NPS Form 10-900-b
(Jan 1987)

OMB No 1024-0018

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

# National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form

APR 2 8 1989

NATIONAL REGISTER

This form is for use in documenting multiple property groups relating to one or several historic contexts. See instructions in *Guidelines for Completing National Register Forms* (National Register Bulletin 16). Complete each item by marking "x" in the appropriate box or by entering the requested information. For additional space use continuation sheets (Form 10-900-a). Type all entries.

## A. Name of Multiple Property Listing

ECW Architecture at Prince William Forest Park, 1933-42

## B. Associated Historic Contexts

The development of parks in Virginia, 1933-42

## C. Geographical Data

Prince William Forest Park (nee' Chopawamsic RDA) is located approximately 30 miles south of the District of Columbia in Prince William County, Virginia. The park land and the entrance to it are situated west of the towns of Triangle, Dumfries, and Quantico Marine Base. The park boundaries are coterminus with several thoroughfares: on the east by Interstate 95, on the south-southwest by VA Route 619, and on the north by VA Route 234. A seven-mile road loops through the center of the 11,122 -acre park, in addition to which there are man-made foot trails, firebreaks, lakes, dams, and branches of the Quantico and Chopawamsic creeks. The buildings that compose cabin Camps (1) Goodwill and (4) Pleasant are located in the central eastern portion on the park; Camp (3) Orenda and the maintenance area near the southern boundary; and Camps (2) Mawavi and (5) Happyland near the southwest edge of the park; the central and northern region contains a few trails but is almost completely unbroken forest.

☐ See continuation sheet

## D. Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this documentation form meets the National Register documentation standards and sets forth requirements for the listing of related properties consistent with the National Register criteria. This submission meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60 and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Planning and Evaluation.

H. Bryan Mitchell

Signature of certifying official — Date

Director, VA Division of Historic Landmarks

State or Federal agency and bureau

I, hereby, certify that this multiple property documentation form has been approved by the National Register as a basis for evaluating related properties for listing in the National Register.

Patrick Andrus — 6/12/89

Signature of the Keeper of the National Register — Date

Three interrelated factors that got their start around the turn of the century led to the definition of new recreational goals in America and gave rise to the development of organized park and campground facilities. The first was a back-to-nature movement that grew up with the establishment of the National Park Service in 1916; concurrent to which was the public's increasing amount of leisure time, and the perception that spending it in a natural, non-urban environment was a healthful and relaxing pastime.

The third major impetus to the development of park systems was an ability to reach these facilities--the rise of automobility. Autocamping had been popular during the first two decades of the 20th century, either in the form of free municipal camps or in the custom of setting up a tent and stove along the road. By the 1930s it became apparent that both practices were inappropriate. The quality of the municipal camps, founded by town fathers to generate local revenue, had greatly deteriorated and they were shut down. Roadside camping, the illegality of squatting on private property and the ongoing rise of auto traffic, left this gypsy-like tradition equally unsavory. The solution discovered by touring motorists was state and national forests.[1]

President Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal of the 1930s offered a solution to the dilemma. The Emergency Conservation Work Act (ECW), introduced by FDR and approved by the Congress on March 31, 1933, included under its auspices the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC).

The CCC was part of an emergency program dually intended to reduce unemployment and promote park construction and conservation. Just as the design aspects of rustic architecture changed during the 1930s, so the role of the CCC changed during these same years. Initially, in the mid-30s, the CCC functioned as a relief agency, then it became a training agency and, finally, just before its demise, it evolved into a defense agency--this last phase the least successful of the three.[2] Although attempts were made to establish a permanent CCC, it ended in 1942, described by one source as a "nine-year experiment by the federal government in the conservation of human and natural resources."[3]

Administration of the CCC program was a cooperative effort among the U.S. Departments of War, Interior, Agriculture, and Labor. The Labor Department recruited men in conjunction with each state, while the U.S. Army was responsible for the conduct and care of the enrollees. During the workday, Agriculture and Interior Departments

---

[1] Warren James Belasco, Americans on the Road: From Autocamp to Motel, 1910-1945 (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1971), pp. 71, 89, 126-27.

[2] Final Report of the Federal Security Agency, p. 32, 38; cited in John P. Byrne, "The Civilian Conservation Corps in Virginia: 1933-42" (M.A. thesis, University of Montana, 1982), p. 22.

[3] Byrne, p. 1

☒ See continuation sheet

directed the men. Each man received $1 per day as well as room, board and the opportunity for an education; each camp was ideally composed of 200 men.[4] Initially the CCC ranks came from a quota of unmarried men (based on state population) age 18 to 25 years old; Virginia's quota was 5,000.[5] Each man enrolled for six months and could re-enlist when that period was up. CCC men worked on municipal, state, federal, and private projects nationwide.

Each CCC company was directed by a commanding officer with his aides, followed by technical personnel in the fields of engineering, landscape architecture, mechanics and tool-keeping; leaders, assistant leaders and members made up the bulk of the corps.[6] The upper ranks earned considerably more than the enrollees, and they were experienced professionals. In 1936, hourly rates for the Washington area, which were apparently somewhat higher than other places, were 40 cents for unskilled labor, and $1.38 and up for skilled labor.[7] In 1938, a company superintendent with engineering, executive and construction-supervision experience earned $2,300 a year; a senior foreman, a landscape architect with training and construction experience, $1,920; and a trained mechanic, $1,500.[8]

During the 1930s, CCC, WPA, Public Works Administration (PWA), and federal monies could not generally be used for the purchase of land. At the same time, farmlands near population centers were identified as submarginal from an agricultural standpoint. In 1934, FDR sought to marry the two situations and established a program for the retrieval of submarginal land. It called for the PWA to allocate $25 million to the Federal Surplus Relief Administration for purchase of the land. This money was then transferred to the Land Program of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA), to which interested agencies of the government were to apply. In May 1935, the Land Program

---

[4] Byrne, p. 2-3.

[5] James E. Ward Jr. and Treadwell Davison, "The CCC Camps in Virginia," University of Virginia Newsletter (December 15, 1934)

[6] Official Annual, 1937 (District No. 3, Third Corps Area, Civilian Conservation Corps. Washington, D.C.: 1937), p. 88.

[7] Joel Berrall to Mr. (Matt) Huppuch, "Status of Negotiation for Labor, Chopawamsic VA-6" (12 November, 1936).

[8] Civilian Conservation Corps Camp Application, Chopawamsic, Virginia (February 14, 1938)

x See continuation sheet

was transferred to the newly created Resettlement Administration, and the next year it was effectively turned over to the National Park Service (NPS).[9]

Henceforth, the NPS was responsible for surveying the public needs, choosing the desired locations, investigating the land, securing options on the land, recommending purchase, and planning the development. Once the land became federal property, a CCC company and WPA laborers began to fulfill a "development plan which [had] been carefully drawn during formative days."[10]

Four types of facilities were slated: 1) wayside parks, 2) national park and monument expansions, 3) state scenic extensions, and 4) vacation developments near a city. This last category developed as recreational demonstration areas (RDAs), which Conrad Wirth, NPS assistant director, felt was "one of the really successful New Deal programs."[11]

Criteria for an RDA included a land mass of 2,000 to 10,000 acres; a proximity of 50 miles, or a half-days' round-trip, to a population center of 300,000 persons; an abundance of water and building material; and generally, an interesting environment.[12] About 400,000 to 450,000 acres of land nationwide were scheduled for such development, purchased at an average cost of $10 an acre.[13] Ultimately, 46 recreational demonstration projects were created in 24 states.[14] Work at these sites included the conservation of water, soil, forest and wildlife resources, as well as the construction of

---

9 Conrad L. Wirth, Parks, Politics, and the People (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980), p. 189; Executive Order 7496, Nov. 14, 1936, confirming action of Aug. 1, 1936, when NPS actually took over responsibility. Ibid., coverleaf page.

10 H. Ickes, A. Cammerer, R. Tugwell, et al. Recreational Demonstration Projects as Illustrated by Chopawamsic, Virginia. (NPS: c. 1936), p. 3.

11 Wirth, pp. 176-78.

12 Wirth, pp. 187-88; Ickes et al, p. 2.

13 Ickes et al, p. 2.

14 Thirty-two RDAs were 'vacation' destinations or organized campground facilities; the remaining 14 were roadside facilities or additions to existing state or national monuments. NPS, 1937 Yearbook (Washington: GPO, 1937), p. 38.

public recreational facilities.[15] In fact, it was intended that work on RDAs was to be done "principally by relief labor," with participation by the CCC.[16] The federal government established most RDAs with the intention of eventually turning them over to the respective states for management.

Since RDAs represented a deliberate effort by the federal government to serve an urban audience and perform a civic-welfare function, they were not intended to replace or compete with state parks, which served a greater socioeconomic cross section of people and were located in less central geographic areas.

> [RDAs] are not national parks, state parks, county parks, metropolitan parks, or forests of any technical classification. They are newcomers to the recreation field--part of a recreational awakening. . . . Land unprofitable to farm due to lack of fertility, erosion, misuse [and] land, which because of its location, attains greater social and economic importance when dedicated to the recreation needs of congested populations.[17]

RDAS provided organized camps--as oppposed to facilities aimed at unstructured habitation and leisure--for children, families, social organizations and especially lower-income groups, because "the organized camp seemed to offer the best solution to the problem of providing vacations and outdoor recreation at low cost to the maximum number of people."[18]

As the ECW and CCC programs grew, the NPS recognized the need to formalize design guidelines and improve job-related training of the men in the respective programs. In response, the NPS published Park Structures and Facilities in 1935. A collection of photographs, plans,and descriptions of architecture in national and state parks, it served as a textbook for the training of new workers involved in the construction of park architecture.[19] The editor, architect Albert H. Good, offered what

---

15 John C. Paige, The Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Park Service, 1933-1942: An Administrative History (Washington: NPS, 1985), p. 118.

16 1937 Yearbook, p. 2.

17 Ickes et al, p. 2.

18 1937 Yearbook, p. 38.

19 William C. Tweed, Laura E. Souilliere and Henry G. Law, National Park Service Rustic Architecture 1916-1942 (NPS, Western Regional Office, Cultural Resource Management, 1977), p. 92.

x See continuation sheet

has become the definitive statement on rustic architecture by the NPS prior to World War II:

> Successfully handled, [rustic] is a style which, through the use of native materials in proper scale, and through the avoidance of rigid, straight lines, and over-sophistication, gives the feeling of having been executed by pioneer craftsmen with limited hand tools. It thus achieves sympathy with the natural surroundings, and with the past.[20]

Good advocated unintrusive park design, calling for harmony in building construction and setting through the use of natural materials and paint of natural hues. But by 1938, when the book was rereleased, the taste for rustic architecture that had risen in the late 1910s had begun to give way to modernism, with its emphasis on simplicity and functionalism, and its disdain for romance in architecture. The new movement swept through the design professions worldwide, and consequently, affected the kinds of designs produced by professional architects employed in the various national and state park offices:

> Fewer examples of 'exaggerated rustic" were appearing. Many NPS residences built in the late 1930s made only minor concessions to their immediate settings. Quite often these were rather unexceptional wood-frame houses incorporating rustic siding and stone veneer foundations.[21]

With similar attention to organization and continuity, it quickly became apparent that CCC camps themselves needed a codified styling and design. In 1936, the NPS determined that all Corps camp structures were to be standardized and easily disassembled. Henceforth, each camp ideally was to be made up of four barracks measuring 100 feet by 20 feet, 12 officers' and service buildings, a mess hall, schoolhouse, hospital, bathhouses, and a latrine block. These were arranged around a "U"-shaped space planted as a lawn or cleared for sports use, according to individual topographical features (map 1), in one of 50 or so layouts usually near the organized-

---

[20] Albert H. Good, Park and Recreation Structures, Part III: Overnight and Organized Camp Facilities (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1938), p. 62.

[21] Tweed et al, p. 97.

camp site (map 2). The most common exterior wall treatments were brown or green paint, the brown-blackish creosote, or tar paper.[22]

Besides work and a steady income, the CCC charged itself with the education, entertainment, and personal edification of its enrollees. The education program at Chopawamsic's SP-25 was fivefold: academic subjects were taught in an effort to combat illiteracy; vocational teaching aimed at giving the men a skill for post-CCC employment; on-the-job instruction augmented in-camp teaching; in addition to informal activities, and a recreation program. Hobbies and sports competitions were advocated; basketball playoffs were held in Richmond and College Park, Maryland, with similiar energies devoted to ping pong, wrestling, and boxing.[23]

Each camp was responsible for the entertainment of its men. During winter 1936, the men of Chopawamsic's SP-22 enjoyed "basketball, pool, and such games as cards, checkers and chess."[24] Shows and lectures were held in the rec hall at SP-25 in 1935, "much to the enjoyment of the enrollees." A company dance was held at least once a month, with other diversions such as stag parties, company sings, and a weekly stunt night.[25] For its conducive atmosphere, SP-25 was ranked the best camp in the Fourth (Virginia) District in 1936.

Between 1933 and 1942, the Virginia CCC employed more than 75,000 men, many of whom served for a full year. Compared to the rest of the nation, Virginia received a disproportionate number of CCC camps, ranking fourth in the number of camps, although ranking 36th among states in area.[26] Six RDAs were established in Virginia. In fiscal year 1936-37, $610,869 was expended for these sites, ranking the commonwealth No. 3 in monies received, after Pennsylvania and Missouri.[27]

---

[22] John A. Salmond, The Civilian Conservation Corp, 1933-1942 (Durham: Duke University Press, 1967), p. 136.

[23] Official Annual, 1937, pp. 17, 89.

[24] "Bi-monthly Narrative Report, 6th Period" (February 13, 1936)

[25] Superintendent E.G. Baldwin, Narrative Report, Camp Virginia SP-25, Chopawamsic Area, Joplin, Va. (January 10, 1936); Official Annual, 1937, p. 89.

[26] Byrne, p. 23, 30.

[27] 1937 Yearbook, p. 2.

x See continuation sheet

Although Virginia benefitted from the public works program, state legislators opposed the idea of a federal dole as the solution to Depression woes. Five Democrat senators consistently opposed FDR in 1933-34, and two were from Virginia.[28] Senator Harry F. Byrd, a former governor appointed in 1933, was a fiscal conservative and ardently resisted the New Deal programs. He "tolerated the CCC in the first few years of the Depression because conditions indicated that [it] was real and citizens in distress required temporary relief."[29] In theory, the states were expected to contribute to the FERA program based on the ability to pay. Yet, "in spite of rather ample resources and an excellent financial condition, the leaders in public life in Virginia [had] no conviction that the state should bestir itself to help."[30]

Once legislation was passed to release relief dollars to each state, however, Virginia was intent on receiving her share. As of December 1935, Virginia comprised 2 percent of the nation's population, yet it contributed less than 6/10ths of 1 percent to the cost of FERA. And although it escaped the worst ravages of the Depression, Virginia ranked 19th among all states in money allotted by CCC enrollees to their dependents.[31]

The Corps largely achieved the natural and human conservation goals of its founding. It provided employment and a positive application of youthful energy at a time of national joblessness and idleness; it resulted in numerous parks for public recreation; and it promoted the out-of-doors as a necessary and healthful pastime.[32]

A 1941 NPS publication, A Study of the Park and Recreation Problem of the United States, reaffirmed the tenets under which that agency had developed for nearly a decade, that the untainted wilderness accessible in organized parklands was particularly crucial to the hassled and corrupt workforce incarcerated in American cities:

> Man's loss of intimate contact with nature has had a debilitating

---

28 James T. Patterson, Congressional Conservatism and the New Deal (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1967), p. 348.

29 Byrne, p. 17.

30 Leland B. Tate, "Emergency Relief in Virginia," University of Virginia Newsletter (November 15, 1935), cited in Byrne, p. 68.

31 Byrne, p. 30.

32 Norman T. Newton, Design on the Land (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971), p. 564.

xx See continuation sheet

> effect on him as a being[,] which can be alleviated only by making it possible for him to escape at frequent intervals from his urban habitat to the open country. . . .He must again learn how to enjoy himself in the out-of-doors by reacquiring the environmental knowledge and skills he has lost during his exile from his natural environment.[33]

Concurrent with the development of parks was the growth of a highway and parkway system to link recreational areas. As early as April 1931, an "Eastern National Park-to-Park Highway" was agreed upon by the Department of the Interior and state authorities for development of a regional thoroughfare. It linked the Shenandoah National Park Project in Virginia with the Great Smoky Mountains National Park Project in Tennessee and North Carolina, the birthplace memorials of Abraham Lincoln and George Washington, as well as with the District of Columbia and Colonial Williamsburg. In the vicinity of Chopawamsic, the Washington-Richmond Highway/Route 1 served as the connector road in this system. The access highways are responsible for increasing "manyfold the patronage of scenic and recreational areas."[34] A 1937 study of Region 1, which includes Virginia, indicates that an average of 4.3 persons per car travelled to parks here, a greater number than the national average.[35]

Conrad Wirth addressed the relationship between automobility and the park system before a convention of park executives in 1936:

> The private automobile and the common carriers are taking people to parks of all classifications, and these people expect to follow the same type of recreation in national, state and metropolitan parks. Thousands will soon be using the federal areas which are being developed in many states as Recreational Demonstration Projects, and the states and cities which will be asked to take over the administration of these areas must plan the use of them in accordance with the facilities which have been provided by a federal agency which looks upon its recreation responsibilities from a national viewpoint.[36]

---

[33] NPS, Park and Recreation Problem, p. 4.

[34] 1937 Yearbook, p. 37.

[35] NPS, "Park Use Study 1937, A Report on Attendance and Use at Eighty-Six Selected Parks in Region I" (Richmond: NPS, 1937), p. 6. Chopawamsic was one of six RDAs included in the study.

[36] Conrad L. Wirth, "Related Park and Recreational Problems," Parks and Recreation (December 1936), p. 174.

x See continuation sheet

FDR recognized the symbiotic relationship between the parks system, their accessibility and tourism, when he founded the U.S. Tourist Bureau as part of the Department of the Interior in 1937, because "touring is fundamentally recreational." He said: "The prudent extension of our great system of national parks, and the widespread expansion of state and local park systems have stimulated interest in travel tremendously."[37]

*******

The proposed multiple property area occupies the historic boundaries of Chopawamsic Recreation Demonstration Area, now Prince William Forest Park (map 3), and is composed of a variety of buildings and structures supporting daytime recreational activities and overnight accommodations. The 11,122-acre park of approximately 30 square miles is bounded on the east by Interstate 95, on the north by VA Route 234, and on the south-southwest by VA Route 619. The single, public-access thoroughfare in the forest is Park Central Road, which forms a seven-mile loop through the park. Four historic districts in the park are being proposed to the National Register of Historic Places (map 4).

This region is crisscrossed by many tributaries of the Chopawamsic and Quantico creeks, for which the land was historically named. Most of the park land is situated on the watershed of Quantico Creek.[38]

White occupation of these lands dates to the 18th century. The heavily forested "interior," including park land, was patented in large tracts during the 18th century, after Tidewater soil was depleted by regular tobacco cultivation. As port towns such as Dumfries--established at the mouth of Chopawamsic Creek and later becoming the county seat--developed, so did the means for active trade and commerce. The tobacco

---

[37] 1937 Yearbook, p. 33-34.

[38] Chopawamsic, or "Chipawansic," is an Indian word meaning "by the separation of the outlet," refering to the probable site of an Indian village at the delta island separating the mouths of the creeks; Quantico is the Indian word for "by the long stream." Dr. Charles W. Porter, "Preliminary Historical Report and a Brief History . . ." (December 28, 1935), p. 1; Fairfax Harrison, Landmarks of Old Prince William (Berryville, Va.: Chesapeake Book Co., 1964), p. 52.

* See continuation sheet

culture prevailed as the dominant crop until at least 1800; historic sites from this period within park boundaries include at least one plantation, mills, shops, churches, and cemeteries. Agricultural diversification gradually took place up to the Civil War within a generally depressed economy, and the county's population fell off; during the war years the area was "devastated." Intensive exploitation of the park-area forest occurred when the Richmond, Potomac & Fredericksburg Railway reached Quantico, initiating thoughtless harvesting of oak for ties; then in the 1920s, more trees were lost to service as road foundations. Through the early 20th century, subsistence farming remained a constant but weak economy, in addition to which the Cabin Branch pyrite mine was in operation until 1919. Residents continued to overcut the wood to sell and use for fuel, building materials, and cooking.

As a result of this steady occupation, an estimated 16 cemeteries that date from the early 19th century are located within park boundaries, many in poor condition and containing unidentified markers.[39]

The park lands were assembled as Chopawamsic Recreational Demonstration Area in the mid-1930s. In summer 1934, NPS officials had begun the search for a large tract of submarginal land, which materialized in the region around Joplin--one of more than 400 sites nationwide investigated for RDA potential. Chopawamsic--the fourth largest of all 46 RDAs, and one of the six located in the Commonwealth of Virginia--served the estimated 500,000 inhabitants of the nation's capital and its metropolitan area:[40]

> Typical of the program is a 15,000-acre project in Virginia, 35 miles southwest of Washington . . . called Chopawamsic. . . . The area comprises one of the nation's unique historical spots, and is a good example of what the program is trying to accomplish both socially and economically.[41]

The original acquisition plan included all the land in the drainage areas of the Quantico and Chopawamsic creeks and west of U.S. Route 1 that was not already part of

---

39 "Cemeteries Found in and About Prince William Forest Park" (September 1973).

40 Ickes et al, p. 20-21; but according to the 1937 Yearbook, Chopawamsic ranked No. 5 in size, p. 41; Washington D.C.'s population in 1930 was 486,869; in 1940, 663,091: U.S. Census Bureau, Historical Statistics of the United States, from Colonial Times to 1970 (Washington: Commerce Department/ Government Printing Office, 1975), p. 26.

41 Ickes et al, p. 6.

x See continuation sheet

Quantico Marine Base.[42] At the time this acreage was identified for purchase by the government, approximately 150 families occupied the area--the majority poor and idle: one-half of these householders had part-time work, one-quarter had steady work, and only one-quarter were employed full time.[43] Washington's Evening Star reported that:

> The population now living on the project area and still attempting to wrest a living from the poor, worn-out soil, is bound to the merest existence level by the limited productivity of the land.[44]

Another newspaper account a year later is more graphic:

> It was a dismal countryside of eroded, sterile fields, dilapidated little farm houses, ancient graveyards overgrown with blackberry brambles, cut-over woodlands, abandoned mining operations. About half the farms were deserted anyhow.[45]

A core group of black and white families lived at the town of Joplin, which had a post office, and Hickory Ridge, a settlement of about 20 houses and a church along what are now North Orenda and Pyrite Mine Fire Roads, respectively.[46] Between 1920 and 1925, it is estimated that more than 30 farms in the area, as well as local businesses including the blacksmith shop, were closed; other businesses accepted property in lieu of monetary payment of debts.[47]

This exacerbated already poor land records which, coupled with the government's inconsistent compensation, was the cause of much alleged resentment among the inhabitants. Wealthy land owners are said to have been approached first and paid the highest price per acre, while those who held out and refused to leave ended up with little

---

[42] E.K. Burlew to Secretary of the Navy (May 27, 1941).

[43] Ickes et al, p. 14.

[44] The Evening Star (Washington, D.C., 6 March 1935); cited in Parker, p. 141.

[45] "Lore of Early Competitor of New York Revived By Dumfries Resettlement Project Near Capital," Washington Star (March 15, 1936).

[46] Parker, pp. 76, 85-86, 124, 127, 132

[47] Charles Gerner, "Project Plan, Recreation Area Demonstration Project, Under the Land Program, Chopawamsic Area, Virginia" (National Archives, Record Group 79, Records of Branch of Recreation, Land Planning and State Cooperation), pp. 11-13; cited in Parker, p. 142.

x See continuation sheet

or nothing. And if they could not prove ownership, they could not be compensated by the Resettlement Agency, nor did they qualify for aid from the Rural Rehabilitation office because they were not full-time farmers. "The records show a wide range of value paid per acre, but the circumstances responsible for this range of values are not clear." [48] The average price paid per acre was $13.33, above the national average of $10, but considered very fair by Land Program officials.[49]

By February 1935, the Land Program Division of the Federal Housing Relocation Agency concurrently began accepting options on the land, and made application for three CCC camps. Camps SP-22/Company 1374, SP-25/Company 2349, and SP-26/Company 2383 arrived at Chopawamsic in April 1935: SP-22 remained in place until March 1939; SP-25 until March 1938; and SP-26 until September 1939, except for a six-month period in 1937-38 (company SP-26 actually moved into the site occupied by the departed SP-25). Camp NP-16 then moved into the SP-26 site(map 1) until vacating in April 1942.[50]

By November 1935, 115 tracts totalling 12,422.13 acres of land had been accepted, purchased for $138,938.88.[51]

Charles Gerner, Chopawamsic project manager with the Resettlement Administration, and H.H. Gordon, director of the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation, a division of the Virginia Emergency Relief Administration, were responsible for identifying the neediest families. Those best suited to farming would continue to do so, while persons suited to other occupations would be trained for them. Almost half of the hundred or so families were assisted in finding new farmland, or were given first preference to getting a job in the park.[52] "After selling their land, most fell back on

---

48 Parker, p. 144.

49 Susan Strickland, Administrative History of Prince William Forest Park (copy of draft, 1987), p. 8.

50 "Civilian Conservation Corps Camp Application, Chopawamsic, Virginia" (February 14, 1938)

51 Strickland, p. 11.

52 "Lore of Early Competitor of New York Revived By Dumfries Resettlement Project Near Capital," Washington Star (March 15, 1936).

x See continuation sheet

relatives living nearby or purchased small tracts just outside the boundaries of the park. Today, many of the original landowners still live in the surrounding community."[53]

> Coincident with the work of acquiring land, planning for development was begun. Master plans to guide the development of each area were prepared. . . . The work of planning had to proceed rapidly, because all construction was to be done by CCC and relief labor, for whom work had to be furnished almost immediately.[54]

A year into the project, there were an estimated 500 CCC men in residence, and 225 WPA laborers recruited from the neighborhood, who were paid out of the Resettlement Administration monies.

Initially, the CCC men erected tent camps, which served as shelter during the two to three months it took to construct the formal camp: "The tent camp was then abandoned and all scars and other evidence of habitation were obliterated."[55]

Recruiting a sufficient number of men to carry out the substantial building tasks at Chopawamsic RDA was an ongoing problem. Although the planned number of men per CCC camp was 200, the average per CCC camp in Chopawamsic/PWFP was 100-120, a labor shortage that plagued development of the intended projects. Project Manager W.R. Hall voiced concern in a semi-monthly report in 1937:

> We need twice as many men as are currently reporting. We have. . . requested appropriate exemptions under which we would be allowed to employ skilled workmen whom we need to carry on our construction program more efficiently.[56]

Labor needs (based on a quota of 400 men) at Chopawamsic per year were approximately 50 percent unskilled, 31 percent intermediate, 16 percent skilled, and 3 percent professional and technical. Professional and technical skills included that of an engineer and draftsman; skilled, blacksmith, carpenter and machinist; and intermediate, watchman, pipe layer, and truck driver.[57]

---

53 Strickland, p. 5, 11.
54 1937 Yearbook, p. 38.
55 W.R. Hall. "Accomplishments of CCC Camp SP-25 During. . ." p. 2.
56 W.R. Hall, "Semi-monthly Report, Chopawamsic RDP" (for January 16-31, 1937)
57 Labor Requirements, Chopawamsic (October, November, December 1936).

Topographical features were attended to first. The permanent CCC camps were erected and the main entrance to the park cut away, as well as filling, draining and grading carried out.[58] A later company report details the intent of the trail system:

> Much work has been done on foot trails. Their [SP-26's] trails are constructed with a definite objective in mind. The three companies in the park are cooperating in this and each camp is assigned a certain portion of the trail system. These trails seek to follow watercourses and to reach scenic points and other interesting places which would attract and please visitors.[59]

The first approved construction in April 1936 was for 12 cabins, which required more than 100,000 feet of lumber; these were followed by the dining hall, infirmiry, two leaders' cabins, two unit lodges, two latrines, and a craft shop. The CCC technicians of this corps were apparently excellent designers, for the drawings for various camp structures at Camps (2) Mawavi and (3) Orenda were highly praised. These are "swell plans--we ought to get plans like these from other projects. These boys know their business," praised one manager.[60] In fact, in 1936 men at work on the construction of Camps (1) Goodwill and (2) Mawavi were photographed for the National Park Service's CCC promotion film the Human Crop.[61]

Three organized camps were planned initially, and work commenced on them almost simultaneously. Although Camp 1-Boys' (map 5), Camp 2-Girls' (map 6), and Camp 3-Family (map 7) were in operation for the 1936 summer season, they were unfinished; all five organized camps were predominantly complete by 1940 (map 8).

Chopawamsic's accessibility via a major highway was intentional, but not so much for self-sufficient visitors who might also travel to a state park. The state parks accommodated travellers of moderate income or better, "thus throwing the entire burden of providing the low-income groups with recreation on local government agencies. The pleasure to be derived from recreation [in] large natural areas will be denied this large

---

58 Ernest Baldwin, "Narrative Report for Camp SP-25" (October 10, 1935).

59 Narrative Report of Progress VA SP-26, Chopawamsic Area and Stafford Wayside (October-November 1935).

60 "Routing slip RDAs," Virginia SP-25 Chopawamsic (n.d., circa 1936).

61 W.R. Hall, Semi-monthly Report, Chopawamsic RDA VA 6 for June 16-30, 1936. The Human Crop is 11 minutes long, with sound.

x See continuation sheet

subsistence group unless special means of transportation can be devised."[62] It was the burgeoning nation's capital that this nearby Virginia park was to serve, as cited by NPS Regional Manager Ira B. Lykes:

> Here in the Chopawamsic area we have an opportunity to present to the public through a combination of natural features and constructed facilities, much in the way of recreation not now found in the immediate vicinity of the City of Washington.[63]

Because it was designed as an organized camp, a genre of recreation born out of the precedents of private and "educational and character-influencing organizations," most campers were bussed in by sponsoring groups. During the summer months, a camp was operated by a sponsoring organization, with the facilities let to a variety of special-interest groups during the balance of the year. In the early years, each unit camp was leased for $600 a season, for example, which included building maintenance, policing,and garbage removal; girls', boys' and family facilities were available.[64] Boys and girls were always segregated; separate black and white facilities were maintained until the mid-1950s.

Two Washington-based charity tent camps were relocated in June 1937 to Chopawamsic--cited as "model camping facilities"--even before construction was complete.[65] Camp Goodwill had been a family campground located in Rock Creek Park and Camp Pleasant in the Blue Plains area served black families; both had operated as part of the District's Family Services Association since the turn of the century.[66]

Camp 3 (aka Orenda, Mothers & Tots, Family)--home of Camp Goodwill during the 1937-38 season-- was "far from being ready for occupancy" when the children arrived,

---

62 "Park Use Study 1937," p. 34.

63 Ira B. Lykes. "Report and Recommendations on the Operating Policy of the Chopawamsic Recreational Demonstration Area, Prince William and Stafford Counties, Virginia." (Nov. 1, 1940: p. 11)

64 "Dumfries Camps to Aid D.C. Groups," Washington Post (March 1936).

65 Family Services Association Summer Outings Committee, "Brief Report to National Park Service on Camp Good Will and Camp Pleasant Operated in the Chopawamsic Area" (Summer 1938).

66 "Chopawamsic: At the Small Isolate Lodge," (preliminary proposal) (January 28, 1935), p. 24.

See continuation sheet

but "there existed such a spirit of consideration and cooperation" among the park people, "that the first season at Chopawamsic was a success and a distinct gain over previous seasons." Family Services sponsored a unit camp for mothers with children under 6; two units for girls age 6-9 and 9-12, respectively; and two units for boys, 6-9 and 9-12. There were 24 campers per unit, with singing, creative writing, nature study, handicrafts, and dramatics part of the regular curriculum.[67]

Happyland, formerly a black and white family campground near Annapolis, Maryland, rematerialized in Chopawamsic as Camp (5), operated by the District of Columbia's Salvation Army during the 1939 season. Two categories of youth were served here: children age 11-20 whose camping experiences promoted democratic living, skill development and nature study, and who paid $4 per 10-day session; the goals for the latter group of children--who "come undernourished, ill-bred, irritable and in quest of attention"--were health, good habits and adjustments to life, for which there was no fee. Regular activities included: pioneering, nature lore, story telling, woodcrafts, bead work, and water sports.[68]

Camp Lichtman, a Washington-based YMCA camp for black youths--financed by a movie-theater magnate and founded at the George Washington National Forest in 1932--moved to Chopawamsic's Camp 1-B (aka Goodwill) in 1938; it displaced Camp Pleasant, which spent summer 1937 at Camp 1-B, and the following year moved to Camp 4 (aka Pleasant, Boys'). The daily regime at Lichtman included reveille at 6:30 a.m., housekeeping, chapel, nature study, arts and crafts, and athletics. Boys age 7-18 paid $14 for two weeks, plus transportation costs to the park.[69]

The Jewish Community Center, which previously had no campground, sponsored Camp 2 (aka Girls', Center Camp, Mawava), and reported a very successful 1939 season: "The physical setting was ideal for the promotion of our program. Camp was divided into four separate units, each a small community unto itself. The campers were divided

---

67 Family Services Association, Summer Outings Committee.

68 "Annual Report: The Salvation Army, Camp Happyland-Chopawamsic Area, LD-VA 6, Camp 5E," 1939.

69 12th Street YMCA, "Have You Heard About the New Y Camp," brochure (spring 1938)

x See continuation sheet

according to age and sex." The curriculum there featured daily athletics, music and dramatics, with arts and crafts each day except Saturday.[70]

The Washington Boys Club and Girl Scouts of Alexandria also applied for camp facilities. During the non-summer season, members of the Boy Scouts, 4-H Club, Welfare and Recreation Association, and churches used the campground.[71]

The camps had to be general enough so as not to exclude any type of user, yet be flexible enough to accommodate large- and small-interest groups. Thus, the site plans are general and conservative.[72] And initially, there was disagreement over who should produce the plans for Chopawamsic. The head of NPS wanted to generate the design from the national office's Branch of Plans and Design, which by 1936 included 220 professional architects, landscape architects, and engineers.[73] Wirth, then assistant director of the Land Program, Recreational Demonstration Project Division of the Office of State Parks, wanted the responsibility to fall on the project supervisor, supported by a team of engineers, architects and landscape architects, among others. He felt that the concept of organized camping was so new and different that it warranted a fresh approach, and his view ultimately prevailed.[74] While it is impossible to ascertain who designed what features at Chopawamsic, names and professions do indicate who was at work on the site: in 1935, landscape architect Richard Hyatt; 1936, Carl W. Zimmerman, assistant architect, and Bernard J. Liff, architectural draftsman and designer; 1937, Lawrence F. Murray, associate landscape architect.

A trio of recognizable NPS camp building typology evolved: administration/ service, recreational/cultural, and sleeping quarters. This is seen in the unit camps composed of two- to eight-person cabins, a latrine and lodge, placed like satellites around a core of shared structures: dining hall, infirmary, craft lodge, central washhouse, and office. These are often somewhat standardized and unelegant designs from camp to camp: "It is usually . . . necessary to forego any burden of cost that might

---

70 1939 Annual Report of Organized Camp 2-G, Chopawamsic RDA," Jewish Community Center, Washington, D.C. (October 6, 1939).

71 "14,000-Acre Park Approved By House," Washington Post (August 6, 1940)

72 Good, reprint "Organized Camp Facilities," p. 2.

73 Tweed et al, p. 92.

74 Parker, p. 158.

x See continuation sheet

be solely assessable to 'imagination-stimulation' or 'romantic appeal.'" Unit camps are defined as organized camps designed to accommodate 25 to 100 campers, broken into groups of 16 to 32 persons--with 24 the ideal number. The small groups invite personal attention, focused interests and the control of communicable disease.[75]

Small unit camps should handle 24 to 32 persons; medium, 48 to 64 persons in two units; and large, 72 to 96 persons in three or four units. Privacy being a paramount factor, 600 feet is the recommended distance between cabins, except for those occupied by youngsters, where 50 feet between cabins and no more than 150 feet to a latrine, are suggested.[76]

All five cabin camps at Chopawamsic/PWFP are large, by this definition, featuring three to five units per camp that accommodate campers in two-, four- or eight- to 10-person group structures, sometimes within the same unit camp.

In June 1939, the National Park Service sought legislation that would orchestrate the return of most RDAs to the states. This was not the case with Chopawamsic, however. From its inception NPS wanted it absorbed into the National Capital Parks (NCP), which continues to serve the Greater Washington community today. "The National Capital Parks are in urgent need of an area qualifiying for recreational use of private charity, semi-public,and other organizations serving the large population," wrote NPS Director Arno B. Cammerer in 1935, in reply to a request by NCP's Superintendent C. Marshall Finnan that: "Maintenance of submarginal lands in the vicinity of Quantico, Virginia, proposed for purchase by the United States under the Land Program, be assumed by the National Capital Parks, if purchased."[77] The effort had the full support of beneficiary and sponsoring agencies.

> Because of the lack of camping and recreational facilities in the National Capital, the development of the Chopawamsic area is indorsed (sic) by all the social service agencies of Washington and the various organizations dealing with the youth movement.[78]

---

75 Good, reprint "Organized Camp Facilities," p. 3, 5, 8.

76 Good, reprint "Organized Camp Facilities," p. 6.

77 Letter from Arno B. Cammerer to C. Marshall Finnan (February 2, 1935)

78 "Park Service Seeks to Keep Chopawamsic Area," Washington Star (July 2, 1939)

x See continuation sheet

On January 1, 1941, this status became official and Chopawamsic RDA was removed from the jurisdiction of Richmond-based Region 1[79]; in 1948 it was renamed Prince William Forest Park.[80]

During World War II, the U.S. War Department's Office of Strategic Services occupied Chopawamsic's cabin camps exclusively, for the purpose of training spies.[81] Almost immediately the men stationed there began the "winterization" of structures for cold-weather accommodation. Through contracts let by the War Department, Celotex lining and tongue-in-groove wainscoating were installed inside, as were removable glazed sash and stoves with flues vented out the window frame. Reroofing replaced shingles of cedar with a synthetic, "asphalt-tile variety, applied in strips of three shingles."[82] This was heralded by the superintendent, for "in addition to its presenting a pleasing appearance, it offers the quality of being fire resistant and insulating.[83] Aesthetics were again an issue in late 1942, when the Army's remodeling apparently went beyond these basics; by which time Camps (1) Goodwill and (4) Pleasant were nearly completed, which all hoped to be converted by the next year:

> It must be called to the attention of the Park Service that in certain instances alterations to buildings and features have been made without prior authority of this office [National Capital Parks] or without notification that such work was to be undertaken [attributed to the constant change of officers]. In instances where buildings are altered, our only satisfaction is in the knowledge that the Army officials have agreed to return the buildings to the condition in which they were found at the completion of their occupancy period.[84]

---

[79] Others that remained in the national park system include Catoctin Mountain Park in Maryland and land adjacent to Manassas National Battlefield Park and Hopewell Village National Historic Site in Virginia. Paige, p.120.

[80] Strickland, p. 30.

[81] Strickland, p.19.

[82] Ira B. Lykes, "Narrative Report, Month of October 1942; Chopawamsic Recreation Demonstration Area, National Capital Parks" (November 9, 1942); Ira B. Lykes, "Narrative Report, Month of November, 1942; Chopawamsic Recreation Demonstration Area, National Capital Parks" (December10, 1942)

[83] Superintendents Monthly Narrative Report, Chopawamsic RDA (October 1942).

[84] Narrative Report, Chopawamsic RDA (November 1942). x See continuation sheet

After 1945, an estimated 100 miles of foot trails were extended and a number of day-use facilities added, including Pine Grove picnic shelter, park headquarters, and the stone recreation shelter at Camp (5) Happyland. Though these represent NPS rustic design, they were constructed after dissolution of the CCC and therefore the period of significance addressed here.

And although the construction of rustic architectural styling essentially ceased with World War II, its tenure fulfilled NPS goals:

> It allowed the development of necessary park facilities without needless disruption of the natural scene. It facilitated the separation of the parks from the rest of the world.[85]

The demise of the CCC, although finalized with the war, was the culmination of a variety of legislative factors, again involving Virginians. In 1937, Congress refused to make the CCC a permanent government organization, but did grant it a three-year extension. In 1941, Senator Byrd was the chairman of the Joint Committee for the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, which released a report that recommended the CCC be abolished by July 1, 1942, because "there is no room for nonessentials in a government stripped for action."[86]

The benefits of the CCC and ECW programs toward the conservation of land have remained unchallenged, however. Because of FDR's New Deal, between 1933 and 1936, parkland in the nation rose from 599,091 acres to 3,859,087 acres.[87] Despite continuous objection from state legislators and a generally conservative government, Virginia received an abundance of national parks, parkways, state parks, and protected historic sites in comparison to the rest of the nation. Recreation demonstration areas such as Chopawamsic have been credited with not only offering publically owned sites and facilities for organized camping, but as the inspiration for state park officials to "become more interested in providing organized camp facilities."[88] According to Wirth, they provided the "most needed links in the nation's park and recreation programs."[89]

---

85 Tweed, p. 106

86 Preliminary Report of the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Congress of the United States, 77th Congress, First Session, Document 152; cited in Byrne, pp. 72-73.

87 Wirth, p. 175; Ward and Davison.

88 1937 Yearbook, p. 39.

89 Wirth, p. 177.

__ See continuation sheet

## F. Associated Property Types

**I. Name of Property Type** public recreation facilities

**II. Description**

All structures in the park are distinctively rustic, except for remnants of the CCC-occupied camp, which are standardized frame. The buildings are low and sometimes sprawling, to complement the natural topography; the frame construction with exterior "waney" board cladding is used in vertical and horizontal arrangements for the most picturesque effect. These structures are modest, with simple screens or single-glazed sash, protected by hinged wood "shutters." Typically, the organized camps are arranged into several unit clusters, with cabins situated around a latrine, central washhouse and

**III. Significance**

Representative of early 20th-century federal efforts to provide recreational facilities for low-income groups and families living in congested urban centers in the form of organized camping facilities, Prince William Forest Park (nee' Chopawamsic RDA) is culturally significant for its rustic architecture, natural landscaping, and sympathetic park design. Located approximately 30 miles south of the District of Columbia, near Triangle and Quantico Marine Base in Prince William County, Virginia, the park is historically important as one of six RDAs established in the state--the fourth largest in the nation--by the Civilian Conservation Corps and WPA laborers from 1935 to 1942. Associated with the nationwide public works programs of the New Deal, Chopawamsic RDA offered gainful employment to the men of CCC companies 1374/SP-22, 2349/SP-25,

**IV. Registration Requirements**

Requirements for this property type include a cohesive and harmonious arrangement of architectural and landscape architectural elements, which maintain historic integrity.

A. Natural landscape features
   1. streams
   2. drainages and ridges
   3. forest

B. Man-made landscape features
   1. park roads
   2. foot trails
   3. dams and lakes

☒ See continuation sheet

☐ See continuation sheet for additional property types

**II. Description** - continued

lodge; several core buildings serve each camp--consisting of three to five units--including a dining hall/kitchen, office/administration building, infirmary, craft lodge, helps' quarters,and storage buildings. The forest and topography is taken advantage of whenever possible, with cabins and lodges set up on ridges to allow for vistas as well as privacy. The scenic natural environment was enhanced by man-made lakes, using streams,and dams. The reclamation and conservation of soil, water, and forest was an integral function of enrollees in the Civilian Conservation Corps, which existed from 1933-42, in addition to their responsibility for the construction of public recreation structures. These facilities have remained generally uninterrupted by alterations or new construction, and they are used today for the original purpose of overnight camping for city children.

---

**III. Significance** - continued

2383/SP-26 and NP-16 during the years of the development of the park and coexistence of the CCC program, whose purpose it was to conserve natural and scenic resources while providing a healthy retreat for residents of Greater Washington, D.C.

---

**IV. Registration Requirements** - continued

C. Architectural typology
   1. sleeping quarters: cabins
   2. administration/service: ie., infirmary, dining hall, latrine
   3. recreational/cultural: crafts lodge, campfire ring

D. Architectural styling
   1. NPS "pattern book" sources: picturesque plans, elevations
   2. indigenous materials: ie., wood, stone
   3. hand-crafted (or simulated) features: ie., hardware
   4. horizontal emphasis: single story, low roof lines

## G. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods

Discuss the methods used in developing the multiple property listing.

The multiple property listing for ECW architecture in Prince William Forest Park, 1933-42, is based on a comprehensive survey and inventory of buildings, structures, and sites in the park. The typology of significant resources is based on National Park Service organization of its park structures into three groups: administration/service, recreational/cultural, and sleeping quarters, all of which fall into the category of public recreation facilities. In addition to which there are a few remnants of CCC occupation. The resources represent a single property type because they were designed and constructed by the same organization, during the same period, of like materials, and of related one-story plans--gable-front-and-wing, L, T, H and rectanglular.

Several sources contributed to the identification and evaluation of the architectural resources: Patricia Parker's Hinterland, a prehistorical and historical analysis; a master's thesis on the CCC in Virginia; John Paige's administrative history of the CCC and NPS; NPS Rustic Architecture: 1916-1942, by William Tweed et al.; Albert

☒ See continuation sheet

## H. Major Bibliographical References

*Miscellaneous correspondence, newspaper clips, narrative reports, and annual reports are found in the:* National Archives, RG 79, Records of Branch of Recreation, Land Planning and State Cooperation; Entry 41, Project records on CCC projects in state and local parks, 1933-37.

Annual Report of the Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1938, 1939, 1940, 1941.

Annual Report of the Director of Emergency Conservation Work. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1935, 1936, 1937.

☒ See continuation sheet

Primary location of additional documentation:

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

Specify repository: _____

## I. Form Prepared By

name/title Sara Amy Leach - Historian
organization Prince William Forest Park date March 25, 1988
street & number 1820 N. Quinn St., #405 telephone 841-9726
city or town Arlington state Virginia zip code 22209

**Summary of Identification and Evaluation of Methods** - continued

Good's definitive 1935/38 Park and Recreation Structures.

The standards of integrity are based on the National Register standards for assessing integrity. Information from CCC and NPS records in the National Archives, period architectural plans, a 1951-52 building inventory conducted by Prince William Forest Park staff, as well as research literature, was used to assess the condition of the property types.

---

**Major Bibliographic References** - continued

Arthur A. Beard Engineers Inc. "Informal Dam Inspection Report, National Dam Safety Program, Prince William Forest Park," Dams at Camp 1, 3, 4, 5 and Carter's Pond Dam. December 1982.

Belasco, Warren James. Americans on the Road: From Autocamp to Motel, 1910-1945. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1971.

Branch of Recreation, Land Planning and State Cooperation Records (RG 79). Project Records on CCC Projects in State and Local Parks, 1933-37 (Entry 41). Virginia.

Byrne, John P. "The Civilian Conservation Corps in Virginia: 1933-42." M.A. thesis, University of Montana, 1982.

Good, Albert. Park and Recreation Structures, 3 parts. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1938.

☒ See continuation sheet

Hall, W.R. "Accomplishments of CCC Camp SP-25 During the Period of Its Existence on the Chopawamsic Recreational Demonstration Area in Prince William County, Virginia." April 9, 1938.

Harrison, Fairfax. Landmarks of Old Prince William. Berryville, Va.: Chesapeake Book Co., 1964.

Ickes, Harold; Cammerer, A.B.; Tugwell, R.G.; Fechner, R. Recreational Demonstration Projects as Illustrated by Chopawamsic, Virginia. Washington, D.C.: National Park Service, 1936.

Ickes, Harold L. Letter to the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War. June 10, 1942.

"Inventory of Property, Prince William Forest Park." May 21, 1976. Located in maintenance office.

Kelly, Kathleen Anne, and Leach, Sara Amy. National Register of Historic Places Nomination: "Douthat State Park Historic District." DHL File No. 08-136, July 1986.

Lykes, Ira B. "Narrative Report, Month of October 1942: Chopawamsic Recreational Demonstration Area, National Capital Parks." November 9, 1942.

Lykes, Ira B. "Narrative Report, Month of November 1942: Chopawamsic Recreational Demonstration Area, National Capital Parks." December 10, 1942.

Lykes, Ira B. "Report and Recommendations on the Operating Policy of the Chopawamsic Recreational Demonstration Area, Prince William and Stafford Counties, Virginia." Department of the Interior: November 1, 1940.

"Master Plan Development Outline: Prince William Forest Park." Draft. March 4, 1957.

"Memorandum to Chopawamsic Recreation Demonstration Area project manager," from E.M. Lisle, Acting Regional Director of NPS Region 1, Richmond. August 1939.

☒ See continuation sheet

Missouri Department of Natural Resources. National Register of Historic Places Nomination: "ECW Architecture in Missouri State Parks, 1933-42." May 1985.

National Park Service, Civilian Conservation Corps. A Day in Virginia Camps. Washington, D.C.: Film on videocassette, National Archives' Motion Picture, Sound and Video Branch, RG 35/3, 1934.

National Park Service. Administration Manual for Recreational Demonstration Areas. Washington, D.C.: April 1937.

National Park Service, Civilian Conservation Corps. Human Crop. Washington, D.C.: Film (11 min., sound) on videocassette, National Archives' Motion Picture, Sound and Video Branch, RG 48/.083, 1936.

National Park Service. "Portfolio of Buildings for Organized Camps." Washington, D.C., 1937. Letter stapled to inside cover: Conrad L. Wirth, Assistant Director of the NPS, to Emergency Activities Officers.

National Park Service, Region I. "Park Use Study 1937: A Report on Attendance and Use at Eighty-Six Selected Parks in Region I." Richmond: 1937.

National Park Service. 1937 Yearbook, Park and Recreation Progress. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1938.

Newton, Norman T. Design on the Land. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Official Annual, 1937. District No. 3, Third Corps Area, Civilian Conservation Corps. Washington, D.C.: 1937. (In the possession of Joe Hebda, Triangle, Va.)

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

☒ See continuation sheet

Parker, Patricia L. Occasional Report #1, Regional Archaeology Program: The Hinterland: An Overview of the Prehistory and History of Prince William Forest Park, Virginia. Washington, D.C.: National Capital Region, 1985.

Patterson, James T. Congressional Conservatism and the New Deal. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1967.

Porter, Dr. Charles W., and Lykes, Ira B. "Preliminary Historical Report and a Brief History and Explanation of Prince William Forest Park (Formerly Chopawamsic Park), Prince William County, Virginia." December 28, 1935.

Prince William Forest Park. "Cemeteries Found in and about Prince William Forest Park." 1973. (Copied)

Salmond, John A. The Civilian Conservation Corps, 1933-42: A New Deal Case Study. Durham: Duke University Press, 1967.

Strickland, Susan. An Administrative History of Prince William Forest Park. NPS, 1986.

Tweed, William C., et al. National Park Service Rustic Architecture: 1916-1942. NPS, Western Regional Office, Division of Cultural Resource Management, 1977.

U.S. Census Bureau. Historical Statistics of the United States, from Colonial Times to 1970, part 1. Washington, D.C.: Commerce Department/Government Printing Office, 1975.

Wirth, Conrad L. Parks, Politics, and the People. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1980.