program in general.

Beginning in 1936 the federal government took steps to reduce the program, setting lower targets for recruitment and closing some CCC camps. From the mid-1930s until the beginning of World War II the program was slowly downsized, while at the same time advocates of the program, both inside and out of government, sought unsuccessfully to establish the program as a permanent government entity. With the war in Europe, the U.S. began planning for the defense of the country. In this context, remaining CCC camps in parks were closed down or transferred to military bases to carry out national defense work. War mobilization also cut into the number of available recruits as defense jobs, which paid higher wages, increased. Finally, despite Roosevelt's requests to the contrary, Congress ended funding for the CCC program in July 1942.

In the period from 1936 to 1942 the NPS technical and professional staff associated with the state park cooperative program was slowly cut back as well. Some of the landscape architects found employment in the Park Service permanent civil service, while others were absorbed into the growing state park bureaucracies that the CCC program had helped to develop.

⁸ Ibid., 69.

⁹ Ibid., 19.

¹⁰ Maher, 166.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 5

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

The CCC, National Park Service, and California State Parks

When the national-state park cooperative program was initiated in 1933, California, unlike many other states, had an established statewide park system with an administration centered in the Division of Beaches and Parks within the state’s Natural Resources Agency. The California State Park Commission, established by legislation in 1927, was comprised of men with national reputations in both the state park and conservation movements. Charles Wing, a Stanford graduate and engineer who had served as the executive officer of the California Redwood State Park (established in 1903), was appointed as the first Park Director (1928-1933).

In 1928 California passed its first park bond act by an overwhelming majority. The California State Park Commission immediately hired Fredrick Law Olmsted Jr. to undertake a statewide survey to identify important potential park lands that would preserve the best of the state’s scenic values.¹¹ Olmsted in turn hired Daniel Hull, the former National Park Service Chief Landscape Engineer, to oversee the project. Hull, along with Harry Shepard, University of California, Berkeley, professor of landscape architecture, and Emerson Knight, a well-known Bay Area landscape architect, sifted through hundreds of suggested park sites to arrive at the one hundred and twenty five acquisitions finally recommended by Olmsted.¹² These three distinguished landscape practitioners, working under Olmsted’s guidance, spent almost ten months gathering data and field inspecting prospective park lands. Hull’s year on the road inspecting potential parks no doubt prepared him for the position he would take in 1933 as one of the first national-state park program inspectors in California and in 1934 as the first Chief Landscape Architect for California State Parks.¹³

With the completion of the California State Park Survey at the end of 1929, the California State Park Commission embarked on an ambitious program of land acquisition. The Commission had approached Olmsted to head their acquisition work, but too consumed by other projects, Olmsted recommended that they hire Newton Drury, then Secretary of the Save the Redwoods League. Between 1930 and 1934 Drury led an acquisition program that increased the state parks from a dozen parks and five historic monuments to forty-nine parks by 1934.¹⁴ These acquisitions included a number of northern redwood stands at Patrick’s Point, Del Norte Redwoods, Bull Flats, and Mill Creek, as well as mountain and coastal areas including Mount Tamalpais, Mount San Jacinto, Palomar Mountain, Cuyumaca Rancho, Point Lobos, Pfeiffer Big Sur, Morro Bay, and one of the largest desert areas in the state at Borrego Springs. The state also acquired a major archeological site in Santa Barbara County with the addition of Mission La Purisima to the park system.¹⁵

By the early 1930s the park system in California was distinguished by its size, extreme variations in landscape zones, and vegetation. In the early years of the park system the focus of the California State Park Commission and of those like the Save the Redwoods League, who had enthusiastically supported its creation, was on the preservation of important natural landscapes that might otherwise be lost through resource extraction or real

¹¹ While Olmsted’s report is one of the major documents of early park planning and philosophy, his role in establishing the California State Park system went far beyond the survey itself. For several years prior to the first park bond act, Olmsted had been actively involved with the Save the Redwoods League and individuals such as Newton Drury, William Colby, Duncan McDuffie and John C. Merriam in developing the concepts that would guide a California park system and in developing political strategies to gain political and voter support.

¹² Olmsted, Fredrick Law, Jr., *Report of State Park Survey of California*, (Sacramento: California State Printing Office, 1929).

¹³ In the period prior to the Olmsted appointment and his CCC work, Hull worked in private practice with G. Stanley Underwood in Los Angeles.

¹⁴ Joseph Engbeck, *State Parks of California from 1864 to the Present*, (Portland: Charles H Belding, 1980), 60.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 62-63.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 6

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

estate development in the rapidly growing state. In the former category the north coast redwoods were of pressing concern and in the latter the coastal beaches. The state park bond provided funding primarily for acquisition, with little for park operations or development. Park oversight was provided by wardens with little assistance from professional, technical, or maintenance staff. Early wardens included Percy French in the northern redwoods and Guy Fleming in the southern part of the state, both of whom had responsibility for thousands of acres of public land.

In some cases the parks the state acquired had pre-existing resort facilities and roads that had been developed for automobile tourists in the 1920s. Among these Big Basin, Pfeiffer Big Sur, Humboldt Redwoods, and Van Damme were notable. For the operation of these facilities the Division of Beaches and Parks depended primarily on concessionaires, much as the National Park Service had done in its early years. Other parks had almost no amenities, including no public access. Neither funding, State Park Commission priorities, nor staffing supported any significant effort to develop visitor facilities beyond what had historically existed in the form of tourist camps.

Part of the State Park Bond campaign in 1928-1929 had been the promise that parks would become scenic and recreational resources for public use. The initiation of the CCC program with its assignment of large numbers of men to accomplish national and state park work provided the California Park System with an opportunity to develop public use facilities that might otherwise have waited many years before realization.

In addition to the manpower the CCC put at the disposal of the California State Park System, it also brought substantial additional funding. By 1935, federal funding had nearly doubled the budget for state parks. By 1937, at the height of the CCC program, out of the \$13 million expended nationwide on state park cooperative projects, California received \$693,000, the fourth highest expenditure in the country.¹⁶ While some of this funding went to augment the state bond funds for acquisition, a large percentage was concentrated on developing amenities to open the parks to the public.

In many other states the first CCC work periods were centered on establishing a park system and in acquiring land for parks. Although relatively new, the California Park System had already addressed these issues and with the Olmsted survey, bond funding, and an active acquisition program, California had already moved well beyond this initial threshold of park building.

In addition to having an established park system, the national-state park program in California was staffed by men with considerable knowledge and experience in park design, as well as great familiarity with California's natural environment and park lands. Lawrence Merriam, had grown up amid his father's founding work for the Save the Redwoods League. A graduate of the University of California, Berkeley in forestry, he had been a professional forestry consultant to both the National Forest Service and National Park Service . In his later career he became Superintendent of Yosemite and later director of the western regional office of the National Park Service.

One of the first employees that Merriam hired was Daniel Hull, who was charged with coordinating with the California State Parks authorities. In his early career (1920-1927), Hull had formulated many of the principles of

¹⁶ National Park Service, *1937 Year Book*, (Washington D.C.: Department of the Interior, 1937), 18.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 7

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

Park Rustic landscape architecture and as a result of the 1929 park survey he was already familiar with the state park system and its resources. Another key figure in the initiation of the CCC program in California State Parks was Charles Wing who had hands on knowledge of park operations from his years as the warden of Big Basin. Following his resignation as State Park Director, he was immediately hired by the NPS Western Office to become the Engineer in Charge of federal projects in state parks. At the same time, Daniel Hull moved from his CCC position to become the first landscape engineer for California State Parks.

Newton Drury, Secretary of the Save the Redwoods League and acquisition officer for the State Park Commission, was actively involved in consulting on CCC projects and in monitoring and advising on development matters of particular importance to the League. At the end of the CCC program, Drury became Director of National Parks during World War II, and later returned to California to direct the California State Park system.

The existence of well-established park units and the involvement of an exceptionally qualified and knowledgeable NPS Western Office and California park leadership group played an important role in the rapid development of an ambitious CCC work program in California. In many states early state park work centered on organizing park systems, while CCC work was limited to debris clean-up, erosion control, fire hazard removal, and firefighting. In California by the fall of 1933, only seven months from the creation of the CCC and four months from the arrival of the first recruits at California camps, major construction projects were in the planning stage or already under construction.¹⁷

As a part of the initial start-up of the CCC program, three CCC camps were established in California State Parks in June of 1933. The first camps were located at Humboldt Redwoods, Big Basin, and Cuyumaca. By October four additional camps had been added at Mount Diablo, Pfeiffer Big Sur, Prairie Creek, and Russian Gulch. Among these, the latter three also were assigned responsibility for several nearby parks. The CCC camp at Pfeiffer Big Sur had responsibility for Point Lobos. The CCC at Prairie Creek was the center of operations for work at Dry Lagoon, Little River State Beach, Del Norte Redwoods, Hiuchi (now Jedediah Smith Redwoods) and Patrick’s Point. The Russian Gulch camp had responsibility for work at Van Damme and Dimmick State Parks and the Sonoma Coast beaches.¹⁸ This pattern of organization in which one “core” camp carried out projects for several park units became relatively standard as more CCC camps were sited throughout the state.

In 1935, twelve camps were added at Castle Crags, McArthur-Burney Falls, Calaveras Big Trees, Mount Tamalpais, Tule Elk Reserve, San Clemente, La Purisima, Mt. San Jacinto, Rubicon Point, Morro Bay, Mt. Palomar, and New Brighton Beach. In addition a camp at Armstrong Redwoods appears to have been established in 1934 and then reoccupied in 1938.

These twenty CCC camps, all in place by the end of 1935, formed the core of the CCC state park work program in California. Administratively the CCC was organized into companies, groups of men who, like an army company or brigade, worked together under a single leadership. Each company was designated by a number.

¹⁷ Recent histories of the CCC, particularly Neil Maher’s *Nature’s New Deal*, have stressed that the initial work of the CCC concentrated on fire hazard control, reforestation, erosion control and other conservation oriented projects. In this interpretation, recreational development in parks got underway late, and did not become a major component of CCC work until 1936. While this may be true in most parts of the country, major facility development began in California in 1934 and were well underway by the mid-1930s.

¹⁸ “Monthly Narrative Reports to Regional Landscape Architect, 1936-1938.” Record Croup 79, National Archives.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 8

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

CCC companies were assigned to camps which provided living accommodations for the company. Over a period of time, different CCC companies occupied different camps. Occupation of the camps appears to have been governed in part by the complexity of the development program and the ability to work on a year-around basis. Big Basin and La Purisima had the most consistent camp occupancy. At La Purisima, Company #1951 served from July 1934 until June 1942, the longest assignment of any company to a camp in the California program. However, this was the exception and clearly reflected the very ambitious program of building and landscape development at that historic park. More typical was the occupancy at Cuyumaca where a core company (#1944) remained two years, and was supplemented by several other companies that occupied the camp for a few months at a time. In some cases, occupancy was controlled by seasonal considerations with work being largely or entirely closed down during the winter months. This was true at Castle Crags, Calaveras, Rubicon Point, Mt. San Jacinto, and other mountain parks. In general, a fairly constant rotation of companies through camps was typical. During the CCC program duration Calaveras was occupied by six companies, Cuyumaca by ten, Mount Diablo by six. In addition to the turnover of companies, the enrollment terms of individuals were limited and each work period a certain number of men either left the program or rotated to other work assignments.

In this situation the National Park Service program’s professionals played a key role in providing consistency and continuity. Each NPS state park program regional office hired a number of design professionals, principally landscape architects. Early in the program these men were called inspectors, but later in the program, as their numbers grew, they were given the title of landscape architect. In carrying out their jobs the NPS landscape architects were aided by the state park coordinating authorities in the person of Daniel Hull, California State Parks landscape architect, and the regional state park superintendents who grew in number during the Depression years. The Locally Employed Men (LEM) also lent stability since they were residents of adjacent local communities and worked in the same park or parks over a longer period of time.

The Park Service landscape architects were most responsible for the approval of designs and the execution of park projects. During the first year of the program the NPS state park office had limited staffing consisting primarily of Daniel Hull 1933-34 and Charles Wing 1935-37.¹⁹ During 1934, George Gibbs, who had been associated with Olmsted Brothers, also served as a Regional Landscape Inspector. However, his initial California tenure was brief with his moving to Omaha, Nebraska in 1935. In 1937 he returned to California to take up a position as a landscape architect in the National Park’s state park cooperative program.

The initial role of the inspectors, such as Hull and Gibbs in California, was to coordinate the production of plans and drawings by technicians who had been assigned to the CCC camps. These specialists, often recent graduates of landscape architecture and architecture programs, were crucial to achieving good park design in the first few years of the program.²⁰ In January 1935 Charles Wing, newly appointed as an inspector, commented that in all the camps he saw evidence of intelligent, skillful work by the technical staff in preparing plans.²¹ The National Park Service and state authorities, such as Gibbs, Hull, and the State Park Superintendents, met often with design and construction staff in the parks, adjusting siting and design on the ground. Based on the National Park Service

¹⁹ Minutes, California State Park Commission, {DATE}. As noted earlier in the text, Hull was hired by Merriam in 1933 as the Engineer-in-Charge of State Park work. Toward the end of 1934 Hull was hired to work directly for the California Division of Beaches and Parks as their Chief Landscape Engineer, a position he retained until his retirement in 1949.

²⁰ McClelland, 401.

²¹ Charles Wing to George Nordenholt, letter/report, January 22, 1935. Management in California State Archives, Series F3735: 208-211, Reports (1927 to 1948). Point of Record Group State Park and Recreational Commission Records.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 9

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

architects' and state park staff's reports, it appears that these men spent a large part of their time on the road, moving from one park to another to inspect projects, make needed modifications, and keep both the National Park Service and state authorities informed of problems and progress.

By 1935-1936 the Park Service began to press for more uniformity in design work to ensure that the Park Rustic design aesthetic was extended into state parks. In 1935 the National Park Service issued *Park Structures and Facilities*, a plan and pattern book that presented acceptable design models for a wide variety of park buildings and structures. Three years later, an elaborated, three volume *Park and Recreation Structures* was published that incorporated advice and examples of campground design based on the ideas that E.P. Meinecke had developed in the 1920s.

In addition to providing written guidance, NPS began to consolidate the design and planning functions for state parks in the national-state park cooperative program offices in San Francisco and Glendale. This idea was already being explored in mid-1935 when Charles Wing and Lawrence Merriam discussed the idea of the state providing funding to rent space for architectural staff that would be hired by NPS.²² On the state side, Daniel Hull strongly supported centralization efforts arguing that this would be more efficient and cost effective than undertaking design in each individual CCC camp.²³ Although a centralized design office remained a goal, it appears that in actual practice drawings and plans continued to be prepared in the camps, under more direct supervision from the NPS regional and state professional personnel.

By 1936, the National Park Service offices had developed a small, but dedicated, staff of landscape architects. Between 1936 and 1938 these men oversaw and coordinated much of the work in California State Parks. With this shift to a larger, more design oriented NPS office, Daniel Hull was given authority by the State Director of Natural Resources to approve all California CCC work program and designs for the Division of Beaches and Parks.²⁴

The Monthly Reports of the Regional Landscape Architects submitted to Merriam in San Francisco provide a picture of the architects' multiple duties. Each landscape architect was assigned a specific set of parks which he oversaw for several months, or even years, at a time. The park assignments tended to be regionally organized, and often extended over hundreds of miles. In 1936, Louis Brandt, one of the earliest NPS landscape architects, oversaw state parks from Silver Strand on the Mexican border to Big Basin in Santa Cruz County. As staff was increased, the number of assignments for each architect lessened, thus allowing them more time and attention to supervise the progress of individual projects within park units. The architects spent at least half of their time visiting parks. NPS landscape architects played a key role in establishing priorities and work programs and were responsible for making sure the work went well and on schedule.

Beginning in 1936 and gaining momentum in 1937, the landscape architects placed a strong emphasize on the need for comprehensive master planning in state parks. This initiative was modeled on the National Park Service master planning process which Daniel Hull initiated in the 1920s and Thomas Vint institutionalized after he took over leadership of the Service's Branch of Plans and Designs in 1927. The 1937 *Yearbook of Park and Recreation Progress*, the National Park Service annual report on the state park cooperative program, led off with

²² Wing to Merriam, letter, July 31, 1935. Same as previous.

²³ Daniel Hull to George Nordenholt, letter, July 26, 1935. Same as previous.

²⁴ Nordenholt to Hull, letter, November, 1935. Same as previous.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 10

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

an article on the primary importance of master planning for park development. In line with this policy initiative, master planning efforts were initiated in several California parks including Big Basin, Big Sur, Cuyumaca, San Clemente, Humboldt Redwoods, and Mount Tamalpais. Several more were begun the next year in 1937. The landscape architects' reports reflect the efforts that were now focused on these major planning documents. In the architects' monthly reports mention is frequently made regarding CCC progress in carrying out boundary studies and topographic mapping as a precondition for producing master plan documents.

The state park master planning initiative was rooted not only in the tradition established by NPS, and was also a response to a number of more immediate factors. Although the CCC had already constructed twenty-seven buildings and eighteen campgrounds by 1935, Charles Wing noted that in the future fire trails, hazard removal, and other environmental concerns would take a backseat to the development of visitor facilities.²⁵ Both state park and NPS staff quickly realized that these more elaborate projects required longer term planning than was provided by the annual work plans. In placing permanent buildings and structures in parks the overall development of the park needed to be considered and projects phased over a period of years. The master plan was seen as the foundation document that would provide a multi-year perspective on building, construction, and landscaping efforts.

In addition, political developments in Washington by 1936 began to make clear that the CCC program would eventually be reduced or even phased out. Anticipating that in the future the state park agencies would take over responsibility for park development, the master plans were seen as a way of establishing good planning practices within state park administrations and ensuring that the National Park Service legacy in state parks would be continued. In California master plans were prepared for at least eighteen parks including Humboldt Redwoods, Big Basin (California Redwoods), Pfeiffer Big Sur, Calaveras Big Trees, Mount Tamalpais, La Purisima Mission, Prairie Creek, Cuyumaca Rancho, Palomar Mountain, Patrick's Point, Tule Elk Reserve, Mount Diablo and Sunset, New Brighton, Natural Bridges, San Clemente, and Doheny.²⁶ Fewer of the northern redwood and other northern parks appear to have had master plans developed. In part this may be explained by the fact that during the period of intensive plan development in 1936-1938, these parks experienced severe summer fires that significantly delayed work other than firefighting and hazard removal.

Most buildings and structures constructed in the California State Parks were undertaken between 1936 and 1942 and were considered in the master planning process. However, it also appears that while master planning provided a framework for overall park development, substantial work was planned and executed within individual park units without the benefit of this guidance. The primary period of master plan development occurred between 1936 and 1938. Work undertaken between the beginning of the CCC program in 1933 and the initiation of the master plans was accomplished on the basis of an annual work plan that was prepared by each CCC camp and agreed upon by NPS inspectors and state park staff. As the number of landscape architects was increased at NPS, they increasingly absorbed the responsibility for preparing the annual work program and the

²⁵ Carol Roland, "CCC Resources in the State Park System," unpublished report, Department of Parks and Recreation, December 1991; Wing to Nordenholt, letter, Feb 5, 1935.

²⁶ "Reports to Regional Landscape Architect." Few of these master planning documents remain in either State Park files, or in the California State Archives. Plans for Patrick's Point, Palomar, and Tule Elk Reserve are on file in the Department of Park and Recreation. CCC Cooperating program procedure required that three copies of each master plan be provided to Washington. Most of these documents were deposited in the Library of Congress. Copies of the California plans, that were not available for this study, would provide substantial additional information regarding park design in California.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 11

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

preparation of master plans.

The national-state park program's most active period of construction and development was between 1934 and 1938, a period that precedes and overlaps with the master planning efforts. During those years an average of sixteen camps were operating within the State Park system. In 1936 Congress began to reduce funding for the CCC program with resulting cuts in the national-state park program. While work was only slightly reduced between 1937 and 1938, by 1939 the number of CCC camps in the parks had been dramatically reduced with most of the camps closed by the summer of 1941. The last two companies at Cuyumaca and Mount Diablo departed in July 1942.

Under Criterion A the national-state park program and the CCC in California are important examples of government action and social history. Their accomplishments had a major and lasting impact on the development of California's extensive state park system that remains in evidence today. In addition, they are a prime example of the public works programs of the New Deal that mobilized the nation in an effort to provide immediate relief to the unemployed and to promote longer term economic recovery. The programs led directly to the construction of hundreds of administration buildings, ranger residences, maintenance yards, restrooms, campgrounds, roads, trails and water systems. The national-state park cooperative program and the CCC built a wide variety of visitor facilities from nature centers, to open air theaters, to boating docks, and recreation halls. Many of these facilities continue to provide the basic services for which they were originally planned and designed. These facilities succeeded in making parks accessible to the public and in providing a major recreational resource for the state.

Park Rustic Architecture and Landscape Design in California State Parks 1933-1942

Background

The National Park Service drew on several strands of historic and contemporary architectural and landscape architectural theory and practice in developing what has come to known as the Park Rustic style. Park Rustic is a distinctive style of architecture designed to blend unobtrusively with the environment of lands set aside for natural preservation. Some of the major influences on National Park Service design and the emergence of a distinctive Park Rustic style are discussed in the following sections.

Architectural Influences

The Adirondack Great Camps and Rustic Vernacular

The resorts and camps built in the Adirondack Mountains of New York in the nineteenth century are one of the most significant precedents for recreational building in a wilderness environment. The Great Camps of the Adirondack Mountains are among of the earliest examples of an architecture designed specifically for outdoor recreation. By the late 1860s railroad transportation had made parts of the Adirondacks accessible to visitors who wanted to enjoy its rugged scenery, hunt, fish, canoe, and hike.²⁷ Many of the early resort hotels exhibited a Victorian predilection for turreted buildings with lacework verandas and porches. But some wealthy private

²⁷ Harvey Kaiser, *Great Camps of the Adirondacks*, (Boston: David Godin Publisher, 1986), 33. In 1868 the first line from Plattsburgh to Point Rocks was completed and three years later, William Durant completed the first major branch of his Adirondack Railroad.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 12

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

landowners began to build their summer retreats in a manner that turned away from the conventions of Victorian architecture and that drew on local vernacular buildings that responded to the often extreme winter weather conditions of the mountains and made use of locally available building materials.

Log construction, steep roofs with wide overhangs, and natural rock foundations characterized many of the pioneer residences in the Adirondack region. Great Camp builders adapted these aspects of the local building tradition into the creation of imposing summer camp enclaves that often included a main lodge, many smaller sleeping cabins, docks and boat houses, gazebos and outdoor structures, and servants' quarters.

The adoption of local precedents resolved a number of practical problems. Raised stone foundations protected timbers from the ground damp that came from heavy winter snowfall and a long spring rainy season. The use of logs precluded the need to ship milled building materials long distances and transport them to remote sites. Large timbers and beams supported roofs that had to carry heavy snow loads, while wide overhangs prevented snow from building up against foundations and walls. Stone fireplaces with high chimneys protected against fire.

The aesthetic that emerged from the use of vernacular models and natural, local materials appealed to a romantic and picturesque ideal of nature, particularly as espoused in the 1850s and 1860s by the influential writer, horticulturist, and designer, Andrew Jackson Downing. In the words of National Park historian Linda McClelland, "Downing cultivated in the American mind an aesthetic appreciation of wild places and stimulated images of the picturesque qualities of such places."²⁸

The Adirondack Style became widely popularized through pattern books and architectural publications. In 1888 William Wicks published *Log Cabins: How to Build and Furnish Them*, William S.B. Dana produced *The Swiss Chalet Book* in 1913, William Phillips Comstock wrote *Bungalows, Camps and Mountain Houses* in 1915, and Augustus Shepard produced *Camps in the Woods* in 1931. This latter provided a compendium of Great Camp architecture and set forth principals regarding camp design based on Shepard's extensive experience in this field. Comstock's book bore testimony to the wide influence of Adirondack style, providing examples of summer homes of this type in such disparate places as Signal Mountain, Tennessee, Leland, Michigan, and Paso Robles, California.²⁹ Although many of the Adirondack camps were designed and built by local craftsman, a number of notable architects also were associated with the grand hunting lodges of New York State. Robert Robertson designed Santanoni and Forest Lodge. McKim, Mead, and White, John Russell Pope, and Delano and Aldridge all designed hunting lodges. Davis, McGrath, and Shepard completed several commissions for the Adirondack League Club, while William Coulter built several enclaves at Saranac Lake.³⁰ This work was featured in professional architectural publications as well as in more popular periodicals such as *House and Garden*.

National Park Service landscape engineers were strongly influenced by a number of aspects of Adirondack Style including the use of rubble stone masonry foundations, log construction, exposed heavy beams, wide roof overhangs, massive masonry fireplaces, rustic work decoration, the practice of siting buildings and features with the natural topography, and grouping buildings into relatively compact enclaves surrounded by many acres of undisturbed nature. It is noteworthy that Shepard's detailed book on Great Camp architecture came out in 1931,

²⁸ Linda McClelland, *Building the National Parks*, (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1998), 20.

²⁹ William Comstock, *Bungalows, Camps and Mountain Houses* (New York: W.T. Comstock Co, 1915; reprinted American Institute of Architects, 1990).

³⁰ Kaiser, *Great Camps*, 69.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 13

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

just two years before the CCC was established. Linda McClelland points out that the Park Service's own *Park Structures and Facilities* manuals, published in 1935 and 1938, and widely used in the design of state park facilities, were modeled after Shepard's presentation and that Herbert Maier incorporated many of Shepard's ideas into the inspectors' guide for state park Emergency Conservation Work in the 1930s.³¹

Shingle Style and Resort Architecture

Shingle Style developed in the same decades as the Adirondack Camps with which it shared common traits. It emerged in the late 1870s in the northeast as a popular housing style, particularly in suburban areas such as Llewellyn Park in New Jersey and Tuxedo Park in New York, and summer resorts like Newport, Rhode Island. Abandoning symmetrical arrangement in floor plan and exterior openings, Shingle Style brought a new freedom and openness into the planning of houses. It offered a flexible system of massing that accommodated interior functions. Characterized by asymmetrical compound floor plans, segmented bays, round turrets, sweeping roof forms, dormers, and wide sheltered verandas, this form of the building more carefully integrated building, site, and surrounding landscape. It allowed scenic aspects of the site to be incorporated into the house by punching openings and locating porches to frame views and vistas of distant mountains, coastline, and rolling meadows. Although sharing many of the design elements of the Queen Anne that preceded it, the shingle house was, as described by Marcus Wiffen, "altogether simpler and quieter... with more horizontal emphasis and much less variety of color and texture." As its name implies, the walls of these houses were always clad with a uniform covering of wooden shakes or shingles and frequently had a first story or half-story of coursed or random rubble masonry.³² These types of materials gave the style a rustic and informal appearance well suited to suburban and resort settings.

Probably the most influential practitioner of Shingle Style was Henry Hobson Richardson. Richardson's Stoughton House in Cambridge (1882) is considered by many to be his masterpiece in this genre. His Ames Gatehouse, outside Boston, was a building of massive rubble boulders with a prominent shingle roof. Richardson worked on this project with Fredrick Law Olmsted, with whom he also collaborated in the design of rustic arched stone bridges, shelters, and monuments in Boston's parks. A number of other notable Boston architects including McKim, Mead and White, Peabody and Stearns, and Arthur Little worked in the Shingle Style.

On the West Coast, Willis Polk, who had worked in Richardson's offices, introduced the Shingle Style in San Francisco and northern California where it flourished through the turn of the century. Along with fellow architect Ernest Coxhead, he adapted principles of Shingle Style to the often rugged and hilly terrain of the Bay city. The flexible floor plans of Shingle Style houses were ideally suited to difficult sites and worked well to frame views of the San Francisco Bay, the Marin Headlands, and the East Bay hills. At the same time, the emerging environmental consciousness of the Bay Area embodied in the vogue of camping, the beginnings of the Sierra Club, and the Bohemian Grove woodland retreats, provided a local inspiration for their work and as well as a willing and interested clientele. Polk and Coxhead designed a number of Shingle Style houses on Russian Hill and adjacent to the Presidio military post in Pacific Heights.³³ On the other side of the Bay, Bernard Maybeck produced a number of Shingle Style designs in the Berkeley hills with exposed rafters and trusses, and massive

³¹ McClelland, 103.

³² Marcus Wiffen, *American Architecture since 1780: A Guide to Styles*, (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1981), 127-128.

³³ Richard Longstreth, *On the Edge of the World: Four Architects in San Francisco at the Turn of the Century*, (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989), 110-111.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 14

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

fireplaces.

In addition to their urban adaptations of the style, Polk and Maybeck produced some West Coast rustic buildings similar in concept to the Adirondack retreats of the East Coast's industrial aristocracy. On the McCloud River in northern California, Polk designed "The Bend," a massive rubble masonry hunting lodge with a series of gable and octagonal shingle roofs. In Grass Valley in the Sierra foothills, he designed a country house for the Bourne family. While the Bourne House is English Revival in its exterior, it exhibits a rusticated interior of unfinished woods, massive fireplaces, and exposed beams. Also along the McCloud River, Maybeck designed the highly idiosyncratic "Wyntoon" for Phoebe Hearst. An interpretation of a Nordic mediaeval castle, it used open trusswork, rubble masonry, shingle cladding, and broad shingle roofs. Late in his career (1921), Maybeck designed the Glen Alpine Resort in the Sierra, combining natural materials and elements of his earlier rustic shingle design with industrial elements.³⁴

The rustic stone and shingle buildings associated with the Shingle Style, especially those that were incorporated into nineteenth century urban parks had a strong influence on later National Park Service architects and landscape architects.³⁵ Several of the NPS landscape engineers and architects attended Harvard's pioneering landscape architecture program and worked with Henry Hubbard. Hubbard, in his *Introduction to Landscape Design*, specifically singled out Shingle Style as suitable to park design and called attention to the work of Richardson and Olmsted in Franklin Park in Boston. Thomas Vint and Herbert Maier, important early National Park Service designers, both studied at Berkeley and were no doubt familiar with the San Francisco Bay Area adaptation of the Shingle Style, several examples of which are found on and near the university's campus.

The Arts and Crafts Movement and the Bungalow

The Arts and Crafts Movement, which had its origins in England, deplored the dehumanizing effects of the industrial revolution and the loss of craft that resulted from industrial production. Dedicated to righting social ills through the medium of art, Arts and Crafts Movement adherents stressed simplicity of design, honesty of materials, and handcraftsmanship. In America, these ideas were disseminated through the work of Gustav Stickley whose periodical, *The Craftsman*, and his books, *The Craftsman Home* (1909) and *More Craftsman Homes* (1912) had a wide circulation. In addition to providing a forum for the philosophical and aesthetic message of the Arts and Crafts Movement, Stickley's publications provided practical and affordable examples of craftsman buildings and interiors, including floor plans. The Craftsman ideal found high style expression in the work of many California architects such as the Greene Brothers, Bernard Maybeck, and Julia Morgan. Many examples of their work, as well as that of other architects were published in *The Craftsman* as well as professional publications such as the *American Architect and Building News*.

Stickley also provided many examples of small homes that incorporated the characteristic elements of Arts and Crafts style, such as open plans, rustic material, exposed wood surfaces, and handcrafted details such as tile work, leaded and stained glass, and hand forged hardware. The emphasis placed on porches, verandas, and in many of the California examples, a central patio, encouraged an integration of the house with its surrounding environment that was new in residential design.³⁶ The garden came to be seen as a part of the overall aesthetic of

³⁴ McClelland, 110.

³⁵ Ibid, 94.

³⁶ Greene and Greene's Bandini House is often cited as the first example of the interior patio design. It was quickly imitated in building

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 15

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

the residence and was made accessible, both physically and visually, by well-placed windows and doors. Stickley's popular publications were supplemented by a large number of other plan books and occasional publications that had both national and regional circulation. Many of the publishing companies that produced these books also furnished low cost architectural drawings that could be mail ordered to contractors and builders, as well as prospective home owners.

These smaller, lower cost homes came to be almost universally referred to as bungalows. Between the late 1890s and the 1920s, the bungalow was one of the most popular forms of housing in the U.S.; enjoying a particular vogue in California with its generally mild climate. Although the true bungalow is defined as a one or one-and-one-half story house, it actually came in many styles and forms.³⁷ The ubiquitous bungalow familiarized architects, designers, and the general public with a rusticated aesthetic that was characterized by low pitched roofs, wide overhangs, exposed eaves, prominent stone chimneys, wide porches, and an integration of site and building achieved through stone walkways, retaining walls, and gardens that incorporated native plants.

The Railroads and the Architecture of Western Tourism

Prior to the establishment of the National Park Service in 1916, Congress had already created a number of National Parks. Following the establishment of Yellowstone in 1872, Yosemite, Sequoia, General Grant, Crater Lake, Mount Rainier, Glacier, and Rocky Mountain were designated as parks by 1910. Always anxious to find means to increase passenger traffic, the railroads were strong supporters of the National Parks and were actively involved in promoting park tourism and in providing facilities for visitors. Acting as concessionaires, the railroads built many of the original hotels, viewing platforms, and other structures in the early parks. Aware of the exoticism and romanticism that the idea of the West held for many Americans, the railroads sought to create buildings that would meet visitors' expectations and enhance their experience.³⁸

The Old Faithful Inn (1903) is generally considered the first major use of rustic architecture in the parks. Designed by Robert Reamer, the hotel features a dramatically sloped multi-story roof punctuated by exaggerated gabled dormers enhanced with natural bent wood purlins and brackets. The interior of the building exhibited exposed peeled log trusses and beams, balconies with rustic log rails, and wheel shaped chandeliers. Although concessionaire hotels differed in design, the adoption in Reamer's work of a rustic, western themed aesthetic set a tone that is reflected in other lodges. The Glacier Park Lodge (1913), designed by Thomas McMahon and built by the Great Northern Railroad, took its inspiration from the Swiss Chalet. It was of log construction with tiers of exterior verandas enclosed by log railings. Like Mary Coulter's and Charles Whittlesey's buildings at Grand Canyon, the original Glacier Lodge incorporated craft work from the local Native American tribes, including a full size teepee in its lobby.³⁹

Even before the establishment of the National Park Service, the Department of the Interior became involved in park construction. In 1913 Secretary Franklin Lane appointed Berkeley professor Adolph Miller as an assistant in

books such as Comstock's *Bungalows, Camps and Mountain Houses*, 14, 30. It also found expression in the bungalow courtyard apartment/cottage enclaves that were built throughout California.

³⁷ Whiffen, 218.

³⁸ Carr, 62.

³⁹ Harvey Kaiser, *Landmarks in the Landscape: Historic Architecture in the National Parks of the West*, (San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1997), 121.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 16

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

charge of National Parks. Miller in turn engaged San Francisco architect Mark Daniels to design a plan for development in Yosemite. Although his plan was never carried out, Daniels introduced the idea of cluster or village organization for park facilities. Under this concept, development was concentrated in one or two areas, leaving the rest of the landscape relatively undisturbed by human intrusions. This was an arrangement pioneered in the Adirondack Great Camps. Daniels also emphasized consistent architectural expression and strong visual relationships of buildings with surrounding natural features.⁴⁰

Perhaps the most influential designer of early National Park buildings was Mary Elizabeth Coulter, the architect and interior designer for the Fred Harvey Company. Coulter drew heavily on the regional vernacular of the Southwest, particularly the ruins of ancient native cultures and the pueblos of living New Mexico and Arizona tribes. In her work, Coulter achieved a remarkable integration of her buildings with the rocky canyon site of the Grand Canyon. Her Viewing Tower, sited on the very edge of the canyon, appears almost to grow out of the steep hillside. Hopi House, Phantom Ranch, Hermit’s Rest, and Bright Angel Lodge provided a wide scope for Coulter’s experiments with integrating site, indigenous forms, and local materials into park construction. In addition, Coulter designed a number of buildings that provided accommodations along the Santa Fe Railroad line throughout the Southwest. Her approach to regional work was widely available and well known.

The work of concessionaires and private architects established clear precedents regarding the type of architecture suitable to parks. Their hotels and lodges stressed the concepts of respectful siting, integration of buildings and landscape, appropriate uses of materials, references to regional and indigenous building traditions and cultures, and rustic aesthetics. Later park designers had immediate access to these models, as well as working relationships with some of the architects. Charles Punchard and Daniel Hull, the first National Park Service landscape engineers, met with Coulter a number of times. Hull directly followed her lead in his later designs for Grand Canyon.⁴¹

Landscape Architecture Influences

At the same time that trends in architecture were contributing to the development of a building style specifically suited to parks, ideas about the natural landscape and the appropriate uses of design in wilderness settings were evolving. From the theory and practice of garden, urban park, and natural reserve design, practitioners sought to integrate buildings and structures with landscape elements and plantings. Through this effort a new profession of landscape architecture, as opposed to gardening and horticulture, emerged in the late nineteenth century. From the English picturesque landscape tradition, American designers drew precedents which were then refined and applied in ways more suitable to the American environment. They also drew lessons from the new science of ecology and the emerging understanding of natural systems. By the 1930s this culminated in a fully developed rustic landscape aesthetic which merged the rustic style trends in architecture with hardscape and plantings to produce a holistic approach to park development.

Andrew Jackson Downing and Fredrick Law Olmsted: The Picturesque Landscape

Andrew Jackson Downing, a New York nurseryman, is generally credited with bringing the English picturesque

⁴⁰ Ibid., 72-74.

⁴¹ McClelland, 112-113.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 17

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

landscape ideal to the United States and popularizing it among architects, designers, horticulturists, and the public. The picturesque had its beginnings in the design of large aristocratic estates, but by the early 1800s, John Claudius Loudin, an English landscaper, and his wife, Jane, published a number of gardening books and established a horticultural magazine intended to provide information and guidance on landscape improvement and design for the middle classes in England.⁴² These widely distributed publications served as a model for Downing who began to publish his own horticultural journal and architectural pattern books for an American audience. Downing's first book was a *Treatise on the Theory and Practice of Landscape Gardening* (1841). The *Treatise*, which included a section on the history of landscape design and the principles of "beauty and art," sold over 9,000 copies in the first twelve years after its publication.⁴³ His *Cottage Residences* and *Architecture of Country Homes* brought together architecture and landscape, addressing the necessity of both in producing an aesthetically pleasing home.

Although Downing was most concerned with residential landscape and gardening, he had a deep appreciation for the natural environment and developed a number of concepts that were readily adapted by the early park movement. Downing was heavily influenced by the early American naturalists such as Nathaniel Hawthorne and Henry David Thoreau, as well as by the renderings of the Hudson River School of painters.⁴⁴ One of his most important concepts was that of the framed view. Whether in the cultivated garden, or in a more naturalistic setting, Downing emphasized the importance of experiencing nature as a sequence of changing vistas. Paths, seats, shelters, and steps could be used to structure the visitors' experience and to frame particularly picturesque settings and locations. In his *Treatise on the Theory and Practice of Landscape Gardening* he established the key landscape components that should be employed in any "pleasure ground," whether private or public. These included winding drives and paths, meadows, rockwork, rustic bridges, stone viewing towers, and wooded glades.⁴⁵

Downing also established a rustic aesthetic for these elements: one that would blend the natural and constructed environment into a compatible whole. He introduced the use of natural and unfinished construction materials such as unpeeled logs, tree branches, and uncoursed rubble masonry. In his writings he provided many illustrations of the use of these rustic landscape elements which were in turn reproduced widely in builders' guides and agricultural publications. Downing is also responsible for raising awareness regarding the central role of circulation in the designed and natural landscape. He established a hierarchy of roads and paths that included the approach *road* that brought one into the landscaped area, the *drive* which provided structured exposure to the landscape, and the *path* which allowed opportunities for individual exploration and contemplation of the environment. While the purpose of the road was to remove the owner or visitor from the public right-of-way and to create a graceful approach to the house, garden, and in the case of larger properties, the rural/pastoral or natural landscape beyond, the purpose of the latter two types of circulation were to guide one through the landscape in a manner that maximized enjoyment and exposed one to its most picturesque elements. The well designed circulation pattern opened a series of painterly vistas, much like a Hudson River School painting.

Fredrick Law Olmsted, a native of Connecticut, is often considered the father of the landscape architecture

⁴² Downing prepared the American editions (1843 and 1846) of Jane Loudin's *Gardening Guide for Women*.

⁴³ Schuyler, David, "Downing, Andrew Jackson: landscape gardener, horticulturist, author," in Charles Birnbaum and Robin Karson, *Pioneers of American Landscape Design*, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2000), 96.

⁴⁴ McClelland, 20.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 21.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 18

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

profession in America. Olmsted arrived at his chosen vocation by a circuitous route that included many years as a gentleman farmer, a journalist, and an anti-slavery advocate. Beginning in the 1850s, he established one of the most important landscape practices in the U.S., and became the most influential writer and landscape practitioner of his generation. Through his sons, who continued the Olmsted practice until the 1950s, his influence was felt long after his death.

Olmsted was introduced to the ideas of Downing both through the horticulturist's writings and through his early association with Calvert Vaux. In 1850, Downing had been introduced to the young architect and had played a major role in bringing him to America, where he went into business with Downing until the former's untimely death.⁴⁶ In 1857 Olmsted partnered with Vaux in submitting a winning entry in the New York City design competition for Central Park. While Olmsted was deeply influenced by Downing and Vaux, he also had been developing his own ideas regarding landscape through his travels and his work as a gentleman farmer on Staten Island. He had read the work of Prince H.L.H. von Pückler-Muskau of Germany. Pückler-Muskau's emphasis on the use of native vegetation and the idea that parks should be arranged for the use and comfort of people made a deep impression on Olmsted.

In Olmsted's view the urban public park should be a re-creation of nature and natural forms. He deeply believed in the idea that exposure to nature had a beneficial social effect on urban inhabitants of all classes. Since the public park was open to those of all stations in life, it was an expression of democracy in which social classes could mingle and enjoy the benefits of exposure to fresh air, exercise, and scenery. The major purpose of a park was to "exact the predominance of nature."⁴⁷ In the case of Central Park and Prospect Park, two of Olmsted's earliest and most important park developments, natural forms were created through extensive topographical manipulation, plantings and the introduction of many of the central features that Downing had enunciated as essential to a pleasure ground, such as meadows, lakes, and woodlands.

To the extent that buildings and structures needed to be introduced into the park environment, Olmsted was of the opinion that they should be inconspicuous and blend into nature. In a number of his later works, including the Emerald Necklace and Franklin Park in Boston, Olmsted worked closely with the architect Henry Hobson Richardson and with his successor firm. In this collaboration Olmsted developed an affinity for rustic stone bridges and minimalist structures that provided the rustic look that Downing had advocated, in a sturdier and less ephemeral form.

In his park design work Olmsted extended and refined Downing's notions regarding circulation. In Central Park Olmsted designed a circulation network of curvilinear paths and drives that unified the park and guided the visitor through a sequence of predetermined scenes. As described by Linda McClelland:

The system was designed so that one could pass through the park on foot without crossing the carriage roads. Olmsted achieved this by constructing an intricate network of bridges and tunnels, call "arches," which allowed paths and roads to cross over or under each other on separate levels.⁴⁸

In his work with natural areas that began at Yosemite, Olmsted also placed a major emphasis on circulation,

⁴⁶ Birnbaum et al., 97.

⁴⁷ McClelland, 37.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 19

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

establishing an entry road and a pattern of circulation that would allow the visitor to take in the valley and its magnificent scenery in a single circuit.

Beginning with Franklin Park, Olmsted became concerned with natural vegetation and the creation of wild gardens. Although not particularly fond of the Mediterranean landscape of California, he recognized the importance of vegetation reflecting its climate. He spent some time in Italy studying the Mediterranean landscape and in his plan for Stanford University campus attempted to employ an environmentally appropriate design palette. This aspect of Olmsted’s practice was carried on by his sons, particularly Fredrick Law Olmsted, Jr. who collaborated extensively with native botanists and the founders of the discipline of ecology, especially in his work in the California State Parks.⁴⁹

Olmsted associated himself with the movement to establish natural scenic reserves, particularly at Yosemite, which he had visited several times when he was employed near the future park as the manager of the Mariposa Mining Company.⁵⁰ He also was a strong proponent of saving Niagara Falls from private exploitation. The ideas of Olmsted, although primarily employed in an urban park context, were highly influential in the early development in the National Parks. Olmsted’s emphasis on the primacy of circulation patterns, the minimization of buildings and facilities, the blending of structures with the natural environment, and the importance of natural vegetation, pervaded the early years of National Park Service landscape philosophy. The Olmsted Brothers firm had a direct influence on the Park Service, acting in many capacities as confidants, advisors, and consultants to National Park Service leadership and to the California State Park Commission. They also took a more formal role in the design of many California park projects. In the California State Parks system, Olmsted, Jr. had a continuous presence from the 1920s through the 1950s and shaped the aesthetic and design decisions that characterize this era of state park development.⁵¹

The Institutionalization of a Park Rustic Landscape Aesthetic: Henry Hubbard and Frank Waugh

By the first decades of the twentieth century landscape architectural training had become formalized with at least sixteen universities offering degree programs in the specialty.⁵² Among the professionals who established themselves primarily as educators during this period, Henry V. Hubbard at Harvard, and Frank Waugh at the Massachusetts Agricultural College, had a particularly significant impact in developing and refining ideas on design in natural environments.

Hubbard’s *Introduction to the Study of Landscape Design* (1917), co-authored with his wife Theodora Kimball, became a standard text in design program through the 1950s. Combined with his teaching of several generations of students, and his editorship of the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) journal, Hubbard’s ideas were widely disseminated through the landscape profession. Hubbard advocated an informal style of landscape architecture which he termed the “Modern American Landscape Style.” This style, as Hubbard defined

⁴⁹ Olmsted consulted extensively with Fredrick Clement, often considered the “father of ecology” in preparing his multiple volume plan for Pt. Lobos State Reserve.

⁵⁰ Norman Newton, *Design on the Land: The Development of Landscape Architecture*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971), 274.

⁵¹ Olmsted Brothers carried out several projects for state parks subsequent to the initial *Report of State Park Survey of California in 1929*. Most notable among these are the master plan for Point Lobos State Reserve, design plans for the Del Norte and Bull Creek highways in the redwoods, and a major acquisition study in the 1950s.

⁵² Carr, 95.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 20

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

it, was a unique American version of the English landscape gardening tradition: one which placed a greater emphasis on preserving and interpreting natural character.⁵³

Hubbard, who was associated with the Olmsted firm at various times in his career, was strongly influenced by Olmsted's work in Franklin Park from which he drew applications to the treatment of natural environments. Author Ethan Carr placed Hubbard within what he termed the Fairsted School of the picturesque landscape tradition: professionals who carried out and elaborated on the basic ideas articulated by Olmsted through his Fairsted offices in Brookline.⁵⁴ Like Olmsted, Hubbard sought to minimize the intrusion of buildings and structures in natural areas. Where they were necessary to facilitate public usage, he urged an approach that subjugated designed elements to the natural environment. He particularly emphasized the use of natural materials and coloration in park buildings. He pioneered the use of cobblestone gutters and drainage, curving paths, the design of shelters to imitate the lines of the surrounding forest, and the use of plantings to integrate buildings with their grounds. Hubbard was a strong advocate of techniques such as screening, enframement, and the use of terraces and paths to create scenic vistas.

Hubbard was a strong advocate for parks of all types and championed the preservation of natural scenery for public enjoyment. He participated in the early park conferences held to discuss the establishment of state and regional parks and acted as a consultant to the National Park Service. When the Great Depression hit in the 1930s, Hubbard actively lobbied to make landscape architects a vital component of New Deal programs. During this period Hubbard also served as a high-ranking advisor for many federal and state programs. Through his efforts Hubbard helped to assure that landscape architects were at the heart of New Deal park planning and construction activities.⁵⁵

Frank Waugh, a contemporary of Hubbard, was trained as a horticulturist at Kansas State Agricultural College. In 1902 he became head of the Division of Horticulture at Massachusetts Agricultural College in Amherst, Massachusetts. In 1908 he established the college's Department of Landscape Gardening, later the Department of Landscape Architecture. Waugh was a pioneer in the use of native landscape plantings and an early adherent of the new science of ecology.⁵⁶

In his many writings which included the *Natural Style of Landscape Gardening* (1917) and the *Recreational Uses of the National Forest* (1918), he developed theories in regard to natural landscapes, and explored the practical applications of planting native species in association with other commonly used plants under natural conditions of topography, soil, and weather. Although early naturalist style landscape had been concerned with imitating natural forms, Waugh extended that notion to vegetation and plantings. Waugh also explored the potential of mass planting to provide backgrounds and screen views. He was very interested in the recreational uses of public lands and making them available to a wide range of people. He wrote extensively on the design of roads, trails, and paths, articulating principles for their design that would to enhance views and screen intrusions.

Like Hubbard, Waugh's contributions were academic and extended to consultation with public agencies. He worked on Bryce, Kings Canyon, and Mount Hood National Forests. During the Depression he authored an

⁵³ McClelland, 72.

⁵⁴ Carr, 102.

⁵⁵ Ibid. 252.

⁵⁶ Birnbaum et al, 434.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 21

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

influential manual for the Civilian Conservation Corps entitled *Landscape Conservation: Planning for the Restoration, Conservation and Utilization of Wild Lands for Parks and Forests*. He also trained a number of prominent landscape architects of the next generation including Frank H. Wirth, Albert Taylor, and Conrad Wirth, the latter serving as Assistant Director of the National Park Service during the period in which NPS instituted the national-state park cooperative program implemented by the CCC.

Hubbard's and Waugh's contributions to the landscape architecture of parks was both theoretical and practical. Linda McClellan sums up their contribution succinctly:

While Henry Hubbard gave the park designer the practical tools for identifying landscape characteristics and the design principles for achieving an informal or natural style of landscape, Waugh laid the philosophical and practical basis for landscape naturalization....⁵⁷

Both men, through their teaching, writing, and public consultation, had an immediate impact on the generation of landscape architects who staffed the National Park Service during the crucial period of its development in the 1920s and 1930s.

Design in the Early National Park Service: Charles Punchard, Daniel Hull, Thomas Vint, and E.P. Meinecke

In August 1916, President Woodrow Wilson signed the National Parks Act which created the National Park Service as an independent agency within the Department of the Interior. The legislation set forth the purpose of the service to:

Promote and regulate the use of Federal areas known as national parks, monuments, and reservations...to conserve the scenery and natural and historic objects and wild life therein, and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such a manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.⁵⁸

The bill was introduced by California Congressman William Kent, a longtime activist in the conservation movement. It reflected the naturalistic philosophy of park development and design that had originated with Downing and the Adirondack Camps and had been widely implemented in the work of Olmsted Sr. and the Fairsted School.⁵⁹ In 1918 the National Park Service elaborated on this statement of intent, issuing policies that established authority to regulate development within parks and establishing the mechanisms for accomplishing this end. The policy statement declared that a harmonious program of park development required the employment of trained engineers who "either possess a knowledge of landscape architecture or have a proper appreciation of the esthetic value of park lands."⁶⁰

In response to this policy, Park Director Stephen Mather appointed Charles Punchard as the National Park Service's first landscape engineer. A graduate of Harvard's landscape architecture program, Punchard had previously been in charge of the public parks of Washington D.C. In 1920, Daniel Hull, another Harvard

⁵⁷ McClellan, 85.

⁵⁸ Quoted in Newton, 530.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ McClellan, 134.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 22

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

landscape architecture graduate, was hired as Punchard's assistant. In what amounted to a two-man design office from 1920 to 1927, Punchard and Hull, and subsequently, Hull and his assistant, Thomas Vint, established the design aesthetics and planning principals that would govern park development until after World War II. The early design office undertook the task of translating the ideals of the picturesque landscape tradition and the Fairsted School of landscape design into practical projects to serve park visitors.

Punchard established a standard for visual appearance in the developed areas of parks, introducing screening of maintenance yards and utility areas, repairing and removing evidence of construction, and framing views.⁶¹ He developed permanent automobile campgrounds, setting basic requirements for sanitation and drinking water. He endorsed the concept of concentrating park services in a single locale or village, thus limiting the intrusion of facilities on the overall park landscape.⁶² This was a concept that was more extensively developed under his successor, Daniel Hull, and was eventually incorporated into all National Park Service planning. Punchard also emphasized the need for topographical mapping as a basis for sensitive planning and development and a reliance on native materials in all construction.

Punchard's untimely death in 1920 led to Hull's appointment as the Chief Landscape Engineer. Building on the foundation laid by Punchard, Hull used his position to further define and institutionalize the landscape engineers role in park design vis-à-vis both park superintendents and concessionaires. Hull took a prominent role in the planning of administrative villages, the design of park structures, and the encouragement of comprehensive master planning for park development. He also set the stage for the joint federal agency agreements that would govern road and trail design and construction within park boundaries. Hull established his offices first at Yosemite and later in Los Angeles, a step toward creating a strong design presence in the West. Among Hull's most significant achievements are the village at Grand Canyon in collaboration with the Fred Harvey Company concessionaires, and the facilities at Zion National Park with Gilbert Stanley Underwood. During Hull's tenure the museum at Yosemite and the Ahwahnee Hotel also were built. In his work at Sequoia, Yosemite, Grand Canyon, and elsewhere, Hull set down the essential blueprint for construction of park facilities for the next twenty years. The idea of concentrating visitor services, park administration, personnel housing, and concessionaire facilities in a single concentrated location also became a basic tenet of later state park development, although state park villages, never reached the scale of the villages developed within National Parks. Architectural historian Ethan Carr also credits Hull with subjugating architecture and the built environment to the overall interests of a cohesive landscape design:

For Hull, architecture formed one element of a coordinated, understated landscape development scheme, governed above all by the "comprehensive plan" that assured all parts were expressions of a unified artistic purpose.⁶³

While Punchard and Hull laid the foundations of National Park's naturalistic design, it was left to Hull's successor, Thomas Vint, to forge a coherent design bureaucracy equal to the task of developing the National Parks and serving as a model for the explosion of state park development that took place in the 1930s. From 1915 through Hull's tenure as National Park Service Chief Landscape Engineer, the Park Service relied heavily on the services of consultants and concessionaire architects in building park facilities. This brought a number of

⁶¹ Ibid. 139.

⁶² Mark Daniels had first proposed this village concept for Yosemite circa 1915.

⁶³ Carr, 123.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 23

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

outstanding architects into park design, including Mark Daniels, Herbert Maier, Gilbert Stanley Underwood, Mary Coulter, and Myron Hunt. Even Hull, who was employed by the National Park Service, carried on a private practice, which eventually led to his leaving the Park Service in 1927. The growth of the park system and the increase in appropriations for park development that occurred in the 1920s required the consistent services of trained and dedicated professionals employed specifically to design and execute projects in the parks.

Vint, a graduate of the University of California, Berkeley landscape architecture program, was hired as Hull's assistant in 1920. When Hull left the National Park Service, Vint was appointed to take his place. Vint's approach to his position was substantially different than that of his predecessors. In 1927 the landscape architecture division was moved to San Francisco. Here Vint set out to build an atelier of designers who would dedicate themselves exclusively to solving the problems of park design and of implementing a coherent long-term construction program within the park system.⁶⁴ In this process Vint and his staff pursued a new direction within the landscape architecture profession. Previously, landscape designers had occupied themselves with a wide variety of enterprises including estate, garden and subdivision design, with park projects constituting only a small portion of their practice. In setting up the NPS San Francisco design office and creating a civil service classification for landscape architects, Vint established a new avenue of full-time employment for landscape architects. By 1929, Vint had increased the landscape architecture division of National Parks to eight permanent professional staff. From this small beginning, park design within federal and state agencies grew to become a major, if not the dominant, focus of landscape architecture by the beginning of World War II.

Vint's great contribution to park design was the institutionalization of the master plan as the basis of all park development. While Hull had emphasized the importance of comprehensive park planning and the integration of architecture and landscape design into a single unified whole, by 1929, Vint succeeded in making the master plans mandatory precursors of development. Whatever park improvements Superintendents or others desired, they had to go through the design division to get review and approval.

In centralizing design decision making Vint established virtual control over park developments. Under Vint's direction park design reached maturation both philosophically and in practical implementation. The design division, with its core of trained professional park designers, moved beyond the experimentation of the 1920s and forged a practice that incorporated the many influences of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries into what Linda McClelland has characterized as "a mature ethic of rustic and naturalistic design."⁶⁵ This ethic was carried through the 1930s and pervaded the character and physical appearance of National and state parks throughout the country.

The bureaucracy that Vint created and the processes and procedures that he instituted served as a model for administrating the massive public works program in parks during the 1930s. By 1934 when the New Deal program began to focus on recreational development, the National Park Service was well positioned to play a prominent role. It was a natural choice to oversee the newly funded program of state and regional park development. Although the state park program and the CCC labor force were jointly directed by several agencies it was the National Park Service that reviewed applications for CCC camps, supervised park plans, and controlled park projects. In doing this, the imprint of Park Rustic style was firmly planted in state parks in the 1930s.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ McClelland, 247.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 24

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

Although NPS was the principal agency that developed park design principals in the 1920s and 1930s, there was one figure working on recreational use outside parks who had a profound influence on the National Park Service and subsequent state park work. E.P. Meinecke was a plant pathologist who worked on National Forest Service, National Park Service, and state park projects over two decades. In studies that he performed in Sequoia National Park and the redwood state parks in California, Meinecke documented the destructive impact of human use in forest areas, particularly through the increasingly popular practice of camping. Parks and forest reserves had set aside specific areas for camping from early in the twentieth century, and generally campers were free to select their own camping locations, set up their arrangements as they pleased, and to drive through meadows and among trees to reach their selected destinations. By the mid-1920s these practices had taken a visible toll on the natural environment. Meinecke established the direct link between concentrations of people in parks and the compaction of root systems and suppression of new vegetation.

Meinecke's solution to these problems revolutionized thinking about the design of campgrounds and continues to form the basis of modern campground design. He determined that campgrounds should be sited in areas with soils that could withstand hard use and away from delicate natural resources. They needed to be organized in such a way that visitors were directed to predetermined use areas via established roads. To accomplish this, he divided campgrounds up into individual camp sites with direct access off a main circulation road and with defined parking spaces. Within this camp site privacy and shade were achieved through design and vegetative screening. Meinecke was a particular advocate of camp furnishings, stoves, tables, and parking pads that would direct patterns of usage within the camp site and discourage campers from moving rocks, logs, and other elements from the surrounding environment to meet their needs. Aesthetically, he encouraged the design of campgrounds within the picturesque tradition, believing that beauty encouraged camp users to respect the natural world around them.

In 1928 Meinecke articulated his ideas in a report on problems in California State Parks and in the 1930s he authored a book on *Camp Planning and Reconstruction* that was widely used by the CCC. When the National Park Service published planning guides for State Parks in the 1930s, the models of campgrounds they present reflect Meinecke's precepts.⁶⁶

Rustic Landscape Design in California State Parks 1933-1942

All of the buildings, structures, and landscape designs produced in the California State Park system during the Great Depression years were executed in what has come to known as the Park Rustic style. The many antecedents and influences that shaped this style have been discussed. Prominent in this legacy were the landscape philosophies of Andrew Jackson Downing, Fredrick Law Olmsted and the Fairsted School, Henry Hubbard, E.P. Meinecke, and Frank Waugh. These ideas were widely disseminated through their writings, teaching, and professional practices. The more rustic masonry architecture of Henry Hobson Richardson and the Craftsman architecture of Stickley, Maybeck, Green and Greene, as well as others, played a prominent role in shaping ideas regarding massing, form and materials in the Park Rustic style. Nineteenth and early twentieth century examples of resort architecture including Shingle Style, the Adirondack Great Camps, and the early railroad hotels in the

⁶⁶ See *Park and Recreation Structures* (1938) for numerous examples of campgrounds designed in different terrain that reflect Meinecke's campground principals.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 25

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

National Parks also played an influential role in shaping Park Rustic aesthetics.

The Park Rustic style took its starting point from nature and the basic premise that in natural parks scenic values were paramount. The purpose and value of cultural amenities from roads to hotels were to provide access to nature and to enhance the visitors' experience of the natural environment. Physically and aesthetically facilities within parks were subsidiary to their surroundings. Even when the recreational role of parks became more predominant in the 1930s, it was generally accepted that recreational facilities such as swimming pools and boating docks would continue to be designed in a manner that would minimize their intrusion on their immediate setting.

In Park Rustic theory, the goal of any building, structure, or element was to appear as if it had grown out of its site and to blend seamlessly with its surroundings. This was often achieved through the employment of masonry foundations, low horizontally emphasized massing, and the use of local materials such as log, unpeeled log and stick work, rustically hewn shingles, and uncoursed rubble masonry. Where paint was required tones of brown and dark forest green were favored. In fashioning windows and doors the rustic aesthetic drew on simple traditional precedents found in vernacular buildings such as the frontier cabin, or rural ranch house. Hand hewn or, at least, hand rusticated boards and wrought iron hardware were common. General character defining features of the Park Rustic style include, non-intrusive siting, horizontal massing, use of local rustic materials, handcrafted detailing, and integration with the surrounding setting.

Adopted and institutionalized by Charles Punchard, Daniel Hull, and Thomas Vint at the inception of the National Park system, Park Rustic's theory and practice was well established by 1933 when the CCC was created. By administratively giving the National Park Service authority over the program of development in state parks, the New Deal ensured that the architectural and landscape architectural principles and practices developed by that agency would be carried into the nation's state parks. A number of manuals and pattern books issued by NPS provided guidance to landscape architects and draftsmen in the national-state park program and CCC.

The national-state park program and CCC work in California reflect the principles of the Park Rustic style. Sensitive siting, natural materials, and craftsmanship are evident in even the simplest and most utilitarian buildings. Restrooms at both Cuyumaca Rancho and Pfeiffer Big Sure State Parks exemplify the employment of the Park Rustic aesthetic in even small structures. Lower half walls of rubble masonry suggest that the buildings are rooted in the ground while upper walls are clad either with hand hewn redwood shakes (Pfeiffer) or unpeeled half rounds of cedar log (Cuyumaca). Windows are small with wood casement, sash and muntins and doors are hewn boards. The buildings admirably achieve the goal of the Park Rustic aesthetic; they are handsomely crafted and at the same time, relatively inconspicuous within their forest settings.

The use of natural materials extended to landscape architectural features. Park entries, roads, parking stalls, retaining walls, vehicle and pedestrian bridges, drainage systems, including culverts and channels, were designed to blend with the natural landscape and were executed in local, unfinished materials. Stone masonry was frequently employed to create entry pillars, walls, and culverts. Bridges often had masonry abutments with wood plank flooring and log rails. Culverts are most frequently constructed of stone which is laid in such a manner that it seamlessly blends into the channel of the creek from which water flow is directed. Road cuts, alignments, and surfacing were designed to minimize straightaways and to follow natural topographic contours. Special techniques of cut and fill had been developed in early National Park road building in such projects as the Going-

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 26

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

to-the-Sun Road in Glacier and the Tioga Road in Yosemite. While no state park roads of this magnitude were constructed, techniques of sloping, view framing, rest stops, erosion control, and landscaping were utilized in smaller state projects. Some of the more important examples of the type of work occur in Mount Diablo, Mount Tamalpais, Mount San Jacinto, and Palomar Mountain. In addition, the regional landscape architects consulted on state highway projects that went through Prairie Creek and Del Norte Redwoods State Parks. Boulders and rail fences were generally used to demarcate camp sites and, based on Meinecke’s ideals of campground design, limit the use of automobiles, and confined use to specific areas of lesser environmental sensitivity.

In addition to original designs, existing concessionaire facilities were extensively remodeled to conform with Park Rustic aesthetics. Once master planning was initiated, many of these cabins and lodges were moved to new locations to better fit in with the overall landscape design. These types of changes and alterations took place at Big Basin, Humboldt Redwoods, and Pfeiffer Big Sur.

Although most California State Parks buildings and landscape elements constructed in the 1930s are recognized by their masonry and wood materials, a small number of parks were developed using historic references that were more suited to the southern California setting. In these cases, designers drew on Spanish and Mexican precedents from California’s past. Adobe was used in the construction of buildings at the southern beaches of Doheny, San Clemente, and Carlsbad, and in Kern County at the Tule Elk Preserve. The most extensive use of this material was at the Mission La Purisima reconstruction near Santa Barbara. In these cases, the use of Spanish influenced materials and design drew on the precedents of work by Mary Colter and by NPS in the Southwest.

Although earlier CCC buildings were designed as isolated projects, the growing concern with comprehensive master planning after 1935 led to a preference for cluster or village development within park units. As discussed earlier, the idea of concentrating visitor facilities in one or more central locations had first been articulated by San Francisco architect, Mark Daniels, in the first, unrealized, Yosemite planning effort. Under Daniel Hull, the cluster arrangement gained impetus with the development of the villages at Yosemite and Grand Canyon. Cluster development was seen as a means to lessen the impact of human use on the vast majority of park land and was a very important concept in Park Rustic landscape architecture. Concentrating auto traffic, camping, interpretation, and recreation within one or a few small areas protected land and resources, and made it easier for the small number of park employees to enforce rules and control misuse of the parks.

Many of the state parks in California exhibit this village or cluster type of landscape design. Although there are some notable exceptions, the general pattern of development included a park entry demarcation that notified the visitor that they had entered park lands.⁶⁷ A park entry road brought visitors to the area of concentrated park services. These clusters were sited on relatively flat or terraced ground, often at a physical, but not at a visual, remove from more sensitive natural resources. For example in the redwood parks, facilities were sited to avoid constant foot traffic within the redwood groves themselves. The clusters can be relatively simple, with only a ranger residence, maintenance yard and campground, or as is the case with Big Basin, Pfeiffer, Anza Borrego, or Prairie Creek, they can be fairly elaborate including a museum/interpretive center, administration building, one or more ranger residences, campground and picnic areas, a store, campfire center, maintenance yard, and one or more tourist cabins. In the case of a few very large parks such as Big Basin, there is more than one cluster,

⁶⁷ Kiosks intended to collect a park entry fee were introduced later. Most CCC entry features consisted of stone pillars, signage, or rustic boundary fencing.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 27

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

although the secondary clusters are typically centered around residences and maintenance facilities for park staff.⁶⁸

Essential to the cluster is a central circulation system of roads and pedestrian paths, including bridges and fords. Roads were designed to connect facilities and preclude traffic congestion and are integral to the understanding the organization and design of the cluster. The relationship of road and cluster development is particularly notable at Mount Diablo State Park where a series of clusters are sited along the summit access road. Some of these clusters consist of picnic/day-use sites which invite visitors to stop and take in the park’s many scenic vistas. Other clusters consist of park operations facilities, including residences and maintenance. All of these culminated at the summit with the monumental museum/lookout building, one of the largest projects undertaken by the CCC in state parks.

The majority of Park Rustic style resources in California State Parks are small in scale. Campgrounds with their rustic furnishings and restrooms are among the most common. Ranger stations and residences form another large resource group. There are however, some small individual architecturally important resources that occur in isolation such as the summit shelter and ranger shelter at Mount San Jacinto. Relatively simple in design and execution, their location in remote, exceptionally scenic locations exhibits a high degree of sensitivity to the environment and a notable use of materials to integrate building and setting.

There also are a number of large scale individual resources in California State Parks that are exceptional examples of the Park Rustic style. In addition to the aforementioned Mount Diablo Summit Building, the Theaters at Mount Tamalpais and Armstrong Redwoods, the Administration Building, Store/Nature Center, and Campfire Center at Big Basin, and the Weyland Bridge at Pfeiffer Big Sur are examples of resources that fall within this category.

The implementation of the Park Rustic style in state parks fell largely to the group of landscape architects associated with the western (San Francisco) office of the National Park Service. Beginning in 1934, George Gibbs and Daniel Hull set the tone of facility development working extensively with the superintendents and draftsmen in the various park CCC camps.

In 1936 as the program expanded and a central design office was established, a number of additional professional landscape architects joined the office. Among those hired was Emerson Knight, already a distinguished landscape architect who had begun his career in the offices of Mark Daniels in San Francisco. In 1927 Knight assisted Hull and the Olmsted firm with the California State Parks survey. He became noted for his work on outdoor theaters which included several pre-Depression era theaters in California, as well as the Depression era monumental theater at Mount Tamalpais. William Penn Mott, who had recently graduated from the University of California, Berkeley landscape architecture program, began his career with the national-state park cooperative program in the employ of National Park Service. He later went on to direct the Oakland Parks Department, the California State Parks Department, and the National Park Service.

Less is known about the other landscape architects who served between 1936 and 1940. They included Louis

⁶⁸ Although several park units originally had rental cabins, most of these have been removed, or are closed and in disuse. Mendocino Woodlands, which is used as a conference center is an exception with a number of functional cabins still in place.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 28

Name of Property
Multiple Counties, California

County and State
The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the
Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks
1933-1942

Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Brandt, Theodore Meier, Dale Hawkins, and William Bigler. Brandt had previously been associated with the landscape planning for the University of Illinois at Urbana, while Meier had been in private practice in Los Angeles and was the master planner for the San Diego subdivision known as Rolando.⁶⁹

Brandt had the primary responsibility for Southern California and was closely associated with the work at Cuyumaca, Palomar, Mount San Jacinto, and the southern California beaches. He also oversaw much of the work at Big Basin until it was taken over by Dale Hawkins in 1937 and he was a major force in carrying out the master planning efforts. Mott was very much involved with the projects at Mount Diablo and Mount Tamalpais, as well as with regional park work in the Bay Area.⁷⁰ Theodore Meier worked in the northern redwood parks and at Castle Crags and McArthur Burney and at Lake Tahoe. After 1936, when George Gibbs returned to California from the NPS Omaha Offices, he took on most of the supervision in the redwoods and at Mendocino Woodlands. While plans were generally signed off by Merriam or Brandt, in southern California, and Daniel Hull for state parks, it is clear from the Landscape Architect "Monthly Reports" that all of the regional landscape architects played a role in the design of facilities in the parks to which they were assigned.

Under Criterion C the park facilities designed and executed in the California State Park system in the 1930s represent an important expression of Park Rustic style architecture. While designs had many originating points, in the CCC camps, at the national-state park program offices in San Francisco and Glendale, or in the California Division of Beaches and Parks landscape office, the administrative system of design approval ensured consistency of aesthetic product and conformance with the principles of Park Rustic design throughout California State Parks. Based on surviving plans and architectural drawings, every blue print was signed off by the head of the National Park Service office, either Merriam or Brandt, and by the state park authority, either Charles Wing or Daniel Hull. While no two park buildings were exactly alike, every building employed rustic and local materials, was carefully sited to fit with and complement its environment, and many were elements in a larger development plan that attempted to concentrate human intrusions into a limited area, minimizing impact of the natural environment. From Silver Strand Beach on the Mexican border to Humboldt Redwoods on the Oregon border, the Park Rustic style unified state park facilities to create a distinctive park appearance and architectural identity.

⁶⁹ Jim Newland, "A Brief History of Rolando, a community of San Diego, California," <http://www.rolandovillage.com>.

⁷⁰ "Reports to Regional Landscape Architect." Mott directed much of the work at Muir Woods and Tilden Park in Berkeley.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 29

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

ASSOCIATED PROPERTY TYPES

A context statement identifies property types that are associated with the principal themes in the history and development of a district or geographic area, which in this case is the statewide development of California State Parks in the 1930s and early 1940s. The identification of property types and their linkage with events, patterns of development, important individuals, or architectural values is intended to provide guidance in developing a methodology for the historic survey of a defined area. Identifying property types helps to focus the identification and evaluation effort for individual buildings, linkage, or continuity of buildings, sites, and landscapes that may be important or contribute to the historical significance of an area. Property type identification is based on the information developed through research, analysis, and preliminary or reconnaissance survey. It identifies general types of properties that exist within an area. It is not definitive in assigning significance to those resources.

The discussion of property types below is based on research, reconnaissance, and intensive surveys carried out over a period of time by state park cultural resource staff, including preliminary inventory studies carried out by Carol Roland, Ph.D. in 1991 and 2003. It also is based on information developed through several scholarly studies of national-state park cooperative programs and CCC work in state parks, particularly the work of Linda McClelland and Ethan Carr.⁷¹ The information provided is of a general nature and may be subject to revision when further study and documentation is accomplished. However, the categories of property described are sufficient to provide a reasonable expectation of property types that would be encountered in a survey and are also sufficient to establish a foundation for survey planning and property evaluation.

Service Facilities

Service facilities were designed and constructed to house park staff and provide the buildings and structures necessary for storage, vehicle and equipment maintenance, carpentry, and operation of the park unit.

Description

Housing

The housing service facilities are used primarily on a seasonal basis. An example of this type of residence is the California Department of Forestry Fire Barracks building at Cuyumaca State Park, which houses fire crews. Staff housing consists principally of three basic types: the single-family ranger residence, the duplex used for both ranger and maintenance staff, and barracks intended to be occupied by several people in a group living situation. Residences are generally sited into residential complexes consisting of two or more buildings. Ranger residences are most often single-family occupancy buildings intended for year-round family living. Duplexes are utilized for both year round and seasonal housing, and are smaller than those of the individual ranger residences. Although relatively uncommon, some park units include a barracks building used for housing a number of people in a dormitory-like setting. Housing for park staff is often surrounded by a domestic yard, not unlike a suburban home. The yard is often set off by fencing used to demarcate the boundaries of the residence area and provide a modicum of privacy to the ranger family or other park staff. Garages are often located adjacent to ranger residences. A small number were constructed in the 1933-1942 period and may be contributing service buildings. However, many garages were added to residential units after World War II, and, although executed in a rustic

⁷¹ Linda McClelland's study, *Presenting Nature: The Historic Landscape Design of the National Park Service, 1916 to 1942*, (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1993) was developed as a context study for the identification and evaluation of National Park Service Park Rustic style resources. The property types developed under this study have assisted in guiding the property type analysis of California State Parks resources.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 30

----- Name of Property Multiple Counties, California ----- County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 ----- Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

style, they do not fall within the period of significance of California State Parks development under the national-state park cooperative program and the CCC.

Ranger residences constructed during the period of the national-state park cooperative program using CCC labor are comparable in square footage and amenities with modest, single-family homes found in cities and towns of the period. Most contain a living room, kitchen, bath, and two bedrooms. The majority are one story tall, and two-story examples also exist. Most have a front porch, back service area, and a fireplace. The ranger residences exhibit qualities associated with bungalow style housing—a low horizontal form, massive stone chimneys, gable and crossgable roofs, wide overhangs and exposed rafters, purlins, and beams. Ranger residences are executed in more rustic, less finished, materials than city and town houses. The presence of native materials and a high level of handcraftsmanship express the emphasis of the Park Rustic style on the use of local rough finish and natural materials, as well as a sublimation of the building to the surrounding environment. Depending on location, materials such as logs, shake siding, unpeeled half-logs, and rough hewn stone predominate, with a lesser number of adobe or stucco buildings in the southern part of the state. Partial masonry walls are not uncommon. A great deal of fine craftsmanship was lavished on residences. Many exhibit plank floors, knotty pine interior walls, multi-light wood frame windows, masonry fireplaces, tongue and groove wainscoting, decoratively trimmed kitchen cabinets, and hand wrought fixtures and hardware.

Maintenance Facilities

Maintenance facilities are generally grouped together into a maintenance yard and are arranged around a large open center area suitable for driving and turning equipment such as trucks, back hoes, firefighting vehicles, and snow removal equipment. The types of buildings and structures found in these maintenance complexes include offices, garages, auto and equipment repair shops, pump and power houses, carpenter shops, barns, and storage sheds. Offices are often integrated into larger buildings such as garages and shops. Buildings are utilitarian, generally one- to two-story in height with gable and/or shed roofs, and are constructed from a variety of local native materials. Although rarely crafted as carefully or with as much detail as park residential buildings, they exhibit a preference for wood, stone, and log materials, and generally have wood frame windows and wooden doors, including double garage doors, forged hardware, and shake roofs.

Maintenance facilities were not intended to be viewed by the public. NPS and state park designers placed considerable emphasis on the use of vegetative materials and walled enclosures to mask these areas from public view and to protect stored equipment and tools. Most maintenance yards are sited at some distance from main park roads and campgrounds, although they are often easily accessible from the residential clusters where park personnel reside.

Significance

Service facilities associated with the development of California State Parks under the national-state park cooperative program and the CCC may qualify for listing in the National Register under Criterion A at the local or state level of significance for their association with important government programs. Service facilities are significant in the context of the Depression era public works programs carried out to establish and develop state parks for public use. Service facilities were fundamental to opening state parks to the public by providing staff housing and working facilities necessary to park operation. In many cases, parks are located in remote areas where such facilities are otherwise unavailable. Residences and maintenance yards were established in all park units, and were one of the most common property types constructed throughout the California State Park System

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 31

Name of Property
Multiple Counties, California
County and State
The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

under the national-state park cooperative program and the CCC.

Under Criterion C, these property types represent examples of Park Rustic architecture as it was implemented in the state parks in the 1930s and early 1940s. Park Rustic is recognized as a distinctive and uniquely American architectural style developed by a single government agency specifically to compliment the country’s natural preserves and wilderness areas. The form, materials, design, craftsmanship, and setting of these property types embody the NPS philosophy of blending the natural and built environments. In several instances in California State Parks, the location and grouping of these property types provide excellent examples of master planned landscape designs intended to unify park development and minimize damage to the natural environment.

Registration Requirements

To meet eligibility requirements for inclusion in the National Register under Criterion A, service buildings and structures must demonstrate their association with the public works programs that oversaw and administratively controlled the development of facilities within state parks. Their association must be demonstrable in the form of national-state park program and/or CCC documentation, and they must be characterized by those essential elements of planning and style that were advocated by the programs. This would include major characteristics of the Park Rustic style such as the use of native materials, evidence of handcraftsmanship, and planning characteristics such as sensitive siting, cluster organization, conformance with the natural environment, and setting. A property need not embody all of these characteristics in order to qualify for listing, but it must embody a sufficient number to provide clear evidence of conformity with the aesthetic tradition promoted by the park programs. The property type must have been designed as a part of the national-state park cooperative program and constructed in a park unit by the local CCC work camp in the period 1933-1942.

Under Criterion C, the properties should be designed in the Park Rustic style utilizing local and native materials that are treated in a rustic, rough hewn, or historic manner. Major design characteristics of the buildings, such as overhangs, porches, windows, and original building or cladding materials, should remain the dominant design features. Window replacement with appropriate sash and/or replacement of original shingle roofs with composition shingle should not disqualify a building or structure from eligibility. The buildings should exhibit handcraftsmanship. Service properties should retain location, natural setting, design, workmanship, and materials.

The siting and association of residences or service buildings also may exemplify a national-state park program master-planned landscape design. The landscape design must be associated with documented design plans and must continue to retain a majority of organization, features, and landscaping in the original design. The location, setting, and landscape elements indicated in the plan should remain clearly distinguishable. Major loss of landscape vegetation, such as windrows, hedges, and mass screening plantings, constitutes a loss of integrity for a planned landscape. The introduction of a large number of post-1942 buildings and structures may disrupt the coherence of the original CCC groupings and undermine integrity of the planned landscape for purposes of registration.

Service facilities may be eligible at the local level of significance for their association with the public works programs of the 1930s, as they were carried out in the individual park unit. The goal of the cooperative program and the CCC was to develop each park unit in order to make it accessible and available for recreational use. In most cases, service facilities were one element necessary to the achievement of this goal at the individual park

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 32

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

unit level. Under Criterion A, service facilities are associated with the work performed by the locally assigned CCC camp during a specific period of time under the supervision of an assigned NPS landscape architect and the state park authority. They may qualify as individual properties, or as contributors to a district made up of other cooperative programs and CCC facilities designed and constructed during the period of significance within the park. Under Criterion C, service facilities may be eligible at the local level as examples of the Park Rustic style as it was interpreted and implemented in the individual park. Service facilities may be individually eligible under this Criterion or may contribute to a district of similar Park Rustic buildings constructed during the period of significance in a park.

A property eligible at the state level of significance should exhibit a high degree of artistry and craftsmanship. Under Criterion A, it should be an outstanding example of national-state park cooperative program planning and design efforts. Under Criterion C, a building of statewide significance should exemplify all the characteristics of Park Rustic style, use of native materials, hand finishing of these materials, architectural embellishment, and handcrafted fixtures. These elements should be accomplished at a very high level of skill and expertise, and should retain a high level of integrity. The buildings, structures, or districts should represent facilities within the broader property type that are unique or unusual in their scale, craftsmanship, and/or design. Service facilities that were a common component of many park units and had utilitarian purposes rarely rise to the level of design and craftsmanship required for state level significance.

Visitor Facilities/Public Use Buildings

These buildings and structures were designed and constructed specifically to accommodate visitor education and entertainment. They include a wide range of subtypes, each with a specific function.

Description

Administration Building/Ranger Station or Office

Although these buildings went by several names, they all functioned as a primary point of contact for the public with park staff and as office space for park personnel. They are the administrative center of the park unit and are therefore generally sited at a central location in the park, close to the main entry road. Administration/ranger stations vary greatly in size. Some have only a small number of offices, a private restroom, and a public counter near the entry. Others, such as the administration building at Big Basin Redwood State Park, are large and include areas for the distribution of park information such as maps, flora and fauna guides, and historic literature. In some cases, displays with interpretive information are also present.

Administration/ranger station buildings constructed during the period of the national-state park cooperative program using CCC labor exhibit low horizontal form, massive stone chimneys, gable and cross-gable roofs, wide overhangs and exposed rafters, purlins, and beams. They are often finished on the interior with knotty pine or exposed log walls and open beam ceilings. The presence of native materials and a high level of handcraftsmanship express the Park Rustic style emphasis on the use of local materials and a sublimation of the building to the surrounding environment. Depending on location, materials such as log, shake siding, unpeeled half-logs, and rough hewn stone predominate, with a lesser number of adobe or stucco buildings in the southern part of the state. Partial masonry walls are not uncommon. A great deal of fine craftsmanship is present in these buildings. Many exhibit plank floors, knotty pine or exposed log interior walls, multi-light wood frame windows, masonry fireplaces, and hand wrought fixtures and hardware.

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 33

----- Name of Property Multiple Counties, California ----- County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 ----- Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Museums/Nature Centers

Museums were constructed to house exhibits related to the natural environment, ethnography, and local history of the park and adjacent area. They are generally sited at a central location in the park, close to the main entry road and administration building. Museums vary in size, but are generally large with an exhibit room or rooms, and some private office and storage space. In many cases, museum facilities are combined with administrative buildings; however, a limited number of stand-alone museum buildings were constructed under the national-state park cooperative program. Patrick’s Point, Big Basin, Humboldt Redwoods, Mendocino Woodlands, and Pfeiffer Big Sur are among park units in which this type of building was constructed.

Museum buildings constructed during the period of the national-state park cooperative projects using CCC labor generally exhibit low horizontal form, massive stone chimneys, gable and cross-gable roofs, wide overhangs and exposed rafters, purlins, and beams. They are often finished on the interior with knotty pine or exposed log walls and open beam ceilings. The presence of native materials and a high level of handcraftsmanship express the Park Rustic style’s emphasis on the use of local materials and a sublimation of the building to the surrounding environment. Depending on location, materials such as logs, shake siding, unpeeled half-logs, and rough hewn stone predominate, with a lesser number of adobe or stucco construction buildings in the southern part of the state. Partial masonry walls are not uncommon. A great deal of fine craftsmanship is present in these buildings. Many exhibit plank floors, exposed log or knotty pine interior walls, multi-light wood frame windows, masonry fireplaces, and hand wrought fixtures and hardware. Interior display cases and poster windows may be associated with the original building.

Recreation Halls

Recreation halls, as their name implies, were built to create an indoor facility where group education or activities could be carried out. These are most common in northern redwood and mountainous parks where weather is not always conducive to outdoor activity. These buildings are generally of moderate size—capable of accommodating 50 to 100 people. Most are rectangular in form with one large open space on the interior. They often are characterized by oversize masonry fireplaces, which serve as the visual focal point of the space.

Recreation buildings constructed during the period of the national-state park cooperative programs using CCC labor generally exhibit low horizontal form, massive stone chimneys, gable and cross-gable roofs, wide overhangs and exposed rafters, purlins, and beams, and covered front porches. They are often finished on the interior with knotty pine or exposed log walls and open beam ceilings. The presence of native materials and a high level of handcraftsmanship express the Park Rustic emphasis on the use of local materials and a sublimation of the building to the surrounding environment. Depending on location, materials such as logs, shake siding, unpeeled half-logs, and rough hewn stone predominate, with a lesser number of adobe or stucco construction buildings in the southern part of the state. Partial masonry walls are not uncommon. A great deal of fine craftsmanship is present in these buildings. Many exhibit plank floors, exposed log and knotty pine interior walls, multi-light wood frame windows, masonry fireplaces, and hand wrought fixtures and hardware.

Comfort Stations

Comfort Stations are restroom facilities providing sinks and toilets for visitors. They are generally rectangular buildings with an interior solid central dividing partition separating men’s from women’s rooms. Most are intended for group use with two or more wash stations and toilet stalls. One of the principal tasks of the CCC

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 34

----- Name of Property Multiple Counties, California ----- County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 ----- Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

work camps was to develop infrastructure in park units that would ensure the delivery of potable water and the safe disposal of sewage.

On the exterior, comfort stations are similar to other Rustic Style buildings. Generally they exhibit low horizontal form, gable and cross-gable roofs, wide overhangs and exposed rafters, purlins, and beams. Entrances are usually located on the end walls with privacy screens protecting the doorways. They are often finished on the interior with tongue and groove paneling, which was painted to provide easily cleanable and sanitary surfaces. On the exterior, the presence of native materials and a high level of handcraftsmanship express the Park Rustic emphasis on the use of local materials and a sublimation of the building to the surrounding environment. Depending on location, materials such as logs, shake siding, unpeeled half-logs, and rough hewn stone predominate, with a lesser number of adobe or stucco buildings in the southern part of the state. Partial masonry walls are not uncommon. Many exhibit multi-light wood frame awning windows, and hand wrought fixtures and hardware.

Combination Buildings

Combination buildings are similar in purpose and design to comfort stations. Combination buildings exhibit the same external features and utilize the same materials as comfort stations. They are distinguished by the presence of facilities to assist people staying overnight or vacationing in the park unit. These facilities generally include showers and laundry rooms, the latter equipped with laundry sinks and ironing boards, and have now frequently been converted to storage space. Like the interiors of the comfort stations, they are finished in tongue and groove wall covering or wainscoting. Combination buildings are most frequently located in or adjacent to campgrounds or to recreation facilities such as swimming pools or beaches.

Kiosks/Entry Stations

Kiosks and entry stations are small buildings, usually sited near the park entrance or at a point where the entry road meets the central park facilities. In small park units, the kiosk/entry stations sometimes serve a dual purpose as a ranger station. They are generally constructed of log, masonry, or wood framing clad with shingle or clapboard, and have an entry-exit door for personnel and a sliding or awning window that allows communication between park staff and visitors in their automobiles. They generally are gable roofed with wide overhangs. These buildings served to demarcate formal entry into park land and are an initial point of contact between the park staff and visitors. It is also a visitor facility used to inform guests regarding park facilities and recreational opportunities, and an enforcement facility from which park rules and regulations can be disseminated.

Theaters and Campfire Centers

Theaters and campfire centers were designed and constructed for outdoor visitor entertainment and education. They range from monumental structures, such as the theater at Mount Tamalpais, to small campfire circles with rough benches and a firepit. They are a central gathering point within the park and are used for organized performances, storytelling, group sing-alongs, and ranger talks on the history, ethnography, and natural environment of the park unit. They can be delineated by built and/or natural features. At Armstrong Redwoods, the theater space is defined by the redwoods on either side of it. In other cases, the last seating row or edge of an excavated bowl mark the boundaries.

Theaters and campfire centers are generally organized in a semi-circular pattern with seating arranged around a stage, raised platform, or fireplace/fire circle. However, there are examples of rectangular plan theater areas with sloped seating leading toward a front stage, such as the forest theater at Armstrong Redwoods. These structures

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 35

Name of Property
Multiple Counties, California
County and State
The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

are sited on both flat ground and in excavated bowls in which seating is tiered. The largest and most impressive structures are masonry and have an imposing and permanent appearance. The most rudimentary forms often have split log seating or benches. Stage areas vary in height and materials, but most incorporate some type of masonry fire pit or free-standing chimney, such as the large masonry fireplace at the Governor’s Camp at Big Basin. Vegetative screens or groupings of trees are used to establish campfire circle boundaries or as a backdrop for the stage area.

Significance

Visitor facilities were at the heart of the mission of the national-state park cooperative program. These facilities were directly designed to provide services and recreational opportunities to state park visitors. They are associated with the development of state parks in the 1933-1942 period of significance, and may qualify for listing individually or collectively as historic districts under Criterion A. Visitor facilities are significant in the context of the Depression era public works programs carried out to establish and open state parks for public use.

These property types represent examples of Park Rustic architecture as it was implemented in California State Parks in the 1930s. Park Rustic style is recognized as a distinctive and uniquely American architectural style developed by a single government agency specifically to compliment the country’s natural preserves and wilderness areas. The form, materials, design, craftsmanship, and setting of these property types embody the NPS philosophy of blending the natural and built environments. Visitor facilities provide some of the most elaborate and refined examples of the Park Rustic style in state parks. Characteristic features include the use of rustic building materials, evidence of skilled workmanship, hand forged and crafted design elements on exteriors and interiors, such as rustic beams, exposed rafters, and plank doors. In several instances in California State Parks, the location and grouping of visitor facilities may represent examples of master planned landscape designs intended to physically and visually unify park facilities into centrally located villages that minimized damage to the larger natural environment. These designed landscapes may be eligible under Criterion A for their association with the master planning efforts of the national-state park cooperative program and/or may represent examples of Park Rustic landscape architectural design under Criterion C.

Registration Requirements

To meet eligibility requirements for inclusion in the National Register under Criterion A, visitor facilities must demonstrate their association with the public works programs that oversaw and administratively controlled the development of facilities within state parks in the period 1933-1942. Their association must be demonstrable in the form of national-state park program and/or CCC documentation and they must be characterized by the essential elements of planning style that were advocated by the programs. This would include major characteristics of Park Rustic style such as use of native materials, evidence of handcraftsmanship, and planning characteristics such as sensitive siting, cluster organization, conformance with the natural environment, and setting. A property need not embody all of these characteristics in order to qualify for listing, but it must embody a sufficient number to provide clear evidence of conformity with the aesthetic tradition promoted by the park programs.

Under Criterion C, the properties should be designed in the Park Rustic style utilizing local and native materials, which are treated in a rustic, rough hewn, or historic manner. Major design characteristics of the buildings and structures, such as overhangs, porches, windows, and original building or cladding materials, should remain the dominant design features. Theaters and campfire centers need to retain the original design and layout,

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 36

Name of Property
Multiple Counties, California
County and State
The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

construction materials, and landscape elements. Visitor facilities must continue to convey their original educational or entertainment function, even if adaptively reused. Window replacement in buildings and structures with appropriate sash and/or replacement of original shingle roofs with composition shingle should not disqualify a building or structure from eligibility. The buildings and structures should exhibit handcraftsmanship. They should retain location, natural setting, design, workmanship, and materials.

The siting and association of visitor facilities also may exemplify a national-state park master planned landscape design. The landscape design must be associated with documented design plans and must continue to retain a majority of organization, features, and landscaping in the original design. The location, setting, and landscape elements indicated in the plan should remain clearly distinguishable. Major loss of landscape vegetation such as windrows, hedges, and mass screening plantings constitutes a loss of integrity for a planned landscape. The introduction of a large number of post-1942 buildings and structures may disrupt the coherence of the original CCC grouping or master planning and undermine its integrity for purposes of registration.

Visitor facilities may be eligible at the local level of significance for their association with the public works programs of the 1930s as they were carried out in the individual park units. The goal of the cooperative program and the CCC was to develop each park unit in order to make it accessible and available for recreational use. In most cases visitor facilities were one element necessary to the achievement of this goal at the individual park unit level. Under Criterion A, visitor facilities are associated with the work performed by the locally assigned CCC camp during a specific period of time under the supervision of an assigned NPS landscape architect and the state park authority. They may qualify as individual properties or as contributors to a district made up of other cooperative program and CCC facilities designed and constructed during the period of significance within the park. Under Criterion C, visitor facilities may be eligible at the local level as examples of the Park Rustic style as it was interpreted and implemented in the individual park. Visitor facilities may be individually eligible under this or may contribute to a district of similar Park Rustic buildings or structures constructed during the period of significance.

A property eligible at the state level of significance should exhibit a high degree of artistry and craftsmanship. Under Criterion A, it should be an outstanding example of national-state park cooperative program planning and design efforts. Under Criterion C, a building or structure of statewide significance should exemplify all of the characteristics of Park Rustic style (i.e. use of native materials, hand finishing of materials, architectural embellishment, and handcrafted fixtures). These should exhibit a very high level of skill and retain a high level of integrity. The buildings, structures, or districts of state level significance should represent facilities within the broader property type that are unique or unusual in their scale, craftsmanship, and/or design. Visitor facilities are among the most likely property type to meet these requirements. Within this property type some buildings and structures represent isolated examples of monumental design and/or extraordinary craftsmanship that transcend their immediate park environment and represent substantial accomplishments of the statewide public works programs.

Campgrounds and Day Use Facilities

Campground and day use facilities were developed to provide meal and food preparation facilities and overnight accommodations for park visitors.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 37

Name of Property
Multiple Counties, California
County and State
The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Description

By the 1930s, under the influence of E.P. Meinecke, park campgrounds had begun to take on a very carefully prescribed landscape design form. Meinecke advocated dividing campgrounds into designated individual camp sites with defined parking spaces directly accessed off a main circulation road. Within each site, privacy and shade were achieved through placement of furnishings and screening. Meinecke strongly favored fixed camp furnishings: stoves, tables, and parking pads that would direct patterns of usage within the camp site and discourage campers from moving rocks, logs, and other elements from the surrounding environment to meet their needs. Aesthetically, he encouraged the design of campgrounds within the picturesque tradition. His guide, *Camp Planning and Reconstruction*, was widely used by the CCC and national-state park program landscape architects.

Most campgrounds built in California between 1933 and 1942 conformed to Meinecke’s dictums. The campground area is usually located along an automobile circulation path, which either borders the camping area or meanders through it. Often a combination of these circulation patterns is employed. Each campsite has a parking pad. The pad is sometime delineated by large landscape boulders, logs, or rail fencing. The camp area itself includes a picnic table, stone stove, and in some cases, a food locker. Picnic tables are generally constructed of stone with concrete tops, or entirely of poured concrete. Most are rectangular, and some round versions were constructed. In the 1930s some tables had split log and hewn board tops and/or log legs or pedestals; most of these have not survived. Stoves, of several different designs, are generally constructed of rough stone masonry with a forged iron grill. Privacy between campsites is usually provided by plantings of native shrubs, trees, or arrangements of boulders.

In addition to designed camp sites and furnishings, campground/day use areas may include access and circulation roads directly associated with the campground, comfort stations and combination buildings, and vegetation, particularly screening trees and hedges, as well as protective windrows.

Significance

Campgrounds and day use areas were designed to provide facilities that made vacationing in state parks possible. They were an essential property type in fulfilling the national-state park cooperative program goal of opening state parks to the public and providing facilities that would allow visitors to enjoy the recreational resources of the park. Campgrounds are significant in the context of the Depression era public works programs carried out to establish and develop state parks for public use. These facilities are among the most common property types constructed throughout the California State Park System under the national-state park cooperative program. At the same time, they were designed to protect the environment from damage due to careless or badly sited activity. These structures and landscape designs, associated with the development of state parks in the 1933-1942 period, may qualify for listing collectively as historic districts and or master planned landscape designs.

Under Criterion C, these property types represent examples of Park Rustic style architecture and landscape architecture as it was implemented in California State Parks in the 1930s. Park Rustic is recognized as a distinctive and uniquely American architectural style developed by a single government agency specifically to compliment the country’s natural preserves and wilderness areas. The form, materials, design, craftsmanship, and setting of these property types embodies the NPS philosophy of blending the natural and built environments. Characteristic features include use of rustic building materials, especially stone masonry, evidence of craftsmanship in the form of excellence of workmanship, and hand forged and crafted design elements. The pattern of landscape design may exemplify the design principles of Park Rustic landscape architecture in its

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 38

Name of Property
Multiple Counties, California
County and State
The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

setting, use of rustic materials, and relationship with the surrounding natural environment, as well as the landscape ideas of Meinecke as expressed in his guidance for CCC projects.

Registration Requirements

To meet eligibility requirements for inclusion in the National Register under Criterion A, campground and day use facilities must demonstrate their association with the public works programs that oversaw and administratively controlled the development of facilities within state parks. Their association must be demonstrable in the form of national-state park program and/or CCC documentation and must be characterized by those essential elements of planning and style that were advocated by the programs. This would include major characteristics of Park Rustic style, such as the use of native materials, evidence of handcraftsmanship, and planning characteristics such as sensitive siting, cluster organization, conformance with natural environment, and setting. A property need not embody all of these characteristics in order to qualify for listing, but it must embody a sufficient number to provide clear evidence of conformity with the aesthetic tradition promoted by the park programs.

Under Criterion C, the properties should be designed in the Park Rustic style utilizing local and native materials, which are treated in a rustic, rough hewn, or historic manner. Major character defining features such as stone masonry firepits and fireplaces, masonry, wood and/or concrete fixed picnic tables, parking pads, and individual camp/picnic site delineation through topography, vegetation, or fencing must be present. The replacement of split wood table tops should not preclude the eligibility of otherwise original furnishings. Removal or replacement of one or more original elements of an individual camp site would not disqualify the overall campground grouping from eligibility. However, a majority of original camp furniture and overall design should be present. Campgrounds and day use areas should retain location, natural setting, and design, including original landscape design, workmanship, and materials.

The siting and association of campgrounds also may exemplify a national-state park master planned landscape design. The landscape design must be associated with documented design plans and must continue to retain a majority of organization, features, and landscaping in the original design. The location, setting, and landscape elements indicated in the plan should remain clearly distinguishable. Major loss of landscape vegetation such as windrows, hedges, and mass screening plantings constitutes a loss of integrity for a planned landscape. The introduction of a large number of post-1942 camp sites and structures may disrupt the coherence of the original CCC grouping and undermine its integrity for purposes of registration.

Campgrounds may be eligible at the local level of significance for their association with the public works programs of the 1930s as it was carried out in the individual park unit. The goal of the cooperative program and the CCC was to develop each park unit in order to make it accessible and available for recreational use. In most cases, campgrounds were one element necessary to the achievement of this goal at the individual park unit level. Under Criterion A, campgrounds are associated with the work performed by the locally assigned CCC camp during a specific period of time under the supervision of an assigned NPS landscape architect and the state park authority. They may qualify as individual properties or as contributors to a district made up of other cooperative program and CCC facilities designed and constructed during the period of significance within the park. Under Criterion C, campgrounds may be eligible at the local level as examples of the Park Rustic style as it was interpreted and implemented in the individual park. Service facilities may be individually eligible under this Criterion or may contribute to a district of similar Park Rustic buildings or structures constructed during the

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 39

Name of Property
Multiple Counties, California
County and State
The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

period of significance.

A property eligible at the state level of significance should exhibit a high degree of artistry and craftsmanship. Under Criterion A, it should be an outstanding example of national-state park cooperative program plan and design efforts. Under Criterion C, it should exemplify all of the characteristics of Park Rustic style (i.e. use of native materials, hand finishing of materials, architectural embellishments, and handcrafted fixtures), all accomplished at a very high level of skill and expertise and retaining a high level of integrity. The buildings, structures, or districts of state level significance should represent facilities within the broader property type that are unique or unusual in their scale, craftsmanship, and/or design. Campgrounds were constructed in most park units and follow relatively clear guidelines for design and furnishings. Only in circumstances where they exhibit an unusual landscape design or high degree of craftsmanship combined with excellent integrity would they be likely to rise above the local level of significance.

Circulation Systems

Circulation systems were a crucial design element within park units. They serve as the means of moving staff and visitors from one location to another, and are also major organizing features that structure usage within the park and direct visitor activities.

Description

Circulation systems facilitate park management and control movement of personnel and equipment. They also serve an important function in presenting the park and its scenic elements to the public. Roads and trails controlled what the visitor encounters by determining routes and scenic destinations, and by framing vistas and views. Finally, by controlling avenues of movement, they also serve to concentrate usage in specific areas, limiting access to sensitive natural areas. Two major forms of circulation are present in all parks: vehicular and pedestrian.

Circulation Systems: Vehicular

Vehicular circulation consists of entry roads, loop and circuit roads such as in campground loops, and internal destination roads that take visitors to remote park locations or provide scenic auto touring opportunities. In addition to scraped and surfaced roadbeds, vehicular circulation systems included drainage systems that direct runoff and channel natural drainages and waterway away from road surfaces. These included culverts and ditches, channels, and embankments. In some cases drainage is controlled in the engineering of the road through treatment of slope, topographic alteration, and alignment. In others, drainage systems consisted of constructed stone culverts and drains. Other features of roads include guard rails, stone retaining walls, and pullouts. Stone pillars are not uncommon on entry roads and are used to create a formal park entrance. Sometimes pillars are combined with signage. Bridges are another major feature of circulation systems.

Park roads are generally designed to follow, rather than alter, the natural topography. They are often engineered to avoid and preserve important natural features. This conscious effort to blend the road into nature is an important design characteristic. While often directed toward a destination, the curving and meandering design of park roads also was intended to slow traffic, allow for scenic viewing, and enhance the visitors perception of the park as an environment separated from the more "civilized" world. Shoulders are generally gently sloped and covered with gravel. Gutters, curbs, sidewalks, retaining walls, guard rails, and pullouts are often executed in stone masonry using rough hewn native stone. Although individually small and often widely separated, these are

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 40

----- Name of Property Multiple Counties, California ----- County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 ----- Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

integral features of the road design intended to preserve its naturalistic appearance while providing important safety features. Roads in campground and day use areas are often loop roads that allow circulation around and through the various camp sites.

Circulation Systems: Pedestrian

Pedestrian circulation systems include paths and trails. In the vicinity of visitor facilities and campgrounds, these are generally dirt or gravel walkways that connect facilities. They are naturalistic in appearance and delineated clearly enough to manage traffic between visitor destinations.

Trails are major design features of state parks and reflect both the picturesque and NPS goal of guiding the visitor through the environment. Like vehicular roads, trails were designed to conform with natural topography, frame vistas and views, and appear as natural as possible. Trails, while often directed toward a final destination such as a meadow, waterfall, or vista, are designed to engage the visitor’s interest along the way through changing vegetation, elevation, and natural features. The banking, sloping, grading, and vegetation of trail cuts is intended to integrate the trail with its surroundings. However, steps and cuts to assist visitors in climbing steep elevations are often found along these forest pathways. Two basic forms of trails predominate: the loop trail, which takes the hiker along a roughly circular route that ends near where it began, and the linear trail, which requires the visitor to return by the same route.

Bridges and Crossings

Vehicular bridges are both an inherent element within the larger road system and individual engineering structures. In the 1920s NPS landscape architects were primarily concerned that the appearance of bridges conformed to Park Rustic ideals. To achieve this goal, they developed aesthetic principals that emphasized the use of native materials, including rough hewn stone, stone veneer, logs, and hewn planks. Park Rustic bridges are simplified and streamlined in form and often lack decorative elements such as coping and piers. Rails are often of log or hewn planks and may exhibit stickwork patterns, although this is more common on pedestrian bridges. These aesthetic principals were applied to a variety of engineering schemes on a site-specific bases.

Pedestrian bridges are a frequent occurrence in conjunction with trails. Pedestrian bridges have several forms ranging from split log crossings at shallow drainages to much more elaborate spans crossing large creeks or wetland areas. Regardless of size or engineering type, the primary aesthetic objective was always to have the bridge harmonize with its natural setting. To achieve this goal, trail bridges of the 1933-1942 period are generally executed in wood or log, and originally often had picturesque stickwork rails.

Significance

Vehicular and pedestrian circulation systems were designed to move staff and visitors in and out of the park unit and to provide access to visitor, staff, and maintenance facilities, as well as to enhance access to and enjoyment of the natural environment of the park. Roads and trails associated with the development of California State Parks under the national-state park cooperative program and the CCC may qualify for listing in the National Register under Criterion A. Park roads and bridges are significant in the context of the Depression era public works programs carried out to establish and develop state parks for public use. Roads and trails were vital to park access and the opening of state parks to the general public.

Under Criterion C, these property types represent examples of Park Rustic architecture as it was implemented in

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 41

----- Name of Property Multiple Counties, California ----- County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 ----- Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

California State Parks in the 1930s and early 1940s. Park Rustic is recognized as a distinctive and uniquely American architectural style developed by a single government agency specifically to complement the country’s natural preserves and wilderness areas. The form, materials, design, craftsmanship, and setting of these property types embodies the NPS philosophy of blending the natural and built environments. Characteristic features include sensitivity of design to topographic and natural features, drainage systems constructed of local rustic materials, rustic bridges, framed vistas and views, retaining walls, stone pillars, and markers. Roads and trails may have been designed as part of an integrated circulation system or master planning effort and may exemplify the design principles of Park Rustic landscape architecture and master planning.

Registration Requirements

To meet eligibility requirements for inclusion in the National Register, roads, trails, and bridges must demonstrate their association with the public works programs that oversaw and administratively controlled the development of facilities within state parks. Their association must be demonstrable in the form of national-state park program and/or CCC documentation and they must be characterized by those essential elements of planning and style that were advocated by the programs. This would include major characteristics of Park Rustic style, such as the use of native materials, evidence of handcraftsmanship, and planning characteristics such as sensitive siting, cluster organization, conformance with the natural environment, and setting. A property need not embody all of these characteristics in order to qualify for listing, but must embody a sufficient number to provide clear evidence of conformity with the aesthetic tradition promoted by the parks program. Examples of this property type must have been designed as a part of the national-state park cooperative program and constructed in a park unit by the local CCC work camp in the period 1933-1942.

Under Criterion C, roads and trails are linear features with a number of contributing elements. The features should be designed in the Park Rustic style demonstrating sensitivity to the environmental setting and embody Park Rustic road and trail design principals. Slope, cuts, culverts, and bridges should retain their original location, setting, appearance, and materials. Original alignments should remain intact with minimal evidence of road widening and later road cuts. Road surfaces have generally been altered, and if other aspects of road design remain substantially intact, this would not disqualify a road or trail from eligibility for listing.

The principle characteristic of trails is their design and route along with the existence of original stream crossings and bridges that are in their original location and setting. Some replacement of bridge materials in kind or of similar character would not necessarily significantly impair their integrity. Trail widening, alteration of original routing, major changes in vegetation, replacement of bridges, or extensive integration of the trail into a more modern and extended trail system would impair integrity.

Bridges, especially larger stream crossings, may qualify for listing individually based on their conformance with Park Rustic architectural principals, use of rustic local materials, and retention of original design elements. Bridges may also be considered in the context of the road or trail of which it is a component and may contribute to a larger linear feature. Bridges should retain their original location and setting, original materials, or materials that are replacements-in-kind. They should exhibit evidence of rustic appearance and craftsmanship. While park bridges may be eligible for listing as engineering structures under a separate context, bridge engineering design or innovation was not an important concern of the national-state park cooperative program and is not a basis for significance within this context.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 42

Name of Property
Multiple Counties, California
County and State
The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

Roads and trails also may be part of a larger national-state park cooperative program master planned landscape. The landscape design must be associated with documented design plans and must continue to retain a majority of organization, features, and landscaping in the original design. The location, setting, and landscape elements indicated in the plan should remain clearly distinguishable. Major loss of original design and route, setting, or contributing features such as crossings, terracing, and vegetation would substantially impair integrity. The introduction of post-1942 routing, alignment, or other features may disrupt the coherence of the original national-state park cooperative program and CCC design and construction and undermine its integrity for purposes of registration.

Circulation systems may be eligible at the local level of significance for their association with the public works programs of the 1930s as it was carried out in the individual park unit. The goal of the cooperative program and the CCC was to develop each park unit in order to make it accessible and available for recreational use. Circulation systems were one element necessary to the achievement of this goal at the individual park unit level. Under Criterion A, circulation systems are associated with the work performed by the locally assigned CCC Camp during a specific period of time under the supervision of an assigned NPS landscape architect and the state park authority. They may qualify as individual properties or as contributors to a district made up of other cooperative program and CCC facilities designed and constructed during the period of significance within the park. Under Criterion C, circulation systems may be eligible at the local level as examples of the Park Rustic style as it was interpreted and implemented in the individual park. Circulation systems may be individually eligible under this Criterion or may contribute to a district of similar Park Rustic buildings or structures constructed during the period of significance.

A property eligible at the state level of significance should exhibit a high degree of artistry and craftsmanship. Under Criterion A, it should be an outstanding example of national-state park cooperative program planning and design efforts. A property of statewide significance should exemplify all of the characteristics of Park Rustic style, use of native materials, hand finishing of materials, architectural embellishments, and handcrafted fixtures, all accomplished at a very high level of skill and expertise and retaining a high level of integrity. The buildings, structures, districts, or linear features of state level significance should represent facilities within the broader property type that are unique or unusual in their scale, craftsmanship, and/or design. Circulation systems were constructed in most park units. Only in circumstances where they exhibit an unusual landscape design or high degree of craftsmanship combined with excellent integrity would they be likely to rise above the local level of significance.

CCC Camp Facilities

Description

This property type includes buildings that were constructed to house and support CCC companies working in state parks in the period of significance. Standard policy and practice was to remove these buildings at the end of the CCC camp's final deployment in the park unit. In California State Parks, most of these buildings and structures were removed by 1942. Some buildings were retained in a few park units, notably at Pfeiffer Big Sur State Park.

Generally the CCC camp buildings were of simple wood frame, single-wall construction with board and batten, clapboard, or shingle exterior cladding. They are frequently gable roofed with wide overhangs and exposed

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 43

Name of Property
Multiple Counties, California
County and State
The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

rafters and purlins. They usually have multi-light wood frame casement or awning windows. They were originally grouped together at a single site, which also often had a central gathering area or parade ground and recreational facilities such as baseball diamonds or basketball courts.

Significance

CCC facilities are associated with the development of California State Parks by the CCC crews that provided the majority of labor to implement the national-state park cooperative programs. They may qualify for listing in the National Register under Criterion A for their association with the public works programs of the New Deal era. The CCC camps were essential to developing the state parks and opening them to the public between 1933-1942.

Conceived as temporary, CCC camp buildings were utilitarian and were constructed of simple, available materials, without reference to Park Rustic style or aesthetics. Although often rustic in appearance, they do not represent the design and aesthetic criteria of the Park Rustic architectural style. In many cases the buildings were modeled after military barracks. While these buildings and structures may be eligible for National Register listing under Criterion A for their association with important public works programs of the Great Depression, they are not eligible under Criterion C as examples of the Park Rustic architectural style.

Registration Requirements

To meet eligibility requirements for inclusion in the National Register, CCC facilities must first satisfy Criterion A. Examples of this property type must have been designed and constructed in a park unit by the local CCC work camp in the period 1933-1942. They must be associated with the housing and support of a CCC work camp that executed projects within the park unit and adjacent parks. They must retain integrity of design, materials, location, and setting. CCC facilities may be eligible at the local level of significance for their association with the public works programs of the 1930s as it was carried out in the individual park unit. The goal of the cooperative program and the CCC was to develop each park unit in order to make it accessible and available for recreational use. The camps housed the crews that were assigned to each park or region. Without such housing facilities, work to develop the parks could not have been carried out on the full-time or massive scale that it was under the public works programs of the 1930s.

A CCC facility may be eligible at the state level of significance based on its rarity or uniqueness. Most CCC facilities, as noted above, were demolished at the end of CCC occupancy. Existing buildings or structures associated with the camp may be the only, or one of very limited number, of surviving examples of this property type.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 44

Name of Property
Multiple Counties, California
County and State
The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942
Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

SUMMARY OF IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION METHODS

This Multiple Property Documentation Form was prepared by Carol Roland, Ph.D., in coordination with the staff of the Cultural Resources Division of the California Department of Parks and Recreation. Jan Wooley, State Park Historian, oversaw the contract for preparations of the document and Kathleen Kennedy conducted research and assembled supporting materials for the nomination. Ms. Roland is a historian and architectural historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification standards in both fields. She is a former State Historian for the California Department of Parks and Recreation, where she worked in both the Cultural Resources Division and in the State Office of Historic Preservation. Ms. Roland has prepared several previous studies of CCC era cultural resources in California State Parks. These include *CCC Resources in the State Park System: An Inventory*, 1991, and *Park Rustic Buildings and Structures in the California State Park System: Assessment and Evaluation*, 2003. She also has presented a number of scholarly papers on the early development of California State Parks, the Olmsted California state park plan, and the development of parks under the public works programs of the 1930s. In 2012 Ms. Roland was appointed California’s State Historic Preservation Officer.

An extensive literature review was conducted on the history of California State Parks and the New Deal national and state park programs. There are a number of well-researched and scholarly secondary works on both these topics. Of particular use for this study were the works of Linda Flint McClelland, *Building the National Parks: Historic Landscape Design and Construction* (1998); Ethan Carr, *Wilderness by Design* (1998); Phoebe Cutler, *The Public Landscape of the New Deal* (1985); Neil Maher, *Nature’s New Deal: The Civilian Conservation Corps and the Roots of the American Environmental Movement* (2008); and John Paige, *The Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Park Service, 1933-1942: An Administrative History* (1985). The origins and legacy of Park Rustic architecture in the National Parks is treated at length in McClelland and Carr and by Harvey Kaiser in *Landmarks in the Landscape: Historic Architecture in the National Parks of the West* (1997). This context statement relies heavily on these works for background information on the origins of the Park Rustic style and the general development of the CCC and New Deal national-state park program. Information, specifically on the programs within California State Parks, relies on previously cited studies of the author and on primary resources within the collections of the California State Archives, the National Archives, the Bancroft Library, U.C. Berkeley, and the files and records of the California Department of Parks and Recreation, Sacramento, California.

A list of properties associated with the development of California State Parks in conjunction with the national-state parks cooperative program and the CCC was derived from the preliminary inventory study conducted by Carol Roland in 1991, and the more extensive assessments and evaluations conducted in 2003 by James Newland, Rebecca Allen, and Carol Roland under the auspices of the Department of Parks and Recreation Department, Cultural Resources Division. These studies were focused on identifying park units that were originally developed in the 1930s under the New Deal programs and on developing preliminary property lists and assessments for resources associated with these programs and with the Park Rustic architectural style. Several hundred properties in all parts of the state were identified as a result of these efforts. The analysis in Section F Associated Property Types were based on resource groupings developed in the course of these earlier studies. This Multiple Property Submission is the next step in evaluating the identified resource types and determining what properties are eligible for listing in the National Register, either individually or as historic districts.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 45

Name of Property
Multiple Counties, California

County and State
The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the
Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks
1933-1942

Name of multiple listing (if applicable)

The 1933-1942 period of significance spans the years from the creation of the national-state park cooperative program within the National Park Service and the legislative establishment of the CCC to the closure of all CCC work camps in California. The first work in California under these programs commenced in 1933. It should be noted that the Park Rustic architectural style continued to be used in California's State Parks into the 1950s. While similar in design, aesthetics, and appearance, those resources were developed within a post-World War II context.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number 1 Page 46

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

MAJOR BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- Albright, Horace. *The Birth of the National Park Service: The Founding Years, 1913-1933*. Salt Lake City: Howe Brothers, 1985.
- Beck, Christopher. "Preserving Western Spaces: The Landscape Planning Vision of Fredrick Law Olmsted, Jr." Unpublished Honors Thesis, Brown University, 1986.
- Birnbaum, Charles and Robin Karson. *Pioneers of American Landscape Design*. New York: McGraw-Hill 2000.
- Cardwell, Kenneth. *Bernard Maybeck: Artisan, Architect, Artist*. Salt Lake City: Peregrine Smith Books, 1977.
- Carr, Ethan. *Wilderness by Design: Landscape Architecture and the National Park Service*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.
- Comstock, William and Clarence Eaton Schermerhorn. *Bungalows, Camps and Mountain Houses*. New York: W.T. Comstock Co, 1915; reprinted American Institute of Architects, 1990.
- Cutler, Phoebe. *The Public Landscape of the New Deal*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.
- Dearborn, Ned. *Once in a Lifetime: A Guide to the CCC Camp*. New York: Charles E. Merrill Company, 1935.
- Department of Parks and Recreation, "Hobarth Worksheets." Unpublished study of CCC projects and work periods, n.d.
- Downing, Andrew Jackson. *The Architecture of Country Houses*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1921.
- Emergency Conservation Work (ECW) Reports 1934-1935. Typescript reports in Natural Resource – Administration – Director Beaches and Parks, California State Archives.
- Engbeck, Joseph. *State Parks of California from 1864 to the Present*. Portland: Charles H. Belding, 1980.
- _____. *By the People, For the People: The Work of the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks, 1933-1941*. (Sacramento: California State Parks, 2002).
- Good, Albert H. ed. *Park and Recreation Structures*. 3 vols. Washington D.C.: National Park Service, 1938.
- _____. *Park Structures and Facilities*. Washington D.C.: National Park Service, 1935.
- Grattan, Virginia. *Mary Colter. Builder upon the Red Earth*. Flagstaff: Northland Press, 1980.
- Kaiser, Harvey. *Great Camps of the Adirondacks*. Boston: David Godin Publisher, Inc. 1986.
- _____. *Landmarks in the Landscape: Historic Architecture in the National Parks of the West*. San Francisco:

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number I Page 47

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

Chronicle Books, 1997.

Longstreth, Richard. *On the Edge of the World: Four Architects in San Francisco at the Turn of the Century*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989.

Maher, Neil. *Nature's New Deal: The Civilian Conservation Corps and the Roots of the American Environmental Movement*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

McClelland, Linda. *Building the National Parks: Historic Landscape and Construction*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1998.

Meinecke, E.P. Camp Planning and Camp Reconstruction. California: U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, circa 1934.

Minutes of the Meetings of the California State Park Commission 1929-37. Typescripts in Department of Parks and Recreation, Central Files.

Monthly Narrative Reports to Regional Landscape Architect – Region IV, 1935-1938. Record Group 79, National Archives, San Bruno.

National Conference on Outdoor Recreation. *Recreation Resources of Federal Lands*. Washington D.C., 1934.

National Park Service. *Yearbook: Park and Recreation Progress 1937-1942*. Washington D.C., GPO, 1938-1943.

National Park Service. "Proceedings: National Park Service Conference of State Park Authorities, Washington D.C., February 25, 1935," National Park Service, Washington, D.C.

Newland, Jim. "A Brief History of Rolando, a Community of San Diego, California,"
<http://www.rolandovillage.com>.

Newton, Norman. *Design on the Land: The Development of Landscape Architecture*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Olmsted, Frederick Law, Jr., *Report of State Park Survey of California*. Sacramento: California State Printing Office, 1929.

Otis, Alison, William Honey et al. *The Forest Service and the Civilian Conservation Corps: 1933-42*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Forest Service, 1986.

Paige, John. *The Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Park Service, 1933-1942: An Administrative History*. Washington DC: National Park Service, 1985.

Roland, Carol. "CCC Resources in the State Park System." Unpublished report, Department of Parks and Recreation, December 1991.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number I Page 48

Name of Property Multiple Counties, California County and State The National-State Park Cooperative Program and the Civilian Conservation Corps in California State Parks 1933-1942 Name of multiple listing (if applicable)
--

_____ "Park Rustic Building and Structures in the California State Park System: Survey and Evaluation",
Unpublished report, Department of Parks and Recreation, December 2003.

Rybczynski, Witold. *A Clearing in the Distance: Fredrick Law Olmsted and America in the Nineteenth Century*.
New York: Scribner, 1999.

Soullière, Laura and William Tweed. "National Park Service Rustic Architecture 1916-1942." San Francisco:
Western Regional Office, National Park Service, 1977.

U.S. Department of Agriculture. *Forest Recreation Handbook*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Forest Service, 1934.

Wiffen, Marcus. *American Architecture since 1780: A Guide to Styles*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1981.