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EPIGRAM

Nicholas "Nick" Scrottish's professional career began as a newly-minted PH.D. teaching in a California college. It ended too early as a promisingly productive research historian with the National Park Service. Nick brought to his work a finely-honed intellectual curiosity, a commitment to competence, and a resourcefulness that informed every manuscript that he authored. He also brought to those with whom he worked an engaging personality, an appreciation of the absurd, and an impatience with humbug that made him a stimulating laborer in the historical vineyard. This resource study is representative of the quality work that he produced from his doctoral dissertation to the report that he completed within hours of his tragic death. The "hot-eyed Croat" was an excellent scholar, a valued colleague, and a credit to this profession and the service.

John Luzader
Denver, Colorado
September 1985
The author wishes to express gratitude for help given by numerous individuals. Former Superintendent Tom Hobbs and his staff could not have been more cooperative. Viola B. Rose, the Superintendent's Secretary, took the time to collect and mail a number of important park documents used in the study. John Luzader of the Professional Support Group, Denver Service Center and since retired, rendered trenchant advice. Barry Combs, Director of Public Relations, Union Pacific Railroad, put corporate research materials at my disposal and allowed the use of a printer-reader. John Witherbee, Union Pacific's Research Specialist, forwarded additional materials. The National Park Service was not asked to pay a cent for these invaluable service.

I also wish to thank Bob Svenningsen of the Denver Federal Records Center; Richard Crawford of the National Archives; Don Snoddy, Nebraska State Historical Society Archivist; Irvin C. McClay of the Utah State Archives; Jay Hammond, Coordinator of Collections at the Utah State Historical Society; and Victor Jackson, Zion Naturalist. Mrs. Maurice Cope, a delightful person, graciously permitted an interview and opened the family's Bryce collection to my inspection. Mrs. Agatha May made available the use of her family collection. I am appreciative to others who allowed interviews. Notwithstanding the assistance given by those above, any errors of fact and judgment that have found their way into this study are my own.
Since Nickolas Scattish's death, the manuscript has been finely edited and typed by Mrs. Joyce Moe. Mrs. Susan Tenney provided additional manuscript editing, and a final copy was typed by Mrs. Monta-Glea Trebilcock.
INTRODUCTION

Small by National Park standards, the 56.2 square miles of Bryce Canyon National Park (BRCA) occupy the eastern edge of the Paunsaugunt Plateau in south-central Utah. The park is not a canyon. Rather, it is a spectacular series of 14 huge amphitheaters, each of which is carved at least 1,000 feet into the chromatic limestone of the Paunsaugunt Plateau. Thus, the geological features of Bryce Canyon represent the park's principal distinction. In fact, Bryce properly presents one of the world's best sites for an appreciation of the inexorable, titanic forces which have shaped the globe's surface. Each of the park's amphitheaters is crowded with protean rock sculptures. Domes, pinnacles, windows, natural bridges, arches, and temples accent an ethereal landscape. The color of these rock formations, augmented by a rising or setting sun, is delicate and often extraordinarily beautiful. Reds, yellows, and whites are predominant, and at least 60 tints of these basic colors have been recognized. In southern Utah this rock is referred to as the Wasatch Formation or Pink Cliffs.

GEOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY: A SKETCH

Due to its outstanding geomorphic qualities, this area of the State has been studied intensively by geologists for more than a century. In the aggregate their research has conclusively demonstrated the reasons for
the resultant fairyland of Bryce Canyon. About 60,000,000 years ago, during the Eocene Epoch of the Tertiary Period, most of southern Utah was covered by water. Inland seas and lakes deposited silt, sand, and lime in beds as deep as 2,000 feet thick. Minerals cemented rock particles together. The weight of overlying deposits and incomprehensible lengths of time completed the transition from sediment to sedimentary rock. Subsequently, about 13,000,000 years ago, near the beginning of the Pliocene Period, diastrophic pressure from within the earth caused the entire area to rise slowly. Beds of rock formerly located at sea level were pushed to heights of several thousand feet or more. These beds cracked along fault lines and separated into the seven major tables located in southwestern Utah. Two of these plateaus, exclusive of the Paunsaugunt Plateau, are located within a few miles of the park. The Aquarius Plateau lies to the east. To the west, the Markagunt Plateau is visible across the Sevier Fault.

Because of this homologous regional development, the geological story of Bryce Canyon is inseparable from that of other scenic attractions in southwestern Utah and northwestern Arizona. The sedimentary foundations of Bryce Canyon and Cedar Breaks National Monument, 65 miles to the northeast, rest on what would be the summit of Zion National Park. Zion, in turn, has its foundation on what would be the rim of the Grand Canyon. It is well known that the Grand Canyon clearly reveals the story of ancient geological time (Paleozoic). Some of its exposed rock in the Inner Gorge dates back approximately 1,750,000,000 years. Zion, Bryce Canyon, and Cedar Breaks dramatically complement this record. The
former displays the events of medieval geological time (Mesozoic).

Bryce Canyon and Cedar Breaks present a graphic record of modern geology (Cenozoic).

The Paunsaugunt Plateau has had its sides exposed to the elements. Full of fractures, these sides are extremely vulnerable to the forces of erosion—particularly weathering. Both physical weathering (disintegration) and chemical weathering (decomposition) are prominent in widening Bryce Canyon's amphitheaters. Disintegrative agents, such as frost action, principally weakens rocks that were fractured in the faulting process. Organic elements, too, such as the pressure from plant roots and burrowing animals, serve to loosen rock material.

Streams and their myriad tributaries, which form from rain and melting snow, do drain off the Paunsaugunt Plateau but flow opposite the amphitheaters. Rather, it is the rain and snow that fall directly into the amphitheaters—and intermittent streams formed from these sources—that are responsible for down-cutting. The park's deepest and most precipitous amphitheaters are carved by the most active intermittent streams at work for the longest time. Naturally, periodic floods greatly accelerate this process. Amphitheater walls on the eastern edge of the Paunsaugunt Plateau have been receding in a northwesterly direction at the approximate rate of 1 foot per 50 years. It has probably taken over a million years for the plateau rim to erode back from the original fault escarpment, some 2-1/2 miles to its present location.
Protean rock formations in Bryce Canyon are basically determined by the hardness of the rocks themselves. Since rock strata exhibit different degrees of hardness, they erode at different rates. More resilient limestones tend to form shelves and ledges. When eroded, softer shales and sands leave grooves, recesses, and small caves.

The brilliant coloration of rock formations in Bryce Canyon results from the presence of specific minerals originally present in the sedimentary rock. Once exposed these minerals oxidize. Hydrous iron oxide compounds, such as hematite and limonite, produce gradations of red and yellow respectively. Purplish or lavender rock likely contain manganese oxides. White sections of rock—and to a lesser extent, cream—have had most of the mineral content leached out of them. In places within the park's amphitheaters, the whiter limestones and siltstones of the Wasatch Formation are coated with a thin layer of reddish sediment. This phenomenon results from a once higher mineral deposit left by rain or snow-melt. Evaporation often leaves the colorful residue plastered to a much lighter surface.

**FLORA AND FAUNA**

As a result of elevation and precipitation, the plants of Bryce Canyon grow in three distinct but overlapping zones. At an altitude of 6,600 to 7,000 feet the Upper Sonoran Zone furnishes a habitable environment for sagebrush, the pinyon pine, and Utah juniper. These areas within
the zone are often collectively referred to as the "pygmy forest." A Transition Zone from 7,000 to 8,500 feet displays a profusion of yellow pine, which constitutes approximately half of the park's trees. Above 8,500 feet, the Canadian Zone sports white pine and ancient bristlecone pine, white fir, blue spruce, and aspen clustered in groves or standing alone.

Mammals most frequently seen within the park include mule deer, porcupines, skunks, yellow bellied marmots, ground squirrels, pine squirrels, gray fox, picket gophers, a variety of mice, and the ubiquitous chipmunk. Red-tailed hawks, woodpeckers, owls, and ravens well represent larger members of the bird family. The park's smaller birds include flycatchers, swallows, jays, chickadees, wrens, thrushes, and a variety of sparrows. Only a few species of reptiles are able to exist in the high, cold forest of the Paunsaugunt region. These include the horned lizard, desert whiptail lizard, and three snakes—the gopher snake, garter snake, and Great Basin rattlesnake.

**ABORIGINAL OCCUPATION**

Scant information is available regarding the archaeological resources of Bryce Canyon or its immediate environs. There is, consequently, little to imply that the aboriginal inhabitants of Utah or adjoining states found the Bryce Canyon area an attractive place for large-scale settlement. Some fragmentary artifacts have been located in the canyons
tributary to the Paria River south of the park. These are thought to identify the Basket Makers as the earliest known inhabitants of the region. Shortly after A.D. 1000, the Puebloans may have followed the Basket Makers into the region, occupying some sites along tributaries of the Paria and Sevier River. If these were indeed Puebloans perhaps their archeological remains—best preserved in rock carvings and paintings on canyon walls—represent the outposts of the main Pueblo settlements in Arizona and New Mexico. A more recent theory holds that it was really Indians of the Desert Culture who migrated into the area and emulated a higher Puebloan civilization to the south and east.

Whether Puebloan or Desert Culture, post-Basket Maker activity in the Paunsaugunt region faded rapidly after A.D. 1200.

Thereafter, the Paiutes—a primitive, peaceful, seminomadic people—gradually filtered into the area. Paiute arrowheads and chipped obsidian tools have been found in relative abundance, implying that the region was used by them for hunting and gathering activities, but little else. At about the same time it is thought that Navajos from south of the Colorado River made periodic incursions into the Bryce Canyon region in search of animal pelts and readily available booty. No native Americans of any kind now live in Garfield County, which is where Bryce Canyon is located, nor in adjoining Kane and Wayne Counties.
Paiute Place Names

Paiute legends and place names illustrate how these aborigines viewed Bryce Canyon. In 1936 "the legend of Bryce Canyon" was explained to the Zion-Bryce Park Naturalist by Indian Dick, an elderly Paiute who then lived on the Kaibab Reservation:

Before there were any Indians, the Legend People, To-when-an-ung-wa, lived in that place. There were many of them. They were of many kinds—birds, animals, lizards, and such things—but they looked like people. They were not people; they had power to make themselves look that way. For some reason the Legend People in that place were bad; they did something that was not good, perhaps a fight, perhaps some stole something...the tale is not clear at this point. Because they were bad, Coyote turned them all into rocks. You can see them in that place now, all turned into rocks; some standing in rows, some sitting down, some holding onto others. You can see their faces, with paint on them just as they were before they became rocks. The name of that place is Angka-ku-wass-a-wits. This is the story the people tell.7

Indian Johnnie, Dick's nephew, translated "Angka-ku-wass-a-wits" as "red painted faces." The Paiute name "Unka-timpe-wa-wince-pock-ich" has often been cited as the Paiute name for Bryce Canyon, supposedly meaning "red rocks standing like men in a bowl-shaped recess."8 When asked by the Naturalist about this name, Indian Dick replied that the Paiutes never referred to Bryce Canyon that way.9 The Paiute, Toney Tillohash, has explained that the phrase could be used as a descriptive term, but would literally mean "red-rocks-many-standing-holes."10
EXPEDITIONS TO THE BRYCE CANYON REGION

On October 20-21, 1776, a Spanish entrada under the direction of the Franciscan Friars, Silvestra Vélez de Escalante and Francisco Atanasio Dominguez, crossed the northwestern Arizona plateau area—somewhat southwest of Bryce Canyon. The "Santa Gertrudis" camp, on the night of October 20, was one of the western branches of Kanab Creek, about 10 miles southwest of Pipe Springs. A night later the "Santa Barbara" camp was made in Kimball Valley near Johnson Creek, 8 miles southeast of Fredonia. At the time the friars' immediate aim was to search for a westward river crossing. Their long range goal was to establish a connecting route between the missions of New Mexico and California. Given the entrada's path, it is probable that the Pink Cliffs were visible on the far skyline to the northeast.\(^{11}\)

In 1826 Jedediah Smith rediscovered the Sevier and Virgin, the westernmost rivers in Utah's high plateau country. Smith was the first American to travel overland to Spanish California. Four years later another American frontiersman named George Yount passed northwest of the park through the present sites of Circleville, Panguitch, and Cedar City. He, too, was enroute to California. In 1844, after a reconnaissance of the Great Basin, Captain John C. Fremont followed the old Spanish trail northward, past the present sites of Cedar City, Parowan, and Circleville. Fremont retraced his steps 9 years later
enroute to California. Mormon scouts, sent out by the church to ascertain the location of favorable agricultural and grazing lands in southern Utah, first visited the Sevier River near Panguitch in 1852. This party probably had a good view of the Sunset Cliffs on the west edge of the Paunsaugunt Plateau.  

A party of Indian fighters, under the command of Captain James Andrus, was sent out from St. George in 1866 to pursue marauding Navajo. These men traversed the upper Paria Valley and were probably the first white men to view the eastern escarpment of the Paunsaugunt Plateau. The southern end of the Plateau was first visited in 1879 by Major J. W. Powell, a geographer working for the U.S. Geological Survey. On this trip his efforts appear to have been restricted to the area above Alton and the Kanab Creek drainage. Scarcely a year later Alvin Thompson and F. S. Dellenbaugh, subordinates under Powell's direction, traversed the bases of the Paunsaugunt and Aquarius Plateaus. They most likely followed a route previously established by the noted Mormon missionary, Jacob Hamblin. Later, Thompson and Dellenbaugh climbed into what is now Bryce Canyon from the south, near Rainbow Point.

This tentative probe into the future park set the stage for a quick succession of visits by Edwin E. Howell, Grove Karl Gilbert, and Lieutenant W. L. Marshall—all members of the mid-1870s Wheeler survey. Howell intensively studied the exposure of the Wasatch Formation at Table Cliffs. Gilbert's surveys centered on the Paunsaugunt Plateau and Paria Valley. An excerpt from his 1872 notebook follows:
Up the Sevier (East Fork) a few miles and then to the left a few miles more until we came suddenly on the grandest of views. We stand on a cliff 1,000 feet high, the "Summit of the Rim." Just before starting down the slope we caught a glimpse of a perfect wilderness of red pinnacles, the stunningest thing out of a picture.

The Wheeler survey was accompanied by an artist, John E. Weyss, whose pencil drawing of erosional remnants is the first known illustration of what is now Bryce Canyon.

During the clement months of 1875-77, Captain Clarence E. Dutton and his colleagues gathered material for two definitive studies of the high plateau region, published in 1880 and 1882. The later study is titled Tertiary History of the Grand Canyon District with Atlas, and includes a plate captioned "The Pink Cliffs (Eocene) upon the southern end of the Paunsaugunt Plateau." This "heliotype" plate was drawn from a photograph by W. H. Holmes, and appears to show a section of the rim above Willis Creek.

On November 18, 1876, one of the most poetic descriptions of Bryce Canyon was written by T. C. Bailey, U. S. Deputy Surveyor, during a few moments of feverish inspiration. At the time Bailey was surveying a Guide Meridian and came onto what is now known as Sunset Point:

Immediately east and south of the last corner set, the surface breaks off almost perpendicularly to a depth of several hundred feet—seems indeed as though the bottom had dropped out and left rocks standing in all shapes and forms as lone sentinels over the grotesque and picturesque scenes. There are thousands of red, white, purple, and vermilion colored rocks, of all sizes, resembling sentinels on the walls of castles, monks and priests in their robes, attendants, cathedrals and congregations. There are deep caverns and rooms resembling ruins of prisons, castles, churches with
their guarded walls, battlements, spires, and steeples, niches and recesses, presenting the wildest and most wonderful scene that the eye of man ever beheld, in fact, it is one of the wonders of the world.

MORMON SETTLEMENT NEAR BRYCE CANYON

Neither Mormon reconnaissance during the 1850s nor the Federal surveys of the mid-1870s served to direct much public attention to the Bryce Canyon region. The Mormons did begin settlement near the eastern edge of the park in 1874, but this did nothing to directly popularize Bryce Canyon's uniqueness. To some extent Bryce Canyon's obscurity, until the second decade of the 20th Century, can be attributed to its distance from railways and sizeable towns. Rough wagon roads to the general vicinity of the Paunsaugunt rim existed but required a slow travel, either through rocky Sevier Canyon or Red Canyon, and then on to the spongy top of the Paunsaugunt Plateau. For several months of the year heavy snow drifts impeded any kind of approach at all.

On December 24, 1874, the David O. Littlefield and Orley D. Bliss families laid out farms in the upper Paria Valley, near the junction of the Paria River and Henrieville Creek. These hardy souls were joined by eight additional families the following year. The settlement's proximity to the Pink Cliffs prompted the name Clifton (Cliff town). Ebenezer Bryce and his family, who came to Clifton in 1875 or 1876, became disenchanted with the settlement and moved upstream to Henderson Valley (New Clifton). Between 1878-80, with the aid of Daniel Goulding and others, Ebenezer Bryce began and completed an irrigation ditch.
miles long from Paria Creek, to make possible the raising of crops and stock. Bryce was also instrumental in building a road to make nearby timber and firewood more accessible. Local people began to use the road and customarily called the amphitheater, in which the road terminated, "Bryce's Canyon." Ebenezer Bryce had originally moved into the upper Paria Valley because of his wife's fragile health. Apparently, the climate was not kind enough. In 1880 the Bryce family left New Clifton for Arizona.

Clifton was abandoned in 1877. The majority of its settlers relocated to a site about a mile upstream, which they named Cannonville. Three families from Clifton established themselves on the present site of Henrieville, approximately 5 miles east of Cannonville. Three miles southwest of Cannonville a few families established a settlement on Yellow Creek which they called Georgetown--later transformed into a single ranch. Of all these settlements, Cannonville became the most successful and remained so until the late 1880s.

In 1889 a shortage of water for irrigation and the consequent limitation of arable land in the upper Paria Valley gave rise to a scheme for diverting water from the East Fork of the Sevier River, a 14 miles distance on the Paunsaugunt Plateau, over the east rim of the Plateau and 1500 feet down into the Valley. The proposed ditch may have originally been envisioned by Ebenezer Bryce, shortly before his departure for Arizona. Locally financed by the Cannonville and East Fork Irrigation Company work was begun on May 15, 1890. Confidence in
the project was shown by James Ahlstrom and C. W. Snyder, who started to
build houses on land which the ditch would supply water to. During the
summer of 1891, local confidence increased and a town site was laid out,
named Tropic to reflect the locale's summer climate. The Tropic Canal
was completed on May 23, 1891. This not only insured the village of
Tropic's future, but made it the most important settlement east of the
future park.20

Attitude Toward Natural Phenomena

No, sir; I never have paid much attention to it; he frankly
confessed. It is pretty common to us folks.

I was born right over behind that cliff in the fields of the
town of Tropic--you can see them from here, only three or four
miles away. I have trailed stock through here every summer
since I could ride a horse, but I have never been off the
trail this far in my life until I saw you fellows just now.

Yes, it is kind of interesting; rough country for critters off
the trail, though, down in there; they used to call it Bryce's
Canyon when "Bill" Bryce ran stock up here, before the
government took the pasture over. Mother was born a little
further down on the Paria, but she never was here until last
summer.21

Twentieth-century chroniclers of Bryce Canyon have often expressed mild
disapproval that Mormon settlers in the vicinity were so little
impressed with the natural grandeur only a stone's throw from their back
yards.22 In fairness to these people, it is, perhaps, more just to
empathize with the spirit of a different time--to perceive the situation
as they perceived it. Mormon pioneers in the Bryce Canyon region were
an assiduous, God-fearing group, whose struggle against the harsh
realities of everyday life left little psychic energy for an
appreciation of magnificent scenery.23 The descendants of these hardy
pioneers best express what was probably the real relationship between
the people and their environment:
Our grandparents were thrilled with its (i.e. Bryce Canyon's) beauty and often referred to it as beautiful "Potato Valley Mountains." Many of us remember them telling us about this canyon as well as of Cedar Breaks. But they could do little about it. They were too busy trying to make a livelihood for their families. There were no roads, just poor trails, their wagons and wagon wheels were worn out, their horses or ox teams were poor and unable to make any trips, save for the bare necessities.

POPULARIZATION

Zion and the North Rim

After lying dormant for 40 years, it is difficult to imagine how Bryce Canyon could have attracted so much attention--beginning in the late teens--had it not been for the proximity of other scenic locations in the area, particularly Zion and the North Rim of the Grand Canyon. It is worth stating as a principle of economic development for southern Utah that all scenic attractions could be tied into a tourist "loop." This had much to do with Bryce Canyon's subsequent popularization. Secondarily, a sprinkling of Mormon settlements east and northwest of Bryce Canyon brought with them an uneven but tangible improvement in the area's roads. Inadvertent explorers of lesser known byways, such as salesmen, were destined to drive some of the first automobiles into Tropic and Cannonville. Their accounts of the area encouraged visits by others.
I shall always feel that the part I played in introducing Bryce Canyon to the world is the greatest accomplishment of my life.

J. W. Humphrey

Nevertheless, it is not to these anonymous businessmen that the origins of popularization of Bryce Canyon can be traced, but rather to a U. S. Forest Service Supervisor named J. W. Humphrey. On July 1, 1915, Humphrey was transferred from Moab, Utah, to Panguitch—then headquarters for the old Sevier Forest. Humphrey could not take over management of the Sevier Forest until early August, so he used the interim to familiarize himself with the area. During one of his forays into the East Fork Range, Humphrey was prompted by Forest Service Ranger Elias Smith of the East Fork Division to view the eastern escarpment of the Paunsaugunt Plateau. Humphrey showed little interest in the suggestion, but Smith was insistent. When Humphrey came on to the rim, just south of where Bryce Lodge stands, he was stunned:

You can perhaps imagine my surprise at the indescribable beauty that greeted us, and it was sundown before I could be dragged from the canyon view. You may be sure that I went back the next morning to see the canyon once more, and to plan in my mind how this attraction could be made accessible to the public.

First hand accounts imply that Mark Anderson, foreman of the Forest Service grazing crew, was elected by Humphrey to publicize the "find." Anderson states that immediately after viewing Bryce Canyon for the first time in the spring of 1916, he rode into Panguitch and telephoned a telegram, by way of Marysvale, to the District Forester in Ogden. In it Anderson requested that Regional Forest Service photographer George Goshen be sent down to Bryce Canyon with movie and still cameras
to take pictures of the grazing crew "at work" near the plateau rim. Goshen, escorted by Forest Service Ranger Wallace Riddle arrived in Panguitch the following evening with his equipment. All the next day he took pictures which Anderson captioned. The movie and a number of still pictures were sent to Washington, D. C., and shown to Forest Service officials. According to Anderson, these pictures, or copies of them, were also made available to Union Pacific Railroad officials in Omaha. 29

Another member of the Forest Service grazing crew, Arthur W. Stevens, wrote a short, illustrated article late in 1916 for Outdoor Life, an early Union Pacific publication. 30 At about the same time Humphrey dictated an article, published under the name J. J. Drew, 31 for the Red Book, a periodical issued by the Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad. These were the first descriptive articles of Bryce Canyon to be published.

Late in the spring or early summer of 1916, Humphrey with the support of Anderson and James T. Jardine—then in charge of National Forest Service grazing studies—secured an appropriation of $50. The money was used to build rough bridges across the East Fork of the Sevier River and Tropic Canal. Dead timber was also cleared out of "Dave's Hollow." 32 Homesteaders did most of the roadwork; the Forest Service furnished the necessary materials for the bridges. The finished product was a dry weather road that made the plateau rim near the present lodge accessible to automobile traffic. To traverse the corral at Dave's Hollow Ranger Station it was necessary to open and close a gate on both the north and
south sides of the station. When the road between Panguitch and Tropic was later altered, Humphrey was granted an additional appropriation of $150 to connect the "rim road" to it.

The year 1917 saw Bryce Canyon really opened to the world. While engaged on a business trip in Cedar City, Humphrey encountered a photographer, Adams, who had heard of the canyon. Humphrey agreed to take the photographer up to the rim, if Adams could get over to Panguitch. Apparently, Adams managed to do so, and in Humphrey's words "secured some of the best pictures taken up to that time ... and these be placed on sale [as postcards], and they added to the advertisement of Bryce Canyon." Later in the year Humphrey also showed Marcus Jones, a botanist-photographer, and J. Cecil Alter the wonders of Bryce. Alter, the U.S.D.A. meterologist in Salt Lake City, wrote an article on Bryce, Improvement Era, published March 1919 in the Utah journal. During the clement months of 1917, C. B. Hawley, a director of the Utah State Automobile Association, made the trip to Bryce Canyon and reported his "find" to officers of the Association in Salt Lake City. F. C. Schramm, another director of the Association, was sent out shortly afterward to confirm Hawley's description. Schramm's report was even more flattering than Hawley's had been. Hawley, Schramm, and State Senator William Seegmiller of Kanab then encouraged Oliver J. Grimes, official photographer of the Salt Lake Tribune, to visit Bryce Canyon.

Grime's visit to the canyon is notable for several reasons. His full page article on Bryce Canyon, titled "Utah's New Wonderland," appeared in the Sunday Magazine Section of the Salt Lake Tribune on August 25,
1918. A profusely illustrated article, it was probably read by more people than anything on Bryce Canyon up to that time. Grimes convincingly put forward the case that Bryce Canyon was open to automobile traffic, and furnished explicit directions from Panguitch to the Plateau rim:

0.0 miles - Leave Panguitch on the Kanab road 
7.3 - Road forks, turn left and cross river [the Sevier]; go through Red Canyon and some sand and washes and, at 
18.2 - Road forks at corral on right; turn right and, at 
20.0 - Gate--Go through it; (I didn't and got lost). 
24.8 - Bryce's canyon.

Grimes later became State Secretary to Governor Bamberger (1917-20). The Governor himself was no supporter of scenic attractions. Grimes, however, found it within his power to help influence the State Legislature. His unceasing efforts, abetted by an article on Bryce Canyon included in the October 5, 1918, issue of the Scientific American, seemingly influenced the Utah Legislature. On March 13, 1919, a Joint Memorial passed the Legislature which reads as follows:

On the public domain within the boundaries of the Sevier National Forest, in the Pink Mountain region, near Tropic, Garfield County, Utah, there is a canyon popularly referred to as "Bryce’s Canyon" which has become famed for its wonderful natural beauty. Inasmuch as the State and Federal Governments have indicated a desire that the natural attractions of our State and our Country be protected and preserved for the enjoyment of posterity, therefore, your memorialists respectfully urge that the Congress of the United States set aside for the use and enjoyment of the people a suitable area embracing "Bryce's Canyon" as a national monument under the name of the "Temple of the Gods National Monument."

General recognition of Bryce Canyon as an area of National Park caliber dates from this time.  

Private Party--the Syretts
When the Forest Service made the first attempt to publicize Bryce Canyon in the spring of 1916, Reuben (Ruby) Carlson Syrett and his wife, Clara Armada (Minnie), were living in Panguitch. The Syretts had been scouting the area to start up a ranch. Six weeks after the birth of their first daughter on March 15, 1916, the Syretts decided to homestead a quarter section near Bryce Canyon. Their choice of land, approximately 3-1/2 miles north of what is now Sunset Point, was a fortunate one. Apparently, the Syretts lived at the Bryce ranch 6 weeks before a Tropic rancher, Claude Sudweeks, introduced them to the rim: "They were speechless, just stood and looked. When they could talk, they could only whisper." 40

During the late summer of 1916 the Syretts began to invite their friends in Panguitch up to see the canyon. This was an amateurish but effective way for them to advertise the area's scenic qualities. Most people in Panguitch thought the Syretts were foolish to homestead in such a desolate locale, 41 but Ruby and Minnie tenaciously hung on to their homestead claim, and even began to purchase additional land near the homestead. Because of the severe winters, the Syretts spent some time between 1916-19 in Esclante—about 30 miles due east of Cannonville. Here Ruby helped his brother run a flour mill. Agricultural pursuits in Tropic also occupied the family.

By 1919 word had spread to Salt Lake City that Bryce Canyon was eminently worth visiting. On a Sunday in the spring or summer of 1919 a sizeable group from the capital did make the trip. To accommodate these
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people the Syretts erected a tent near Sunset Point and served a noon meal. Later in the day Ruby went back to the Bryce ranch and brought up five or six beds, which he dispersed under the pine trees near the Plateau rim. The Syretts provided an evening meal and breakfast the following morning. Before noon on that Monday more people arrived. Whether by design or chance the Syretts began accommodating tourists. They remained near Sunset Point until the fall of that year.

During the spring of 1920 the Syretts decided to build a permanent lodge on the southeast quarter of Section 36 of Township 36 South, Range 4 West, Salt Lake Base and Meridian. This land had been set aside as a school section by the State, so before Ruby started construction he obtained "verbal" permission from the State Land Board. The lodge, soon named "Tourist's Rest," was made of sawed logs and measured 30 feet by 71 feet. It contained a sizeable dining room with a fireplace, a kitchen, a storeroom, and several adjoining bedrooms. In keeping with the Syrett's informal nature, the lodge's double front doors served as a guest register. Visitors thoroughly enjoyed carving their names onto the doors. Eight or ten functional cabins were built near the lodge, as well as an open air dance platform, measuring 35 feet by 76 feet. This modest complex accommodated tourists from all over the world, and the Syretts did well by it until it was sold to a subsidiary of the Union Pacific System in September 1923.
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CONCEPT-ORIGINS

By the early 1920s four major parties recognized Bryce Canyon's scenic potential. These included: (1) the influential citizens of Salt Lake City, acting through Utah's State government; (2) the National Forest Service; (3) the National Park Service; and (4) the Union Pacific System. Each party was interested in the Canyon's development for different reasons, and each was thus apt to rate its importance differently. All parties, however, were unanimous on two issues. First, if Bryce Canyon's development was pursued, the cooperation of the remaining three groups was essential. Second, any meaningful physical plan for Bryce Canyon was inseparable from the more general economic development of southwestern Utah.

On paper the State of Utah stood to gain the most from nationally popularizing Bryce Canyon. In the summer of 1922, however, Salt Lake City's most important boosters had temporarily directed their attention elsewhere. They were captivated by the Wasatch summit drive project, and were convinced that this attraction near the capital would hold up westbound motorists for several days. A good chunk of the tourist auto traffic might not even bother going on to the coast. For the time being, substantial investments in southwestern Utah by the State would have to wait.
One high ranking Forest Service official, Acting Forester E. A. Sherman, considered that the Salt Lake people were on the "wrong tack." In Sherman's opinion, Utah's version of an Alpine scenic highway was unlikely to hold up more than 25 percent of the westbound motorists. Even those who took the drive could tear through it in a day and continue westward. Sherman's contention was that tourists from east of Colorado were psychologically primed for California. These people were only inclined to stop in Salt Lake City to see the Mormon Tabernacle, maintenance their automobiles, gas up, and move on.

Sherman firmly stated where he thought the State should place its primary emphasis:

It is my feeling that Utah's best bet, which is also Salt Lake's best bet, is to emphasize and capitalize the very unique attractions in the southern part of the State, such as Bryce's Canyon, Cedar Breaks, Zion National Park, and the Grand Canyon. Their aim should be to divert the west-bound traffic south from Salt Lake through their State to Bryce Canyon, Grand Canyon, Zion Canyon, Cedar Breaks [sic], and then westward. Of course they (tourists) will not be spending their money in Salt Lake City, but you will see enough of Utah to realize that most of the money left in the State eventually finds its way into the capital city.

The Forest Service realistically knew that leadership in the development of southwestern Utah was not going to come out of Salt Lake City. Nevertheless, whoever took charge would have to lend a sympathetic ear to public opinion emanating from the capital.

A report monitoring recreation problems in District 4 was presented to Forest Service officials in Washington, D. C., during the fall of 1922 by "collaborator" Frank A. Waugh. He noted the geographic unity of southwestern Utah, the acute need for better roads, and the assessment
that Bryce Canyon presented the most urgent problems in the entire District. Waugh thought it incumbent on the Forest Service to take the lead in making Bryce Canyon a national monument. By effecting an exchange of Forest Service lands, the agency was in a position to acquire Section 36 from the State with a minimum of delay. Waugh recommended the prompt appointment of a Forest Ranger for the area, a topographical survey, and careful reconnaissance for available water. His well thought out report also presented the first known physical plan for Bryce Canyon.

I . . . recommend that, in order to avoid serious mistakes, a development plan for this area be worked out at the earliest possible opportunity. This plan should cover, amongst other features, the following:

1. Location of hotel and attached camps, with ground plan for the same.
2. Location and equipment of public camp-ground for automobile tourists.
3. Location, distribution and allocation of water supply.
4. General sanitary plans.
5. Suitable approach to camp and to rim view.
6. Trails along the rim of the Canyon.
7. Trails into the Canyon.
8. Location of store, post office and other services.
9. Location of public garage and service station.
10. Aeroplane landing. (Someone has already been at the Canyon looking for such a landing.)
11. All night camps in the Canyon.

Steven Mather, the first Director of the National Park Service, was undoubtedly interested in the scenic region of southwestern Utah. He was, however, against including Bryce Canyon in the National Park System. Mather preferred to have Bryce Canyon become Utah's first State park, and urged this course of action upon Governor Charles R. Mabey and the State Legislature. On December 19, 1921, a general meeting of all interested parties was convened in Salt Lake City to create a State Park Commission. In accordance with Mather's wishes, the
"Committee on Legislation and Geographic Boundaries" recommended that Bryce Canyon be made the first of a series of State parks. Only in 1924, when the State failed to do anything with Bryce, did Mather agree to Bryce Canyon's acquisition as a national monument. Given this status it would be provisionally administered by the Forest Service.

Because of its considerable financial resources and the company's willingness to invest in projects that promised to turn a tidy profit, the Union Pacific was probably the party most actively interested in Bryce Canyon. There were, however, formidable problems involved in the development of Bryce Canyon, and these the company had to carefully weight against future gains. The Union Pacific had two immediate problems. The first was to assess its relationship to the State of Utah, the Forest Service, and the National Park Service and determine how cooperative these agencies would be to one another. The second involved ascertaining the intentions of the Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad (D. & R. G.), whose existing track to Marysvale, Utah, positioned it to outflank a major developmental project by the Union Pacific.

Section 36 rightfully appeared to Union Pacific officials as the key to Bryce Canyon's future development. If the State refused to implement a conciliatory policy, the railroad's investment in Bryce Canyon was an unjustifiable risk. Major difficulties were not anticipated with the Forest Service. In fact, the Union Pacific would have preferred to deal
exclusively with the Forest Service, in lieu of the National Park Service. Mather's opinion of Bryce Canyon was probably known to Union Pacific officials, which implied that friction over Bryce Canyon between Federal agencies would be minimal.

Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad

J. W. Humphrey once made an effort to interest the Denver and Rio Grande (D. & R.G.) Western Railroad in Bryce Canyon, shortly after its "discovery" in the spring of 1916. He explained how tourist traffic could be easily linked to the North Rim of the Grand Canyon, and "other attractions down that way." At about the same time the Union Pacific reputedly received the pictures and color movies shot in Bryce Canyon by Forest Service photographer George Goshen. Why one railroad had its interest aroused and the other did not is an issue worth examining.

The growth of southern Utah's livestock industry and the promise offered by metallic ore deposits in the area prompted the D. & R.G. to extend its trackage from Thistle, Utah, to Marysvale. The first train entered Marysvale on August 7, 1890, and construction of Marysvale's depot followed 9 years later. In 1915 a big mining boom struck Marysvale. Gold was discovered in the mountains near town, although workable claims proved short lived. A more important resource proved to be nonmetallic alunite ore, from which alumina oxide and potash as a by-product were extracted. As long as the German embargo of potash lasted during World War I, an Armour subsidiary--Mineral Products Corporation--prospered.
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Three additional companies outside Marysvale concentrated exclusively on mining crushed potash ore for the manufacture of ammunition and fertilizer. Within a few short years Marysvale grew from a town of a few hundred to several thousand.

Horse drawn carriages and hacks met the train each morning to pick up the passengers and cart them off to either the Bullion Hotel, the Pines, the Grand Hotel, the Marysvale Hotel or the Straw Place.

At this juncture the D. & R.G. supposedly executed plans to push its trackage all the way to Flagstaff. Marysvale's economy again took a radical turn when the war's end dramatically braked the demand for high-cost aluminum. Potash could be imported more cheaply than mined in Utah. The town's economy began to slip into a steady decline. By the early 1920s both freight and passenger traffic were way off standards set during the teens.

During the Clement months of 1922, however, some tourist traffic was still routed through Marysvale. Touring automobiles from three outfits eagerly met the morning Salt Lake City mail train. Arthur E. Hanks operated out of Marysvale. He conducted a 1-1/2 day tour to Bryce Canyon, as well as a 4-1/2 day junket to the North Rim via Bryce Canyon. H. I. Bowman headquartered his touring service out of the Highway Garage in Kanab, Utah. Given his location, it was necessary for him to base tours on the number of miles traveled:

50 cents per mile 5 passenger car (4 passengers and driver); 60 cents per mile 7 passenger car (6 passengers and driver); a minimum of 20 miles will be charged for each day. Two children under six years of age carried in lieu of one adult; 25 pounds baggage per capita carried free.
Only Parry Brothers of Cedar City offered tours to Bryce Canyon, the North Rim, Zion National Park, and Cedar Breaks. Touring was expensive in the early 1920s. The Parry Brothers' North Rim-Bryce Canyon excursion, a 5-day affair, cost each adult $80; the 8-day Bryce, North Rim, Zion, Cedar Breaks loop $140.61

Notwithstanding the light volume of tourist traffic conducted through Marysvale, the Union Pacific (UP) was deeply concerned about the D. & R.G. 's future plans for Marysvale. On October 17, 1921, W. S. Basinger, Passenger Traffic Manager of the company, directed a brief report to H. M. Adams, Vice President in charge of traffic for U. P.; in it Basinger frankly expressed his uncertainty over the matter:

The construction of a railroad only a part of the way into the scenic territory would simplify very materially the problem of developing it in that respect, in that it would decrease the distance for auto transportation. The general impression exists that most of this territory is valueless except for its scenic attractions. The fact is quite the contrary and I feel sure that the opportunities for successful development, both from a freight and passenger standpoint, are large and are well worth careful consideration.

The D. & R.G. now have a line extending south from Thistle, Utah, to Marysvale, which is situated at the north end of the territory described. From time to time there are rumors that this line will be extended. Some of these rumors state that the extension will be on account of the large amount of lumber available. Others are based on oil development of which there are some indications. Whether, however, the D. & R.G. have ever given serious consideration to the extension of this line, I am unable to say.62

As early as 1916 J. W. Humphrey had gotten the distinct impression from D. & R.G. officials in Salt Lake City that any plans to build a tourist hotel at Marysvale, or to provide company bus service to scenic
attractions, was out of its line. Humphrey inferred from his interview with unspecified personnel that "possibly financial difficulties of their R. R. System prevented them from undertaking a new project of that kind." An examination of D. & R.G. archival materials does suggest that the company was in and out of financial trouble during the early 1920s.

An intracorporate letter, dated August 22, 1922, proves that by this time the Union Pacific felt it could accurately ascertain the D. & R.G.'s position regarding the southern Utah tourist trade. This key piece of correspondence was directed from Union Pacific President Carl R. Gray to Judge R. S. Lovett, Chairman of the company's Executive Committee in New York City.

I have discussed the question of D. & R.G.W. competition with Mr. J. H. Young [unidentified]. He tells me they will be glad to enter into the same arrangement with us that they now have for Yellowstone Park excursions, establishing a line of rates which would permit passengers to go from Denver to Salt Lake City via the D. & R.G.W., to be delivered to our line at that point, in which event, they would not put in any excursion rates permitting a side trip to Marysville. This would bring all excursion business which moves via either line, to one railroad from Salt Lake City to Cedar City. I would regard this as a satisfactory arrangement from both standpoints, because I cannot believe they can ever satisfactorily handle passengers over this long branch with the character of service which they could afford to provide. I think we can safely disregard Marysville as an element of competition.

UNION PACIFIC SYSTEM

The letter from Gray to Lovett, quoted above, is notable in other respects. In it the U. P.'s President explained along general lines how the company intended to develop the scenic attractions of southwestern Utah. Gray also illuminated the underlying justification for what would
amount to a massive expenditure of approximately $5,000,000. The more specific problem of Section 36 in what was soon to become Bryce Canyon National Monument was temporarily ignored.

Gray was convinced that Cedar City, Utah, should be made the hub of the U. P.'s proposed development. This could only be realized if a spur were constructed into Cedar City from the main line, which ran through Lund, Utah, 33 miles to the northwest. Cedar City would require a large, modern hotel. It would also be necessary to construct smaller hotels in Zion and Bryce and a luncheon pavilion in Cedar Breaks. For the time being Gray thought the Union Pacific should not involve itself in the development of the North Rim, given the extremely poor state of the road, via Kanab, which led into this attraction. Roads were also of uneven quality in southwestern Utah, but Gray felt that with the cooperation of State and Federal agencies the most pressing problems could be overcome. The railroad did not want to assume any direct responsibility for the construction or improvement of roads, but did want the exclusive right to transport tourists over them.

President Gray and his closest advisers were thinking big. They wanted to soon advertise a major tourist attraction, whose season lasted at least a month longer than Yellowstone's. They also saw no theoretical reason why a trinity of first-rate attractions, properly developed, managed and advertised, would not rival the annual volume of tourism to
Gray appears to have based his position—in part at least—on earlier information which passed between Basinger and Adams.

This information was in Basinger's September 1921 report to Adams, which described the former's North Rim trip. It included a meaty section on the "Possibility of Tourist Travel" for North Rim and environs. At the time Basinger was convinced the Union Pacific System needed convention sites for Pacific Coast groups that could provide accommodations "early in June and as late as October, to which we are unable to offer Yellowstone Park and the members of which are induced for that reason to use the Santa Fe [to South Rim] or the Canadian Pacific." Basinger also stressed his belief that with proper roads and hotel accommodations at North Rim the Union Pacific could put a dent in the Santa Fe Railroad's South Rim traffic. As noted above, Gray's letter to Lovett, dated August 14, 1922, suggests he gave less credence to this part of Basinger's report.

**Lund-Cedar City Spur**

On October 24, 1921, President Gray instructed Vice President of Traffic H. M. Adams to direct "quiet investigations," on the part of the Traffic Department, for the purpose of ascertaining the feasibility of a rail line from Lund to Cedar City. Thereafter, the project moved forward quickly. On February 5, 1922, Gray wrote to H. V. Platt, Manager of the Oregon Short Line. He explained to Platt how Omaha planned to justify the Lund-Cedar City Spur to the company's Executive Committee in New York City. Basically, Gray thought the real potential lay in the
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excursion business; but, admittedly, this would only be a paying proposition for 3 or 4 months a year. To convince the Executive Committee—and by extension, Union Pacific investors—it would be necessary to offer additional inducements for the spur's construction. These were readily available.

Gigantic deposits of iron ore were believed to exist just northwest of Cedar City. Southwestern Utah had also gained a reputation for the fertility of its arable land. Agronomists had proven that anything, with the exception of citrus fruit, could be grown in this part of the State. Therefore, the promise of a lucrative freight traffic in ore and fresh foodstuffs certainly abetted Cray's argument. The Columbia Steel Corporation, which operated three large plants—one at Ironton, Utah, and the other two in Pittsburg and Torrance, California—had, in fact, recently secured claims to iron ore in the Iron Springs District, 10 miles west of Cedar City. Columbia had no efficient means of transporting its ore from Iron Springs to Lund, and so proposed to construct a rail line. In August 1922, Columbia founded a subsidiary for the purpose, whose legal name was the Iron County Railroad Company.

It is coincidental that two independent corporations should have developed a simultaneous interest in a spur from Lund to Cedar City or its environs. It is highly doubtful, however, that the Union Pacific found the situation at all amusing. Action was called for and the Union Pacific took the initiative as was its custom. Columbia wanted access
to the main line at Lund, and the Union Pacific wanted to see this access realized, providing the track used was its own. Apparently, Columbia was approached late in the summer of 1922 by Union Pacific representatives and agreed to withdraw its application to the Interstate Commerce Commission (I.C.C.) if the Union Pacific would build the Lund-Cedar City Spur, do it quickly, and provide the Iron Springs District ready access to it. During the last week of August 1922 the I.C.C. approved the Union Pacific's petition. This cleared away the first major obstacle for the proposed development of the high plateau country.

The citizens of Cedar City were understandably eager to see the railroad come into their town. Consequently, they readily agreed to conditions imposed by the Union Pacific, which included the following. First, Cedar City was required to furnish the right-of-way from Lund, and guarantee fulfillment by posting a $50,000 bond. Second, the city was to sell two downtown blocks to the Union Pacific at a cost not to exceed $45,000. The Citizen's Committee of Cedar City agreed to absorb any amount in excess of this figure. Local cooperation was all the railroad had a right to expect. On June 27, 1923, the first scheduled train into Cedar City from Lund arrived, bearing President Warren G. Harding and his entourage. A few weeks later, on September 12 the completion of the Lund-Cedar City Spur was officially celebrated by the laying of a "golden rail."
Cedar City Complex

The third and final condition imposed on Cedar City by the Union Pacific involved what was to become the core building in the railroad's Cedar City Complex. In 1918 the townspeople had begun the construction of a large hotel. From its onset the project was badly under-financed, and by the summer of 1922 the hotel was only half completed. Omaha wanted to purchase the building for estimated costs expended on it, less interest. This sum amounted to $77,597.14, and the railroad assumed it would take another $100,000 to open the hotel. Actually, this estimate was only about 50 percent of what the Union Pacific poured into the structure, but it was ready for business late in 1923. The hotel was named "El Escalante" in honor of Friar Escalante who had traversed the region in 1776 (see Modern Discovery, Expeditions to the Bryce Canyon Region).

Construction of the Cedar City depot was accomplished during the first 6 months of 1923. George Albert "Bert" Wood, a Cedar City contractor, did the work. He was also responsible for completing the Escalante Hotel and later participated in building the Utah Parks Lodges. The depot was rounded out in 1929 when a patio and bus shelter were added to its south and east sides. Between 1925-29 the completion of four buildings augmented the complex. These were the West Garage (1925), Chauffer's Lodge (1926), Machine Shop (1928), and Commissary Building (1929).
Incorporation of Utah Parks Company. Omaha's decision to go ahead with the Cedar City Complex carried with it the realization that sooner or later the railroad would need to conclude long-term concession agreements with the National Park Service. Director Mather of the National Park Service made it clear to Union Pacific as early as March 1922 that he thought the railroad should operate in the Cedar City region as two separate companies. One should take the responsibility for transportation and related services, the other for hotels and camps. Mather suggested that transportation be handled as an extension of the railroad--and hotels and camps by "Utah people," with the financial backing of the railroads.

Mather knew well the political climate in Washington, D. C., and was particularly concerned about Enos Mills' agitation against what Mather called "so-called monopolies" in the national parks. Members of the Appropriation Committee for the Interior Department who had visited the parks were generally pleased with cooperation between western railroads and the Park Service; but, Mather sensed that constant agitation could raise questions in the minds of constituents, and put unwanted pressure on friendly politicians. Mather's message to the Union Pacific was clear: why needlessly antagonize these politicians? Omaha was essentially forced to concur with Mather's position.

There were also secondary reasons why the formation of a separate corporation for concessions made sense to the railroad. For one thing it would limit legal responsibility, and as Gray once remarked to Lovett
"a great railroad is much more subject to attack in such matters than a smaller and independent corporation." Additionally, Gray felt a separate corporation, dealing on a day to day basis with a well-heeled, discriminating, carriage trade, would "avoid compromising [the] railroad in the thousand and one little elements of dissatisfaction arising in [the] operation of hotels."66

Articles of incorporation for the "Utah Parks Company" (UPC) were drawn up in Salt Lake City on March 26, 1923, antedating by several months the opening of the Escalante Hotel in Cedar City. Article V. established the UPC's responsibility, not only for a wide range of tourist accommodations, but for transportation facilities as well:

The business of this corporation . . . shall be as follows . . . to own, lease, operate and maintain automobiles, automobile busses, trucks and other self propelled vehicles and to establish, maintain, operate and conduct a general automobile, livery, and garage business and service including the hiring out of automobiles of any and all kinds, and the care, repair, maintenance supply thereof, together with the necessary buildings, shops, service stations, and other facilities necessary or incident thereto . . . .

The Railroad Securities Company of New Jersey, a Union Pacific subsidiary, subscribed 98 percent of the Utah Parks Company's capital stock. High officials of the railroad assumed key positions in the new company. Gray became the Utah Parks Company's President and H. M. Adams the Vice President. Both E. E. Calvin, Union Pacific's Vice President of Operations, and George H. Smith, General Counsel for the Union Pacific System, became Utah Parks Company Directors.88
Section 36, Bryce Canyon. In August 1922 Union Pacific's President, Carl R. Cray, was willing to temporarily ignore the problems posed by Section 36 in soon-to-be Bryce Canyon National Monument, but not for very long. Intensive negotiations with the State of Utah were opened in April 1923. Gray telegraphed Governor Mabey on April 19 proposing that the railroad buy the 30 acres along the Plateau rim and sign a 25-year lease for the remainder of the section. Gray made it perfectly clear to Mabey that the Union Pacific was willing to agree to certain limitations on the lease. Gray emphasized that Section 36 would never be closed to the public. Areas for parking and camping would be set aside by the railroad for the State's use, at no charge to either the general public or State. 89

Ten days later Gray telegraphed George Smith, informing him precisely what it was the railroad wanted:

We want to acquire the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section thirty six, township thirty six south, range four west, and will want to lease the balance of this section for the term of twenty five years with right for an additional twenty five years as provided in special statute. You are authorized to make formal application in behalf of the corporation Utah Parks Company. Will want this transaction to include understanding that we may, presently or later, transfer this property and leasehold to Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad Company or Union Pacific Railroad Company if we desire.

Smith did as he was instructed on May 3, 1923, making formal application in the name of the Utah Parks Company with John T. Oldroyd, the State Land Commissioner. 91 The next day Smith sent Gray a copy of the application to Oldroyd. He noted that the Land Board had classified the section as grazing land, appraised at $2.50 per acre with a lease value
of 25 cents per acre. It was Smith's impression that Oldroyd was indifferent to the railroad's proposal. On the morning of May 4 Oldroyd told Smith that the State wanted a much larger sum for the land. Smith had inferred from this that the Land Board would immediately reclassify and reappraise Section 36, so as to conclude the most advantageous bargain. 92

Subsequently, Gray and Smith began to learn that the State was not merely interested in money. About May 10, State Senator Lunt, a member of the State Road Commission, informed Smith that State authorities feared the railroad would eventually exclude the general, nonpaying public from Section 36. Lunt himself favored an outright sale of all or part of the section to the Union Pacific but indicated to Smith that his hands were tied. 93

At this stage of the negotiations Gray became exasperated. On May 14 he wired Smith that the Union Pacific would not be forced in the matter:

> We will neither pay an excessive price and rentals nor will we take any other land than that we have decided upon, and if the matter is delayed and the hotels not constructed, the responsibility will have to rest where it belongs, which would certainly not be with us... 94

Arbitration between the two parties reached its lowest point on May 16, when Smith, accompanied by Union Pacific System Park Engineer S. L. Lancaster, met with Oldroyd. Smith first tried to schedule a meeting at Bryce Canyon between Governor Mabey, interested State officials, and representatives from the railroad. This meeting appears to have taken place about the beginning of June, but it was probably not
because of any effort Oldroyd made. In fact, during the May 16 meeting Oldroyd became flippant and at one point laughingly remarked to Smith and Lancaster that he, Oldroyd, had received suggestions that land in Section 36 be sold for $500 an acre, or as much as $100,000 for a 40-acre tract. Even at this price Oldroyd was insistent the State would never relinquish title to the southeast corner of Section 36, but would want the railroad to take its 40 acres "farther back." Smith must have left this meeting clenching his fists.

During the next few days several influential members of the Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce and Commercial Club actively came to the railroad's support. On May 26 the Board of Governors of the Commercial Club met with Mabey and Oldroyd. These businessmen do not appear to have completely carried the day, but were likely instrumental in scaling down the State's demands. Unfortunately, no record is known to exist of what transpired between June and September. Gray's September 27 correspondence to Lovett as well as a lease, deed, and patent from the State, dated September 8 and 10; however, do spell out the compromise solution reached between the State and railroad.

Omaha, in the name of the Utah Parks Company, was granted a lease on 618.39 acres of Section 36--said lease to begin on January 1, 1923, and run for 25 years at $2 per acre per year. An option for an extension of 25 years was written into the lease. Leased land comprised the following parcels: (1) W1/2; (2) NE1/4; (3) W1/2 of SE1/4; (4) NE1/4 of the SE1/4; and (5) beginning at the SE corner of the SE1/4 of the SE1/4,
running W 1320 feet, then N 970 feet, then E 970 feet, then N 970 feet, then E 350 feet, then S 1320 feet to the SE corner (18.39 acres). The 18.39 acre parcel in the SE1/4 of the SE1/4 was deeded back to the State "for the support of the common schools of the grantee." The 21.69 actually sold to the railroad, cost $540.25, that is $25 per acres.

Both parties could be justifiably satisfied with the settlement. For its part, the Union Pacific now effectively commanded the situation at Bryce Canyon. An outlay of several hundred dollars was indeed a modest price to pay for this first rate opportunity. The annual lease fee was negligible. On the other hand, the State of Utah could claim its servants had carefully considered the situation, and what was done had been done for the long-term welfare of the State's citizens. Numerous conditions attached to the settlement do make clear that Omaha did plenty of compromising. The Union Pacific was required to provide ample space (as much as 40 acres) for public camping, and relinquish a right of way for a public road to the campground. No timber could be cut on leased land without the State's permission. The State retained all mineral rights on the 21.69 acre plot it sold to the railroad.

Syrett Camp. A more informal condition imposed by Salt Lake obligated the Union Pacific to reach "an amicable settlement with R. Syrett." Omaha viewed this as a necessity anyway, since Syrett had filed on the
closest water supplies to the SE corner of Section 36. It was also apparent to Smith that Syrett was well regarded in Mormon settlements near Bryce Canyon. It would make no sense to incur Syrett's enmity, and risk poisoning relations with the local populace. Smith accordingly opened negotiations with Syrett during the first week of June 1923. The Union Pacific offered to loan Syrett $2,500 at 6 percent interest, for the purpose of paying off debts Syrett had incurred to improve Tourists' Rest. Syrett would be allowed to operate Tourists' Rest until the Bryce Lodge was ready for occupancy. He would then be moved, at the railroad's expense, to another location within the SE 1/4 of Section 36, and issued a 5-year lease--presumably for the purpose of catering to motorists. In return for Syrett's assignment of water rights in Section 16, T. 37 S., the Union Pacific agreed to furnish Syrett's camp with free water "for such period of the year as the water supply is available." No concessions, such as the saddle horse operation, were offered to Syrett.

Smith's proposal was pretty tight-fisted and Syrett likely saw it that way. Ruby thus attempted to use the State Land Commission as an intermediary, for the purpose of securing a better deal. Land Commissioner Oldroyd was not a personal friend of Syrett, but was prone to side with a fellow Utahn, especially one pitted against a powerful out-of-State corporation. Syrett presented the State Land Commission an inventory of property, valued by himself, at $18,500, inclusive of water rights. Howard Mann, a Union Pacific engineer, valued Syrett's property at $7,360, exclusive of water rights. Smith was reluctantly drawn
in. He proposed the sum of $9,000 as a fair offer, subject to Gray's approval. 107 Syrett had successfully managed to raise the ante in his favor, and decided to horse-trade for all the situation was worth.

Late in September a series of offers and counter-offers resulted in the Union Pacific's willingness to pay Syrett $10,000 for the latter's property and water rights. 108 Actually, the company was under pressure. Oldroyd, backed by State law, was withholding patent to land the railroad had purchased until either the company settled with Syrett, or deposited an amount with the Land Commission equal to the value of Syrett's improvements, as assessed by the State. The Union Pacific could resort to the latter method of settlement, but this would take time, and--more importantly--would not solve the water rights question. 109 Gray also had information from an unnamed source that the National Park Service had made an attempt to discourage Governor Mabey from facilitating the sale to the Union Pacific of any property. 110 Gray inferred from this that the National Park Service assumed Section 36 might someday be incorporated into a national park.

Syrett, too, may have been under some pressure to conclude agreement. He was in debt for improvements to Tourists' Rest, and it may be that the Panguitch bank wanted the debt liquidated. At any rate, a Bill of Sale concluded on September 25, 1923, settled the issue. Ruby and Minnie Syrett received $10,000 for enumerated property situated in the SE1/4 of the SE1/4 of Section 36, and water rights they held outside the section. 111 The Los Angeles and Salt Lake Railroad Company (L.A. & S.L. R.R.) acted on behalf of the Union Pacific System.
Water Supply for Section 36. Syrett's water rights, as assigned to the Union Pacific System on September 25, 1923, consisted of Hopkins Spring and Shaker Springs—sometimes referred to as Weather Springs. Syrett's application to the State Engineer for Hopkins Springs was approved on January 9, 1923, bearing registration No. 8888. Union Pacific Attorney George Smith noted that Hopkins Spring was located adjacent to Syrett's Tourists' Rest complex and informed Gray the spring did not amount to much. Syrett's application for Shaker Springs was approved on June 25, 1923, and bore registration No. 9221. Shaker Springs was located approximately 4-1/2 miles northeast of the proposed site for Bryce Canyon Lodge in Section 16, T. 37 S. It was considerably larger than Hopkins Spring and was the main reason the railroad wanted to buy out Syrett's water rights. When Syrett applied for Shaker Springs he probably intended to cover another spring in the immediate vicinity. Nevertheless, his description was defective, and Omaha thought questions might arise as to the claim's validity. The L.A. & S.L. R.R. thus made an independent filing on the spring to avoid future complications.

On October 18, 1923, Union Pacific Resident Engineer, H. C. Mann, informed the Los Angeles office of the L.A. & S.L. R.R. that it would be necessary "to do some work" before December 31, in order to hold the water filing at Bryce. It appears Mann was referring to Hopkins Spring alone. Smith and Mann conferred on this issue, which implies the improvements were for the purpose of conforming to State law. Smith recommended that excavations be made for a head box around the spring. It would then be necessary to build forms and fill them with concrete or
stone mortared into place. Smith estimated the project to cost between $500 and $1,000. On account of Bryce Canyon's severe winter climate, Smith said work should begin as soon as possible. It must be assumed the project was completed late in the fall of 1923.

There is every reason to believe Union Pacific employees directly involved with the Bryce Canyon Lodge project were uneasy with the water supply acquired from Syrett. Consequently, additional sources of potable water were energetically sought after. In June 1925 the Union Pacific System, in the name of the L.A. & S.L. R.R., concluded a 25 year lease with W. J. and Elizabeth W. Henderson. For $50 per annum, the railroad acquired the use of a spring in the W 1/2 of Section 34, T. 36 S., whose rate of flow was gauged at 0.16 second feet of water, i.e., over 100,000 gallons per day. The lessor agreed to permit the use of sufficient land in the W 1/2 of Section 34 for the construction and maintenance of a pumphouse and pipeline. Having concluded the Henderson Lease, the Union Pacific probably evaluated its water supply as adequate for years to come.

Reconnaissance for Bryce Canyon Lodge. Union Pacific's intent to construct major buildings in Zion National Park, Bryce Canyon, and Cedar Breaks made it necessary for the company to secure the services of a competent architect. During the early spring of 1923 National Park Service Landscape Architect Daniel P. Hull worked closely with an architect named Gilbert Stanley Underwood on the Yosemite Village project. Notwithstanding Underwood's limited success on the project,
Hull was impressed with Underwood, and undoubtedly recommended him to the Union Pacific System for use of the development of the Utah parks.

Underwood, who had opened an office in Los Angeles in January 1923, was invited to come to Omaha. On the morning of May 1, 1923, he met with E. E. Adams and J. L. Haugh, Executive Assistants to President Gray. Adams and Haugh hired Underwood to plan the Zion Lodge. They also asked Underwood to go over to Bryce Canyon and "look it over and make some suggestions." It was understood that if the railroad was pleased with the results of Underwood's Zion project, he would shortly receive similar commissions. The next day Underwood started for Utah, accompanied by Union Pacific Park Engineer S. L. Lancaster and Randall L. Jones, the Union Pacific System's key liaison man in the Cedar City area. Enroute, Daniel Hull joined the group in Cheyenne.

Underwood and the others arrived in Cedar City on the afternoon of May 4. They spent the night in Cedar City, then went on to Zion and spent the entire day there. The next morning, Sunday, May 5, 1923, the group departed for Bryce, and in Lancaster's words arrived there "in time to see the effect of the beautiful Sun Set." Architect Underwood's first involvement with Bryce Canyon then, was on the Monday morning of May 6, 1923. He confined his efforts to the selection of a suitable site for the lodge. It appears that Underwood was made aware of the fact the plateau rim would likely be off-limits as a construction
site. For this and less well known reasons, a site was chosen back away from the rim, yet close enough to make it readily accessible to lodge guests.

Lancaster was scheduled to meet Underwood in Los Angeles on May 21, 1923. At that time the two presumably went over Underwood's preliminary sketches for Zion Lodge, and may have exchanged a few words regarding the proposed structures for Bryce Canyon and Cedar Breaks. Underwood and Lancaster did not meet again until early in July. This conference—involving Underwood, Lancaster, and Hull centered—on Zion Lodge. During the working season of 1923 Architect Underwood's work at Bryce Canyon can be characterized as nothing more than reconnaissance.

Construction Program's Organization. During May 1923, with everything in a state of flux, the Union Pacific began to assemble and organize key personnel in its ad hoc construction team for the Utah parks. Howard C. Mann, a veteran Resident Engineer in the Union Pacific System, was transferred from the Columbia River bridge project to an office in Cedar City. He assumed a role as the principal technical figure in the entire Utah parks construction program. Mann was expected to handle estimates and expenditures, construction routines, and individual project organization. Samuel C. Lancaster, Union Pacific's roving Park Engineer, reported to Mann. Lancaster was responsible for choosing building sites and for landscaping. It would be his additional task to work with the National Park Service, Forest Service, and County and State Road Commissions regarding road work. Randall L. Jones had two primary responsibilities. He would be depended upon to secure local
laborers and craftsmen. He was also to assist Mann as a supervisory architect. Jones, like Lancaster, reported directly to Mann. As a team Mann, Lancaster, and Jones were destined to successfully inaugurate Union Pacific's major construction program for the Utah parks. The erection of all buildings in Bryce Canyon's "initial" building phase, between 1924-29, can be attributed to their efforts.

Materials for Bryce Lodge. As early as March 27, 1923, Lancaster sent Randall Jones to Bryce Canyon to investigate the possibilities of using local timber and rock for the construction of Bryce Lodge. On March 29 Lancaster returned to Cedar City from St. George and made arrangements with the Forest Service for cutting timber to be used in the lodge's framework. The Forest Service charged $475 for this privilege. Two days earlier Jones had contacted Charles Church and Fred Worthen to quarry suitable stone. For the sum of $143.65, Church and Worthen furnished 12 men and the necessary teams to haul stone. These men would be split into two 6-man gangs, with Church and Worthen acting in a dual capacity as foremen and powdermen. A quarry site was selected within 1-1/2 miles of the lodge site. Men were paid $3.20 per day, the foremen $5.

Lancaster planned to accumulate lumber by means of a contract with Ruby Syrett and Owen Orton, dated March 30, 1923. These men were to provide 200,000 board feet of lumber at $27.50 per 1,000 feet. The contract also stipulated that as many slabs as needed for the lodge's construction be provided at 5 cents per linear foot. Each side of an
individual slab had to be 1 foot wide, with its sides and ends squared. Syrett and Orton were to harvest all trees on National Forest land and agreed to have lumber and slabs properly piled on the lodge construction site by July 15, 1923.  

Lancaster justified these preliminary expenditures to Gray by explaining that construction during the 1924 working season could not proceed without properly seasoned timber. Naturally, no timber could be used until the basement and foundations had been laid in stone. Lancaster estimated that shipping timber from the Northwest would add $20,000 to $30,000 to the cost of buildings proposed for Bryce Canyon and Cedar Breaks. He insisted that the best way to save money was to employ local people. This labor force could erect the lodge up to the laying of floors, the installation of plumbing, and the application of finished work.  

For some time Union Pacific's Executive Committee in New York was at pains to understand why Lancaster proposed to use so much stone in the Lodge's construction. On June 21 Lovett remarked to Gray that:  

... stone-cutters are among the highest paid class of workmen and, furthermore, are not very plentiful ... I confess it is rather hard for me to believe that attractive hotels can be built with stone at less expense than with lumber grown in abundance on our own lines, no matter where the stone is found ...  

In subsequent correspondence Gray pointed out to Lovett, and the rest of the Executive Committee, that the Utah parks buildings would be built "in the interior, far from the railroad." Hauling lumber into Bryce
by truck from Cedar City would also entail large expenses. Perhaps
Gray's most persuasive argument was that stone work could be done at
Bryce Canyon for 40 cents an hour. Lovett, at least, was convinced
and on July 30 communicated to Gray: "There is, of course, no doubt
under the facts stated by you that the stone should be used in building
these hotels." 

A few days earlier, in a progress report, dated July 15, 1923, Gray had
told Lovett the foundation stone for Bryce Lodge was in the process of
being quarried:

The stone is of such a nature that it breaks out from the
quarry in the shape required for laying in the walls and it
will not be necessary in any case to use a stone cutter upon
it. The stone is to be laid up in a rough rustic style in
cement and mortar, and can be done with the same common labor
that is used for quarrying it.

Gray further explained that timber at Bryce Canyon had proven to be of
inferior quality—not at all suitable for the lodge's exterior
finishing. Milling the requisite amount of lumber was slow because of
the trees' small size. Gray figured the lodge's walls would be built up
to the snowline with stone, above that with timber. He concluded by
stating that actual construction would not begin until the spring of
1924 principally because of the area's poor roads.

During a meeting of the Executive Committee, held in the first week of
October, F. A. Vanderlip took an extremely negative view of the entire
Utah parks venture. Vanderlip centered his criticism on two issues:
the expense of individual buildings, Bryce Lodge among them, and what he
termed the wretched condition of regional roads. Lovett, himself, could not dismiss this criticism and asked Gray to fully advise him of the situation. Gray's reply to Lovett on October 6 was masterful and shows the President intended to stand firm during this period of crisis over the Utah parks program.

Gray adequately justified expenditures for rough materials. He explained that it was necessary to take good advantage of weather conditions. If the railroad decided not to build the lodge, this material could be used for the construction of camps. Gray emphasized his disagreement with Vanderlip's objection to the construction of lodges in Zion and Bryce Canyon. Gray cited that Omaha's Traffic Department had assessed that with camps alone the Union Pacific would be restricted to a "secondary class of travel." This implied the railroad would not be able to secure any of the convention traffic, which then represented a significant percentage of rail traffic to Yellowstone and Glacier National Parks. The proposed return on camps alone also failed to justify a major advertising campaign for the Utah parks—a campaign considered absolutely necessary if the Union Pacific hoped to effectively compete with the first-class hotel accommodations available at Yellowstone, Glacier, and the South Rim of the Grand Canyon. Gray did not ignore Vanderlip's remark about roads. He assured Lovett that Omaha's final decision to go ahead with development in Zion, Bryce Canyon, and Cedar Breaks was predicated on proper roads "and our [i.e. Omaha's] determination in this last respect has been very emphatically stated."
Transportation Franchise

From early on Union Pacific officials were eager to launch a concerted effort for better roads in southwestern Utah. Yet, logic dictated that Omaha first secure the exclusive right to transport tourists in the area, and this meant dealing with the Parry brothers. Chauncey and Gronway Parry pioneered the tourist transportation industry in southwestern Utah and northwestern Arizona. At an unknown date, the brothers had secured a certificate of convenience and necessity from the Public Utilities Commission of Utah. This entitled them to operate a touring service to all scenic attractions within the State of Utah, but "with limitation as to time." In the spring of 1917, William W. Wylie, his brother, Clinton W. Wylie, and the Parry brothers incorporated the National Park Transportation and Camping Company, whose title changed shortly thereafter to the Zion National Park Company. The National Park Service granted this company the exclusive privilege to maintain tourist camps in Zion, and to provide a tourist transportation service in and out of the park. The contract was finalized on September 6, 1917, but made the company's privilege retroactive to January 1, 1917. In February 1922 a Memorandum of Agreement was drafted and signed by both parties, extending the Zion National Park Company's concession privileges for an additional year, to January 1, 1923.

George Smith approached Chauncey Parry early in April 1923, that is, several months after the Parrys' Zion franchise had expired. At the time Chauncey Parry told Smith the brothers had no property, other than
a few automobiles, automobile equipment, and a small garage. Smith was taken back when Chauncey told Smith the brothers expected to secure interest in whatever transportation scheme the Utah Parks Company proposed for the region. It was Smith's impression Chauncey based this aggressive position on reassurances he had gained from an earlier conversation with Samuel Lancaster.

A dearth of documents on the franchise issue prevents an accurate appraisal of Omaha's position between April 1923 and March 1924—when the railroad did effectively secure the Parry's interests in southwestern Utah. From a strict legal standpoint the brothers' position was indefensible. Their Zion franchise had expired, and the State's Public Utility Commission license indicated the touring service from Cedar City and Marysvale operated "with limitation as to time." It was probably this ambiguity written into the State license, however, and resistance on the part of the Public Utility Commission in Salt Lake City to clarify it, that forced the railroad into a contractual agreement highly attractive to the Parry brothers.

The 16-page agreement concluded on March 4, 1924, permitted the brothers to operate a regional motor transportation service under Utah Parks Company supervision. There were two key provisions in the contract, both generous to the Parrys. First, the brothers were to operate the transportation service for the Utah Park Company, until they decided to sell out completely. Second, as long as the Parrys operated the service, in accordance with the provisions of the contract, they were to receive the combined annual salary of $5,000.
The Utah Parks Company was legally required to purchase only vehicular equipment acquired by the brothers after February 15, 1924. A description of these vehicles is not included in the contract, but it is known the Parrys operated some "White" touring cars. On May 3, 1923, nearly a year before the Parry settlement, H. R. Child, President of the Yellowstone Park Transportation Company, strongly recommended to H. M. Adams, Union Pacific's Vice President of Traffic, that the Utah Parks Company purchase White touring cars for its operation:

... I do not hesitate to say to you very frankly that there isn't a car manufactured which can come anywhere near holding its own in any way with this White equipment, and you will make a mistake if you put in any other automobile to handle your tourists ...

Child's advice was passed from Adams to Gray, but it appears Gray decided to be selective. In the spring of 1925, the Utah Parks Company received permission from the Utah Public Utilities Commission to operate 40 touring cars, each having seats for 10 passengers. Eight of the forty were new White "53's" with Scott bodies. In 1929, Utah Parks Companies transportation fleet was augmented with the addition of 5 White "65's," capable of carrying 13 passengers. The Whites did prove durable and were the backbone of Utah Parks Companies touring service until the outbreak of World War II.

REGIONAL ROAD DEVELOPMENT (1923-25)

In 1922 two principal highways traversed the scenic region of southwestern Utah--both on a rough north-south axis. The "Arrowhead Trail," or Salt Lake City-Los Angeles Highway, entered from
the north at Parowan, intersected Cedar City, and St. George via Anderson's Ranch. The distance from Parowan to St. George then was approximately 75 miles. An earlier but less important highway originated at Marysvale, and snaked southward some 70 miles to Hatch via Junction and Panguitch. Ten miles south of Hatch the road forked. Its more heavily traveled eastern branch ran approximately 50 miles through Alton and on to Kanab. The western branch intersected Glendale, Orderville, and Mt. Carmel then continued on to Kanab.

Bryce Canyon was practically equidistant from Marysvale and Cedar City. However, the road eastward from Cedar City to the Marysvale-Kanab highway junction had not yet been completed. In January 1922 a critical 8 mile gap existed just east of Cedar Breaks. There was an alternate 85-mile route between Cedar City and Bryce Canyon. It led from Cedar City north to Parowan, then ran northeast to junction with the Marysvale-Kanab highway at Orton Ranch, between Junction and Panguitch. This road was in reasonably good shape, but was impractical for the purpose of tying Bryce Canyon into a tourist loop with Zion and Cedar Breaks. At the time, Zion and Bryce were essentially inaccessible to one another. The only road which connected the Arrowhead Trail to the Marysvale-Kanab highway led from Laverkin, southeast of Anderson's Ranch to Fredonia, Arizona, 7 miles south of Kanab. This 63 mile stretch was regarded as the worst road in the entire region.

The Union Pacific knew that in order to make practical a tourist loop between Cedar City, Zion, Bryce, Cedar Breaks, and eventually the North Rim it would have to approach the improvement of the regional road
system in a systematic way. Omaha had made clear its intention to refrain from direct investment in roads, so the railroad could only work behind the scenes to galvanize the State of Utah, National Park Service, and Forest Service into action.

In October 1923, Union Pacific's first priority was to immediately get behind the State's proposed improvements for: (1) the Arrowhead Trail between Cedar City and Anderson's Ranch, and (2) the road eastward, between Anderson's and the south entrance to Zion via Rockville. A first-rate road from Cedar City to Zion was in Omaha's estimation, essential for the establishment of a tourist circuit. The railroad had secured Salt Lake's backing to construct a road eastward from Rockville to Mt. Carmel. Once Mt. Carmel was linked to Rockville and Zion, the next logical step required an improved road from Mt. Carmel north, to junction with the eastbound Cedar City road at Divide. Later, attention to the road south from Mt. Carmel to Kanab would prevent the tortuous 50-mile stretch south from Hatch to Kanab. With an eye to the future development of the North Rim, the Union Pacific also intended to push for the construction of a road south from Rockville to Short Creek, near the Arizona State line.

Early in 1923, the State Road Commission had less than $200,000 at its disposal. Even these funds were set aside as a revolving deposit to meet emergency situations. The 1921 State bond issues of $1,000,000 promised to be of some assistance. However, most of this money had already been spent. Where, then, was support to come from for an accelerated road program?
The basis for a solution rested with the provisions of the 1921 Federal Highway Act. It stipulated that the Federal Government would subsidize highway construction in individual States to the extent of 7 percent of the total mileage in each State. In 1923 total road mileage within Utah was approximately 24,000. Thus, some 1,600 miles of road could be made eligible for the "7 Percent Plan." According to the provisions of the Highway Act, Utah would receive 74 percent of all construction costs for the 1,600 miles designated. The State was required to foot the 26 percent balance, and pay for all engineering costs prior to actual construction. All plans, specifications and estimates were subject to the approval of the U. S. Bureau of Public Roads. To conform to federal specifications, roads had to be at least 18 feet wide, with a 3 foot shoulder on each side. The road had to be surfaced with gravel or a suitable paving material, such as cement. No grade could exceed a maximum of 6 percent. Bridges, culverts, and the like had to conform to a similar set of specifications. 164

In October 1923 authorities of Utah's Road Commission applied to the Federal Government for approval of the following roads to be included in the 7 Percent Plan:

From Cedar City south to Anderson's Ranch, thence to Rockville and Zion National Park and eastward to Mt. Carmel, thence south to Kanab and on to the Arizona state line; also the new highway from Rockville south, crossing the new bridge to be built this winter [i.e. 1923] over the Virgin River, a distance of approximately 25 miles, to the Arizona state line. 165

Dr. L. I. Hewes, Regional Director of the Office of Public Roads in San Francisco, approved this application, and the necessary papers were forwarded to Washington, D. C. 166 In January 1924, the Union Pacific
learned the roads applied for had been approved by the Secretary of Agriculture and would be included in the Federal Aid System. Their estimated cost, based on Federal standards, was approximately $1,000,000. Neither Federal nor State funds were then available, so construction would proceed as the necessary appropriations were released. In March 1924, a $220,000 appropriation, voted by the Governor's Committee to the State Road Commission, reinforced the Union Pacific's optimism. This money was specifically earmarked for the Cedar City-Zion road, and Randall Jones thought it would complete the road south from Cedar City as far as Laverkin.¹⁶⁷

By April 1924 the road from Cedar City to Kanarra, a distance of 12.2 miles, had been contracted and work was in progress. No construction funds were available for the 4.5 miles from Kanarra to the Iron-Washington County line, but this stretch was regarded in good enough condition to stand up to all-weather driving. The 11 miles from the Iron-Washington County line to the foot of Black Ridge was financed and bids would soon be advertised. From this point for the next 7 miles to Anderson's Ranch the road was complete. The 7-1/2 miles from Anderson's to Laverkin were financed and bids would be advertised as soon as plans and specifications had been prepared. No money was available for the 24 mile stretch from Laverkin to Zion's southern boundary.¹⁶⁸ A Union Pacific survey conducted in January 1922 rated the road from Springdale to Wylie Camp in Zion as "60 percent."¹⁶⁹ There is no indication that in April 1924 either of the proposed roads running east and south from Rockville had as yet been started. Obviously, much needed to be done in Zion's vicinity.
In April 1924 the road from Cedar City to Bryce via Cedar Breaks was classified as a Forest Highway, with the exception of an 18 mile stretch from the Kane-Garfield County line north to Panguitch. Forest Highways were not constructed nearly as well as 7 percent roads. Their main deficiency was an inability to stand up to heavy traffic, especially during inclement weather. By June 1924 approximately 20 miles of road from Cedar City to Midway—within 4 miles of Cedar Breaks—was in good shape by Forest Service standards. Only 4 miles of road east of Cedar Breaks had not yet been completed. Even so, this section was under contract to a reputable firm, and its completion during June 1924 seemed assured. Forest Highway improvements from Divide north for 5 miles to the Kane-Garfield line began late in May 1924. Additional funds were shortly expected for Forest Highway improvements from Divide, 20 miles south to Glendale. No funds were available to improve a fair road from the Kane-Garfield line to Bryce Canyon Junction. Most of the 18 miles between Bryce Junction and Bryce Canyon were in excellent shape; however, a 6 mile stretch east of Red Canyon needed resurfacing.

Financing the Cedar City-Cedar Breaks road for a distance of 23 miles proved a complex affair. It was estimated that $35,000 to $40,000 would be needed to widen the existing trail, surface it with a suitable material, and provide proper drainage. Neither Federal nor State funds were available for this purpose, and the Union Pacific had, as a matter of principle, made clear its aversion to directly invest in roads. Fortunately for Omaha, the Forest Service was interested enough
to subscribe $20,000.\textsuperscript{174} At about the same time--September 1923--State Senator Lunt agreed to raise a bond issue of $5,000 in Cedar City.\textsuperscript{175} However, only in February 1924, when the Commissioners of Iron County voted an appropriation of $10,000, was the project really made possible.\textsuperscript{176}

By the spring of 1925 Omaha likely evaluated regional road development as uneven but promising. On the negative side, roads in and around Zion were only fair. The State project to extend a road from Rockville east to the Marysvale-Kanab highway had been flatly abandoned. Progress on the road from Rockville south to Short Creek was tangible, but roads in northwestern Arizona were only poor to fair. The Cedar City-Bryce Canyon connection via Cedar Breaks had received plenty of attention, but Union Pacific officials had no idea how well this critical road would stand up to heavy traffic.

Against these deficiencies long-term prospects appeared good. In November 1924 George H. Dern became Governor of Utah, but was only one of a few candidates representing his party to be elected. This situation implied that Dern would make no significant changes in the State Road Commission Governor Mabey had put together. In his 1925 inaugural address, Dern defined his position on roads, emphasizing that the exploitation of Utah's scenic attractions depended upon the steady improvements of approach roads leading to them. Dern not only wanted to continue Mabey's expansionist road program, but stressed the need to institute a systematic State road maintenance plan. During the 1925
session, Utah's legislature responded to Dern's position on roads by increasing the State's gasoline tax from 2-1/2 cents to 3-1/2 cents per gallon. This measure almost immediately generated funds to reimburse citizens in Iron and Washington Counties who had advanced money to improve local roads. Increased State aid, coupled with the steady flow of Federal funds into the 7 Percent Plan, foretold well for southwestern Utah's road system. The possibility of someday including the North Rim in Union Pacific's tourist circuit also received a boost in the fall of 1923, when the Governor of Arizona promised Utah Senator Lunt and Randall Jones that he would work strenuously to include the road south of Short Creek to Fredonia in Arizona's 7 Percent Plan.

Zion-Mt. Carmel Road (1927-30)

The fascinating story of Zion-Mt. Carmel Road properly belongs in a general history of Zion National Park. It is, however, well worth noting its singular importance to the development of Bryce Canyon. The extension of a road from Rockville east to the Marysvale-Kanab highway was never pursued by the State with enthusiasm. In 1927 a more attractive and challenging proposal envisioned the construction of a tunnel through the 10,000 foot range which bisects Zion on a north-south axis. A road from the tunnel's eastern end to Mt. Carmel could then be built to connect the two main north-south highways in southwestern Utah.

On July 4, 1930, after 3 years of arduous work brilliantly channeled by engineering excellence, the Zion-Mt. Carmel tunnel was dedicated. Its 5,600 feet had been blasted through solid rock, using engineering
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techniques never before attempted. Inclusive of the tunnel, approximately 8-1/2 miles of road within the park were linked to a 16-1/2 mile section, running from the park's eastern boundary to Mt. Carmel. Road costs within Zion amounted to $1,440,000 with $503,000 spent to construct the tunnel alone. All of this money was taken from National Park Service appropriations. The 16-1/2 mile section from Zion to Mt. Carmel cost $456,000 of which the Federal Government paid $358,000 and the State paid the rest.

Completion of the Zion-Mt. Carmel Road reduced the distance between Zion and Bryce from 149 to 88 miles. Traveling time from Zion to the North Rim was dramatically shaved by a third. For the first time, Zion, Bryce, Cedar Breaks, and the North Rim were effectively tied together. The Union Pacific obviously stood to gain from this situation, but had it not been for the perseverance of its agents, there would have been little chance for an accelerated road program during the 1920s. Construction of the Zion-Mt. Carmel Road had one other significant result: the very creation of Bryce Canyon National Park in September 1928. (See section under NATIONAL PARK STATUS.)

NATIONAL MONUMENT STATUS

LEGISLATION (1919-24)

The Legislative Memorial, directed to Congress by the State of Utah in March 1919, was followed within months by Utah Senator Reed Smoot's legislative attempt to make Bryce Canyon a national park.
Bill 3379, "a bill to establish the Utah National Park in the State of Utah," was introduced to the first session of the 66th Congress on November 9, 1919. During the spring of 1920 the Secretary of the Interior, John Barton Payne, was asked to report on the bill, and defined his Department's position as follows:

That this area covered in the pending bill should be at once brought under full national contract and protection is not only desirable but imperative, but it is believed that this should be accomplished by creating it a National Monument by presidential proclamation rather than as a national park. Later on, when investigation of the other areas has been made ... it will not be difficult to have the entire area created as a national park if Congress so decides.

Smoot, even though Chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, found himself stymied. Later in 1920 Smoot was probably instrumental in soliciting descriptions of Bryce from John A. Widtsoe, President of the University of Utah, and Herbert E. Gregory, Professor of Geology at Yale University. Bryce Canyon itself was given extensive publicity by the National Parks Association. These measures appear to have had a favorable effect on Congress, and Smoot was encouraged enough to introduce Senate Bill 487 to the first session of the 67th Congress on April 12, 1921. Senate Bill 487 was a duplicate of the Utah Parks bill he had introduced some 18 months earlier. Yet, Smoot hoped the new Republican Administration, and the new Secretary of the Interior, Albert B. Fall, would see things differently. Fall reported on Senate Bill 487 in mid-June 1921:

I am informed that there are certain other areas in the general vicinity which probably should be considered for inclusion in a park if one be created, and that the Bureau of Parks proposes to conduct an investigation in the vicinity, probably this year.
I believe it would be well to defer the enactment of the legislation until that investigation is completed.

There was little Smoot could now do but bide his time.

The park proposed by Smoot was comparatively diminutive, comprising no more than 11-5/8 sections of land (7,280 acres). Eight of these lay within the eastern side of the Powell National Forest, and included:

1. Section 31 in T. 36 S., R. 3 W. (S.L.M.);
2. Sections 6, 7, and 8 in T. 37 S., R. 3 W.;
3. Sections 1, 12, and 13 in T. 37 S., R. 4 W.;
4. The much discussed Section 36 in T. 36., R. 4 W.

Late in 1922 Senator Smoot had apparently given in to the idea that Bryce would have to become a national monument before it became a national park. On December 19, 1922, a meeting was held in Smoot's Washington office. Present were Union Pacific's General Traffic Manager W. A. Basinger, Acting Director Arno B. Cammerer, Assistant Director Horace Albright of the National Park Service, Utah General Land Office Commissioner Spry, Utah Congressman Don Colton, and Mr. Kneipp of the Forest Service. The future status of Bryce Canyon was practically the sole topic of discussion, and two important decisions resulted from the conference. First, Smoot agreed that for the time being the campaign to make Bryce Canyon a national park should be shelved, and instead steps be taken to make it a national monument. Second, the monument would retain the 11-5/8 sections asked for in the proposed national park, with the 3-5/8 sections outside Powell's boundary incorporated into it. Additionally, all present agreed that Bryce Canyon National Monument should be administered by the U. S. Forest Service.
Strong recommendations by the Departments of Interior and Agriculture, and the Institute's high appraisal of Bryce Canyon's geological uniqueness, prompted President Harding to proclaim Bryce Canyon a national monument on June 8, 1923 (Map 3). In order to effect national monument status for the entire 11-5/8 sections, it was necessary to change Powell's boundaries so as to include: (1) all of Section 32 in T. 36 S., R. 3 W.; (2) the W1/2, NE1/4, and W1/2 of the SE1/4 of Section 5 in T. 37 S., R. 3 W.; (3) the W1/2 and W1/2 of the E1/2 of Section 8 in the same Township as Section 5; and (4) all of Section 17 in the same Township as Sections 5 and 8.

Smoot probably acceded to the creation of a national monument only to gain time and strengthen his contention that Bryce Canyon be made a national park. On December 10, 1923, he introduced Senate Bill 668 to the first session of the 68th Congress—a duplicate of his 1919 and 1921 National Park bills. This time Smoot's campaign was abetted by the support of Michigan Congressman Louis B. Cramton, who was the Chairman of the subcommittee for Department of Interior appropriations. Cramton had traveled extensively throughout the High Plateau country during July 1923, and was invited by the American Automobile Association to deliver a broadcast, extolling the wonders of scenic southern Utah. Cramton did this over the radio in Washington, D. C., on April 17, 1924. The speech was florid but undoubtedly influential. An excerpt follows:

This rapid outline of the other wonders of this region must now suffice while I give my time to Bryce Canyon, so aptly termed by Prof. Frederick Pack of Utah University as Nature's "most delicate jewel."
I want to tell you my impressions of the canyon as from its rim I saw the full succession of its inspiring contrasts, its richly beautiful panorama—by the glare of day, with the passing of the sun, in the dim starlight, at the rising of the moon at midnight, and at the dawning of another day. The ordinary schedule of my waking and sleeping was shattered, but that does not matter if you have but a day at Bryce. The maze of forms and outlines in the canyon gives fancy free rein and you are thrilled not only by what the eye perceives but by what it "half creates" as well, as Wordsworth has it.

Sit with me here near the chasm’s brink as the sun drops low. Before your fancy presents to you the city beautiful, the myriad forms left in the disorder of chance after centuries of erosion resolve themselves into something planned . . . . The architecture is all in harmony. Great buildings rising hundreds of feet, passageways, sometimes but a few feet wide, separating one structure from another, but the walls erect and accurate, story upon story. From Acropolis Hill see how the grade drops rapidly to the waterless river bed which is parked so plentifully with trees on either side of the watercourse. Rising then abruptly to the right from the river are vermillion cliffs, where the palace of the king appears, surrounded by great turreted walls, a steep approach leading to the castle itself, nestling close against the barren cliff.

There is no sound; no smoke arises; nothing in motion but the circling cliff swallow. It is simply the ideal of fancy.

The sun has gone. Darkness falls closer and deeper and the fine tracery of the architecture dims from sight, only the lighter shades of some of the buildings holding prominence. Still you can see the great commanding outline of the fortress and in the center the white of the crowning Acropolis. The swallows are no longer flying about . . . . There are no tones, no lights from below; only the splashes of white upon the dark background, set off with darker markings of the tree areas. The city of fancy is asleep.

At midnight we cautiously approach again the rim and watch, while far in the east over Acropolis Hill a glow enriches the horizon. Soon a silver point comes to view, like a star of hope for the darkened city. Rapidly rises the majestic moon that whitens the night and brings out formless shapes of the city but does not lighten. It mounts to the heavens and the city to the west of us reflects it dimly. It is a spectral city, and the watcher under the rays of moon, the million wonders of the Milky Way, and all the stars overhead, comes to imagine an occasional moving in the tenantless homes. But there is nothing in the city but night.
Up again and to the watcher's post; the day is dawning. A rosy hue in the east; an orange glow over Table Cliff Plateau; to the right a group of clouds which simulate a snowclad range of peaks for a time and then revert to cloud banks, reflecting rosy tints, as mounts the orb of day . . ..

[.. .]

Before you now in glare of day is a prehistoric city of Babylonish splendor. It seems to have been covered with the sands of ages and appears now as if largely revealed by recent excavations still to be completed, banks of earth still in part enshrouding edifices and walls the impression mounting that further beauties are yet to be revealed.

Far in the east you see the modern Utah town of Tropic, surrounded by its fertile green fields, a touch of reality to bring fancy back to earth. But the spell of Bryce Canyon hangs long in your memory.

Cramton's mellifluous tongue certainly did nothing to prejudice Smoot's cause. However, it was not until June 7, 1924, that Public Law No. 227 of the 68th Congress established the "Utah National Park." Smoot's immediate reaction to the bill's passage is not known, but he could not have been completely happy with it. The law's key provision stipulated that the Utah National Park, encompassing the same tracts of land as Bryce Canyon National Monument occupied, would not be made a national park until all "land within the exterior boundaries of the aforesaid tract shall first become the property of the United States."195

FOREST SERVICE ADMINISTRATION (1923-28)

Unanimous agreement that Bryce Canyon National Monument should be administered by the Forest Service was based on the monument's contiguity to Powell National Forest. Thus, in theory, the monument's supervision would be nothing more than an extension of supervision for
Powell National Forest. That the Forest Service exercised its administrative responsibility for Bryce Canyon with a light hand is borne out by available facts. During the 1927 tourist season, the monument was supervised by "Forest Service Ranger" V. O. Brown. Actually, Ranger Brown was employed jointly by Garfield County, the Forest Service, and the Utah Parks Company—but received his salary exclusively from the latter. Brown remained in Bryce Canyon from June 1 to November 1. He took care of the automobile campground, gave out information to campers and Utah Parks Company tourists, and guided visitors on trail trips. In September 1927 visiting National Park Service personnel got the distinct impression Brown earned most of his compensation from tips.

Brown's situation is instructive, because it shows the Forest Service followed its principle of spending money for physical improvement rather than administration. In fact, the key contribution made by the Service to the monument's development had to do with roads. As early as 1923 the Forest Service cooperated with the State Highway Commission to make Bryce Canyon more accessible to the public. Funds allotted for the general development of National Forests were used to improve the Panguitch-Tropic road via Red Canyon, and the Bryce Canyon road from what is now Ruby's Inn to the SE1/4 of Section 36 in the monument. A total of $123,000 was appropriated for the Panguitch-Tropic project, of which $6,300 had been spent by July 1, 1923. Similarly, of $22,300 set aside for the Bryce road, $1,600 was spent by the end of fiscal year 1922. In 1927, the monument road was described as having been
constructed according to the standards of the Bureau of Public Roads. At the time the Forest Service proposed to extend this road some 4 miles southeast, toward Bryce Point.\textsuperscript{199}

Forest Service expenses for the monument itself were comparatively small. For example, during fiscal year 1923 only $500 was allotted for administration.\textsuperscript{200} In 1927 not more than $100 was spent on maintenance and improvements.\textsuperscript{201} Between 1923-28, then, the Forest Service essentially did the following: First, and most importantly, it provided a good road into the monument, and a fair weather road as far as Bryce Point; Second, the automobile campground was maintained at no more than adequate standards. In the 1927 season, 16 tables, 12 garbage cans, and 5 toilets—3 for men and 2 for women—had to suffice for 150 to 200 automobiles, each carrying an average of 4 people;\textsuperscript{202} Third, several miles of foot and horse trails were constructed and kept up between what is now Sunrise Point and Bryce Point; Fourth, a "ranger" was kept on duty during the clement months to give tourists general information, and to accompany groups on trail trips.

Between 1923-28 no accurate record was maintained on visitation statistics. V. O. Brown estimated that 4,200 cars would enter the monument during the 1927 season. Of these approximately 60 percent used the campground—the remainder the lodge. Averaging four to a car, then, some 16,800 people entered the monument by automobile, and another 8,000 by Utah Parks Company vehicles, for a rough total of 25,000.\textsuperscript{203} In
subsequent years, this ratio of 2:1—between tourists who came in by private automobile and the carriage trade—was to dramatically increase in favor of the former.

EARLY ACTIVITIES OF THE UTAH PARKS COMPANY AT BRYCE CANYON (1924–29)

Absence of Contractual Agreements

As explained in "Incorporation of Utah Parks Company," it was because of National Park Service Director Mather's unwillingness to grant a railroad company concessions in Zion that the Union Pacific found it necessary to secure these in the name of a subsidiary—the Utah Parks Company. Accordingly, the Utah Parks Company's authorization to operate at Zion was based on a contract between the Utah Parks Company and the National Park Service, dated June 9, 1923. A near-duplicate contract was effected between the same parties for operations at the North Rim on November 10, 1927. Transportation rights exercised by the Utah Parks Company in Zion and the North Rim were obtained from the Parry brothers. The situation encountered by the Utah Parks Company at Bryce Canyon was somewhat different. Since the Forest Service exercised administration over the national monument from 1923–28, the Utah Parks Company temporarily had no need of a formal concessions agreement.

Initial Construction Phase at Bryce Canyon

The first cost estimate for Bryce Canyon Lodge was given to Union Pacific Chairman Lovett by President Gray in a letter dated August 14,
1922. At this time Gray said 100-room structures at Bryce Canyon and Zion would cost from $150,000 to $175,000 each.\textsuperscript{204} The following April, Gray revised this figure to $315,000 for a 75-room lodge at Bryce Canyon, and $335,000 for the same type of structure at Zion.\textsuperscript{205} Lovett, upon receipt of these escalated estimates, became irritated. In his telegram to Gray, dated October 5, 1923, he asked Union Pacific's President to clarify the issue at once.\textsuperscript{206} The following day, in a letter to Lovett, Gray admitted embarrassment for the earlier estimate—a figure given before there was an opportunity for detailed investigation. Subsequent consultations with architectural and construction personnel convinced Gray that he had badly underestimated the problems posed by Bryce Canyon's remote location, scarcity of usable timber and the severely limited labor pool in the Bryce Canyon's environs.\textsuperscript{207}

Construction of the lodge began on a site approximately 4,000 feet south of the monument's north boundary, and 700 feet from the Canyon's rim. This spot was probably chosen by Underwood, Lancaster, Jones, and Hull during their reconnaissance of the area in the first week of May 1923.\textsuperscript{208} Architect Underwood’s later plans for Utah Parks Company buildings were approved by National Park Service Landscape Architect Hull, Superintendent E. T. Scoyen of Zion, and National Park Service Director Mather. Foundation work and skeletal construction was probably completed during the working season of 1924. Both Melford Ahlstrom and Harmon Shakespeare, local residents who assisted in the lodge's construction, affirm that no unusual problems or delays occurred.\textsuperscript{210}
In the original main building, finished by May 1925, there was an office and lobby, a dining room, kitchen, and showers and toilets for both sexes. The entire second floor was taken up by sleeping accommodations for overnight guests.

It is not known exactly when the main building's rock facade was applied, but it was definitely in place prior to September 1927. Underwood's drawings for the wings are dated February 19, 1926, with revisions made on May 16. It must be assumed the wings were added during the working season of that year. Underwood's sketches for the wings show the rock facade, so it may have been added to the entire building during the clement months of 1926. There is no evidence to indicate precisely why the Utah Parks Company added the wings when it did, but the company's principal motive obviously stemmed from a desire to quickly increase the number of sleeping accommodations. A curio store occupied the lower level of the south wing. The addition of a Recreation Hall in 1927 rounded out the lodge's final configuration.

By September 1927 no fewer than 67 standard and economy cabins were grouped about the lodge. Construction on these had begun during 1925. Concrete walks connected all cabins to the lodge. For the sake of aesthetics, electrical wiring was placed in underground conduits. Furnishings for standard cabins were surprisingly similar to those for deluxe cabins.
In September 1927 only 5 deluxe cabins were in existence, and 10 more augmented the lodge complex in 1929. Construction techniques at Bryce Canyon appear to have followed closely those used for the deluxe cabins at North Rim 2 years earlier. Lodge poles presented a particular problem for the deluxe cabins at Bryce Canyon, since each had to be 49 feet 10 inches long and 10 inches through the tip. The Utah Parks Company wanted nearly 100 of these and according to Harmon Shakespeare, Supervisory Forest Service Ranger Wallace Riddle was particularly cooperative allowing Shakespeare to "mark" those trees most suitable for the poles. Concrete walks also connected the deluxe cabins to the lodge. As the illustrations make clear, the Utah Parks Company used a consistent motif for both the standard and deluxe cabins.

Service structures, including a garage, were begun in 1925. The most significant of these are included in the architectural data section. By the fall of 1927 water used by the complex was pumped from the springs at East Creek. Only an "infinitesimal" amount was obtainable from those located on White Man's Bench. As early as 1927 it was apparent that the water supply at Bryce Canyon presented long-range problems. Sewage from the lodge complex was carried in a 6-inch pipe to a treatment plant approximately 1/2-mile north of the lodge building, and 500 feet west of the main road. Effluent first flowed into a septic tank, and was then sterilized with chlorine. Telephone service between Bryce Lodge and Cedar City was established by the fall of 1927. Apparently, the line provided excellent long distance capability.
A bill of sale between the Los Angeles and Salt Lake Railroad Company and the Utah Parks Company on September 10, 1928, is an excellent document for ascertaining how much property the Union Pacific System owned. Just prior to Bryce Canyon's national park status it owned:

- 1 Main pavilion (frame), 41'6" x 130'4", with extensions,
  - North wing, 43'6" x 31'
  - South wing, 53'10" x 31'
  - West wing, 77'4" x 112'
- 18 Guest cabins (frame), 12' x 24'
- 63 Guest cabins (frame), 12' x 26'4"'
- 5 Deluxe cabins (stone and log), 16'4" x 40'
- 4 Tent cabins, 12' x 14'
- 1 Oil sales cabin (frame), 10' x 12'
- 2 Comfort stations (frame), 16' x 30'
- 1 Laundry (frame), 14' x 16'
- 1 Employees' pavilion (frame), 21' x 53'
- 1 Power house (Corr. Galv. Iron), 24' x 42'
- 2 Toilets (frame), 6' x 6'
- 1 Chlorine house (frame), 6' x 8'
- 1 Septic tank (concrete), 7' x 9' x 26'10"
- 1 Filter trench (concrete), 197' x 8'4"
- 1 Filter trench (stone), 191' x 9'
- 1 Garage (Corr. Galv. Iron), 24' x 92' with 2 wings each 24' x 146'
- 1 Drivers' quarters (frame), 16' x 20'
- 1 Lumber tent, 8' x 10'
- 1 Tent, 8' x 10'
- 1 D.C. & H. building (frame), 12'4" x 40'2"
- 1 D.C. & H. building (frame), 21' x 73'
- 1 D.C. & H. building (frame), 8' x 8'
- 2 Toilets (frame), 4' x 6'
- 1 Bunkhouse (frame), 14' x 14'
- 2 Bunkhouse (frame), 12' x 12'
- 6 Bunkhouse (frame), 16' x 20'
- 1 Material shed, 14' x 15'
- 1 Lattice fence, 8' x 118'
- 1 Open air fireplace, 18' diam.
  - 6" pipeline from Shaker Springs (portion in Bryce Canyon National Park, only)
- 1 Concrete reservoir, 26'9" x 48'4"
- 1 Automobile barrier
- 1 Underground gasoline storage tank
- 2 Observation platforms
- Concrete paths and steps
- Roads and trails
- Lighting system
- Water supply system
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NATIONAL PARK STATUS

CREATION OF BRYCE CANYON

Early in July 1927 discussions took place at the Canyon Hotel in
Yellowstone Park between Union Pacific's President Gray and National
Park Service Field Director Horace Albright. 217 Their subject was the
means by which Bryce Canyon could achieve national park status.
National Park Service Director Mather had given Albright full authority
to conduct negotiations with Gray, and Gray made it clear to Albright
the Union Pacific was vitally interested in immediate action. Omaha had
developed deep concern over the deplorable condition of roads in
northwestern Arizona, and was reluctant to go forward with its plans for
the development of the North Rim until transportation was made more
efficient to and from it. 218

Basically, what came out of the discussions between Gray and Albright
was an exchange proposal by Gray. Omaha wanted the Zion-Mt. Carmel
road, and specifically wanted the National Park Service to authorize
that portion of it within Zion to be completed within 2 years. In
return the railroad agreed to deed the 21.69 acres owned by them at
Bryce Canyon to the Federal Government. Additionally, Omaha consented
to the transfer by the State of Utah to the Federal Government the balance of Section 36, upon which the railroad had a long-term lease. In order to operate at Bryce under National Park Service administration, the Union Pacific wanted a concessions agreement duplicating privileges it received at Zion by virtue of the June 9, 1923, contract.

Gray readily apprehended the fact that no one individual could conclude an agreement binding the Federal Government, so he suggested placing the deed of land in escrow until the conditions asked for by the railroad were fulfilled.\footnote{Union Pacific's Finance Committee in New York approved the escrow agreement on July 26, 1927.} Necessary papers were actually placed under deed to the Federal Government in Walker Brothers Bank of Salt Lake City on August 12, 1927.\footnote{Gray and Albright well knew that Congressman Cramton of Michigan was the only individual who alone could block the achievement of national park status for Bryce Canyon. Cramton simply would not permit Congressional appropriations to the Interior Department for the Zion-Mt. Carmel road until terms creating "Utah National Park" had been met.\footnote{As early as July 5, 1927, Acting National Park Service Director Arno B. Cammerer was careful to tip-off Cramton that negotiations between the Union Pacific and Park Service were proceeding satisfactorily with respect to Bryce.} On July 22, 1927, Cramton responded to Cammerer as follows:}

\begin{quote}
I have your letter of July 5 with enclosures mentioned concerning the Utah National Park, etc. I am delighted to know of the very encouraging prospect for the clearing up of the Utah National Park situation. If that is cleared up satisfactory [sic] and in time, I see no reason why the road construction work in Zion should not be pushed as fast as Mr. Mather desires.
\end{quote}
Thereafter, Cramton, with the aid of Utah Senator Smoot and Utah's Congressmen, began to push for legislation creating Bryce Canyon.

Cramton's reply to Cammerer says much for the Park Service's attitude toward the Bryce Canyon negotiations. There was, in fact, whole-hearted agreement with Union Pacific's proposal. Nevertheless, the Service faced an immediate problem of substantial proportions: financing the Zion-Mt. Carmel road within Zion. By the middle of July 1927 plans for sections 1 and 2 of the tunnel were available through Assistant Chief Hewes of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads. Estimates for the work approximated $700,000, and it was this figure the Park Service had to make quickly available.

Exactly $450,000 was already in the Zion allotment, so Cammerer began to assiduously seek funds that could be transferred from appropriations granted other parks. This was done in the following way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glacier</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(saving on contract for Babb-Many Glacier project)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Canyon</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(saving on contract for North Rim project)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesa Verde</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Ranier</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(saving on contract for Nisqually-Paradise project)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yosemite</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(paving of Yosemite Village plaza deferred)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowstone</td>
<td>77,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$250,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finishing the road within Zion would cost an additional $740,000, but Cramton could be counted on to secure these funds in appropriations for
the next fiscal year. At a major conference in Salt Lake City on July 20, 1927, attended by representatives of the three principal parties, Henry H. Blood of the Utah State Road Commission assured the National Park Service that Utah would have its 16-1/2 mile section between Zion and Mt. Carmel constructed at the same time the Service finished its section. 227

The State of Utah's most critical role in the Bryce Canyon project, however, hinged on its willingness to relinquish the lion's share of Section 36. This the State was willing to do, as Governor Dern made clear to Congressman Cramton on July 20, 1927:

I am pleased to inform you that the State Land Board had a meeting today and . . . you are hereby advised that the State of Utah will exchange the school section in question for some other section of land in order that Bryce Canyon may be made a national park . . . . 228

Dern had another reason for writing Cramton. Salt Lake City was not happy with the condition in the June 7, 1924, law renaming Bryce "Utah National Park." Dern thus put forward three sound arguments for scrapping the name. First, Bryce Canyon had already received extensive advertising during its national monument status by the Union Pacific. Changing its name would do much to negate the railroad's expense and effort. Second, the name Utah National Park had no local significance. It could have been used for any other scenic attraction in the State. Third, the title implied Utah had but one national park, and Bryce would in fact be the second. Dern urged that the 1924 law be amended to read "Bryce Canyon National Park." 229 Accordingly, Senate Bill 1312, introduced to the first session of the 70th Congress by Senator Smoot
was titled a bill "To change the name of the Utah National Park . . . to the 'Bryce Canyon National Park,' and for other purposes." By "other purposes" Smoot meant the acquisition of additional land.

LAND ACQUISITION

Senate Bill 1312 resulted in the February 25, 1928, Act of Congress which made the title Bryce Canyon National Park official. By virtue of this Act, and a corrective Act dated May 14, 1928, a total of 11 sections of land were added to the future national park. These were:

1. the E1/2 of the NE1/4 of Section 25 in T. 36 S., R. 4 W.;
2. the E1/2 and SW1/4 of Section 20, and all of Sections 21, 28, 29, 30, and 33 in T. 36 S., R. 3 W.;
3. all of Sections 24 and 25 in T. 37 S., R. 4 W.;
4. all of Sections 19, 20, and 30 in T. 37 S., R. 3 W.

From May 14, 1928, to June 13, 1930, Bryce Canyon included 22,625 sections, or 14,480 acres (Map 5).

Lands added to Bryce Canyon as a result of the 1928 Acts had to be excluded from Powell National Forest. This, of course, required close cooperation between the National Park Service and the Forest Service officials. The Chief Forester, Colonel Greeley, was willing to relinquish land to the Park Service, and asked only that it be land of particular scenic value. Randall Jones, Union Pacific's agent in Cedar City, had thought for some time that Little Bryce Canyon and Boat Mountain belonged to the park, and available evidence suggests that Park Service officials concurred with his assessment. They also wanted
sufficient surrounding area to make these attractions accessible from Forest Service roads in Bryce Canyon. It is worth emphasizing, however, that indiscriminate additions to Bryce Canyon made no sense to either Mather or Albright. In fact, there was a deep seated unwillingness on Mather's part to acquire so much Forest Service land that road building obligations would overwhelm the future park's budget for years to come.

The direct relationship between the size of Bryce Canyon and the financial obligations of the National Park Service toward it did not, however, prevent Senator Smoot of Utah from assiduously attempting to enlarge the park. Smoot actively opened his Congressional campaign in the spring of 1930 with Senate Bill 4170, a bill "To provide for the addition of certain lands to the Bryce Canyon National Park . . . and for other purposes." On June 13, 1930, Senate Bill 4170 resulted in Public Law 352 of the 3rd session, 71st Congress. This law, and the joint recommendation of the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior, authorized President Hoover to issue Proclamation No. 1930 on January 5, 1931.

Smoot's original bill, introduced on April 15, 1930, and House Bill 11698 sponsored by Utah Congressman Don Colton the following day, asked that any or all of unsurveyed Townships 37 and 38 S., R. 4 W. not already included in the park be added to it. This general request was later made precise, and took in the following parcels by virtue of the Presidential Proclamation of January 5, 1931:
Unsurveyed T. 37 S., R. 4 W.

1. S1/2 of Section 2
2. S1/2 of SE1/4 of Section 3
3. S1/2 and NE1/4 of Section 10
4. All of Sections 11, 14, and 15
5. E1/2 and the E1/2 of the SW1/4 of Section 16
6. E1/2 of SE1/4 of Section 20
7. All of Sections 21, 22, and 23
8. W1/2 of Section 27
9. All of Section 28
10. E1/2 and E1/2 of SW1/4 of Section 29
11. S1/2 of Section 31
12. All of Section 32
13. N1/2 of Section 33.

The principal effect of President Hoover's January 5, 1931, Proclamation was to more than double the size of Bryce Canyon from 22.625 sections (14,480 acres) to 47.75 sections (30,560 acres). Southwest expansion along the Paunsaugunt rim allowed the Park Service to take under its protection points of scenic interest as far south as Rainbow Point (Map 6).

On the very day President Hoover issued Proclamation No. 1930, Senator Smoot introduced Senate Bill 5564 to the 3rd session of the 71st Congress. Eight days later Congressman Colton followed with the near-duplicate House Report 16116. Smoot and Colton asked for the removal of Section 30 in T. 37 S., R. 3 W., and Section 25 in unsurveyed T. 37 S., R. 4 W., but the real thrust of their bills was the proposal to add approximately 9.42 sections northeast of the park, as well as a total of 1 section to the far south. These proposed additions promised to entail the National Park Service with no further road building obligations, so high Park Service officials--especially Albright--favored the measure.

Park Service Director Albright explained his position on House Rule 16116 in a letter to the Secretary of the Interior, dated January 17, 1931:

The area covered by this bill is adjoining and contiguous to the Bryce Canyon National Park and comprises approximately 6,360 acres [sic].

Approximately 3,400 acres of this area are within the Powell National Forest and the remaining approximately 2,960 acres are a part of the public domain but were withdrawn by Executive order dated January 5, 1931 for classification and
in aid of legislation. The lands in the bill are not of any great value for grazing purposes and are of greater value for scenic and scientific purposes than for economic development.

This bill also proposes to eliminate 1,280 acres from what are now within the boundaries of the national park and add same to the Powell National Forest. The adjustment of the boundaries of the Bryce Canyon National Park as provided for by the bill is along lines worked out by the superintendent of the Bryce Canyon National Park and the regional forester of the United States Forest Service under agreement between the two services. This adjustment will not change in any way the financial obligation of either service.

I have to recommend that H.R. 16116 . . . be given favorable consideration and enacted into law.

The House Report did become Public Law 675 of the 3rd session, 71st Congress on February 17, 1931. President Hoover used this law as partial authorization for Proclamation No. 1952, dated May 4, 1931. Additions to Bryce Canyon included in the Proclamation are listed below with necessary emendations:

T. 36 S., R. 3 W.

Surveyed

1. S1/2 of SW1/4 of Section 2
2. S1/2 of S1/2 of Section 3
3. SE1/2 of SE1/4 of Section 4
4. E1/2 of Section 8
5. All of Section 9
6. N1/2 of Section 10
7. NW1/4 of Section 11
8. E1/2 of NE1/4 of NW1/4 and E1/2 of NW1/4 of NW1/4 and E1/2 of NW1/4 of NW1/4 and N1/2 of SE1/4 of NW1/4 and S1/2 of NE1/4 of SW1/4 and N1/2 of the S1/2 of SE1/4 of NW1/4 and N1/2 of SE1/4 of SW1/4 of Section 17.
Note: Both the Act of February 17, 1931, and Proclamation of May 4, 1931, erroneously described Section 17. The correct description should read: E1/2 and NE1/4 of NW1/4, etc. This correction was made by Public Law 485 of the 2nd session, 77th Congress on March 7, 1942. Public Law 485 of the 2nd session, 77th Congress, brought to an end the legislative history for Bryce Canyon.

9. S1/2 of S1/2 of Section 19
10. S1/2 of NW1/4 of Section 20.

Unsurveyed

1. S1/2 of Section 10
2. SW1/4 of Section 11
3. W1/2 of Section 14
4. All of Sections 15 and 16
5. W1/2 of W1/2 of E1/2 and NE1/4 of Section 22

Note: Both the Act of February 17, 1931, and Proclamation of May 4, 1931, erroneously described Section 22. The correct description should read: W1/2 and W1/2 of E1/2, etc. This correction was made by Public Law 485 of the 2nd session, 77th Congress on March 7, 1942.

6. N1/2 of NW1/4 of Section 23
7. W1/2 of Section 27
8. N1/2 of NW1/4 of Section 34.

The principal effect of President Hoover's May 4, 1931, Proclamation was to increase Bryce Canyon from 45.75 sections (29,280 acres) to 56.22 sections (35,980 acres). Northeast expansion along the Paunsaugunt rim allowed the Park Service to take under its protection points of scenic interest as far north as Shakespeare Point.

Boundaries

Marian Frost Settlement. Section 2 of the June 7, 1924, Act establishing the Utah National Park Stipulated that: "...nothing herein contained shall affect any valid existing claim, location, or entry under the land laws of the United States, whether for homestead, mineral, right of way, or any other purposes whatsoever, or shall affect the rights of any such claimant, locator, or entryman to the full use and enjoyment of his land."
The full meaning of this provision was not an issue until Marion Frost, a resident of Tropic, directed a complaint to the State Land Board on September 22, 1930. This complaint was soon referred to the General Land Office in Salt Lake City for an answer. In it, Frost explained that "Park Surveyors" had sent him notice to move his house and fence from a 40 acre tract in Section 33, T. 36 S., R. 3 W. This property, Frost contended, was as much his as the patented homestead adjoining it—upon which he claimed settlement since 1917. 239

Frost originally had his house and other improvements located on the SW1/4 of the SW1/4 in Section 34, T. 36 S., R. 3 W., and after patent moved them to the unsurveyed SE1/4 of the SE1/4 of Section—the land in question. "About" September 1928 Frost sold his 120 acre homestead, comprising the W1/2 of the SW1/4 and NE1/4 of the SW1/4 of Section 34, and the 40 acre tract in Section 33 to Jesse L. and Mary L. Jolley of Tropic. At the time of the sale Frost gave the Jolleys a written statement, transferring all rights and interest in the homestead, and promised he would deliver deeds to the unsurveyed land in Section 33 as soon as they were obtainable. 240

If Frost's claim was valid, its effect on the young park would be singularly negative. Naturally, the most far reaching implication involved the cardinal condition imposed for the creation of a National Park at Bryce Canyon by the June 7, 1924, Act: that all land within the park be owned by the Federal Government. If this condition had not been fulfilled, then everything done by the National Park Service since its administrative takeover on September 15, 1928, was illegal.
Secondarily, if the 40-acre tract were removed from the park, it would be left as an isolated, unsurveyed block, with contiguous land to the north and west already having been added to Bryce Canyon (see Map 5).

Responsibility for certifying that the land in question was free of encumbrances lay with the General Land Office, Department of Interior. However, Eli F. Taylor, Registrar of the Land Office in Salt Lake City, had already muddied the water by recognizing Frost's title to the SE1/4 of the SE1/4 of Section 33. This forced the National Park Service to seek a solution from higher authorities. On September 30, 1930, Bryce Canyon/Zion Superintendent Scoyen directed correspondence to Acting National Park Service Director G. A. Moskey, plainly asking for advice. A week later Moskey told Scoyen to wait until the Land Office in Washington, D. C., conducted an investigation and issued a decision. 241

Scoyen was understandably uneasy. On October 8, 1930, he wrote National Park Service Director Albright that:

. . .the General Land Office in Salt Lake advises that they . . .had no way of knowing the existence of this claim, and, on the basis of information presented, there could be doubt as to the validity of Frost's claim. However, in view of the fact he has sold this claim, it will be necessary for him to prove that this transaction was completed before the land was put in the park. If this cannot be done the purchaser will have no claim to the land and Frost's claim will no longer be effective. 242

Given the issue's seriousness the General Land Office in Washington, D. C., moved quickly to resolve it. On November 11, 1930, Acting Assistant Commissioner John McPhaul of the Land Office wrote a stern letter to Registrar Taylor, definitely implying that Taylor was guilty
of hasty judgment in recognizing Frost's claim to the unsurveyed 40 acres in Section 33. Early in January 1931 Assistant Commissioner Thomas C. Havell of the General Land Office reached a final decision, holding that neither Frost nor his successors in interest—the Jolley family—had a valid claim. Havell's decision was immediately approved by John H. Edwards, the Assistant Secretary of the Interior. Edwards' action denied Frost any right of appeal. The case was closed.

Havell's reasoning followed the principle enunciated by Superintendent Scoyen 3 months earlier. Thus, it could be demonstrated that Frost had legally sold the 120 acres in Section 34 to the Jolley family, but the "sale" of 40 acres in Section 33 was another matter. In Havell's words:

> The original act [i.e. June 7, 1924] excepted from its provisions valid existing claims, locations and entries under the land laws "whether for homestead, mineral, right of way, or any other purpose whatsoever." Under the terms of these acts, any valid existing settlement claim within the areas set aside for park purposes is protected from the force and effect of the withdrawal, so long as the claim is properly maintained. Upon the failure of such claim, however, by relinquishment, attempted sale, or otherwise, the withdrawal at once becomes effective and prevents any further appropriation of the land.

> It would seem, therefore, that upon the sale of the said patented land and the attempted sale of the settlement claim by Frost, the withdrawal attached as to the unsurveyed land and prevented any further lawful appropriation thereof; that the settler, Frost, has forfeited whatever right he had to such claim and that the purchaser, Mrs. Mary L. Jolly [sic], has no right thereto which can be successfully asserted against the withdrawal."
Abbreviated Grazing History. Expansion of the park, especially to the southwest, did not merely imply the National Park Service would be saddled with road building responsibilities. There was, as well, another major consideration: the opposition of local stockmen. These men reasoned that if certain areas upon which they grazed animals were absorbed into Bryce Canyon, they were likely to lose rights whose value was calculable. For example, a stockman selling a herd of sheep which had the right to graze on National Forest land was normally paid about $3 extra for each animal covered by the permit. Consequently, if land under a valid Forest Service grazing permit was acquired by the new park, local stockmen expected the National Park Service to either buy out applicable grazing rights or continue to allow grazing in the area.

Grazing was well established at Bryce Canyon, dating back to Mormon settlement of the area in the late 1860s. With the creation of the "East Division" of the Sevier National Forest in 1903, grazing at Bryce Canyon naturally came under Forest Service supervision. The situation continued when the "East Division" was added to the Powell National Forest in 1919. In fact, the Forest Service issued grazing permits at Bryce Canyon until 1929. As an interim measure the National Park Service Director authorized the Forest Service to handle grazing through 1929.

Conditions of leniency ostensibly prevailed during the issuance of Forest Service permits from 1904-29 and in retrospect it can be demonstrated that between 1907-40 total forage in the Bryce Canyon area
In 1936, 6 years after the Park Service began imposing grazing restrictions, grass was still scarce along the Paunsaugunt rim. In 1930 the dead and partly dead stumps of shrubs such as snowberry, willow birch leaf, aspen, and yellow pine were all too evident. Their sad presence was poignant testimony to the story of overgrazing at Bryce Canyon.

In accordance with a memorandum of understanding between the two services, dated December 2, 1927, the Forest Service agreed to relinquish lands of exceptional scenic value to the future national park on condition the National Park Service refrained from imposing immediate or drastic action on local stockmen. At the time, District Forester Rutledge stressed that grazing permittees be given reasonable time and opportunities to locate alternate ranges. Bound by this understanding, and the disinclination to buy away grazing rights, the National Park Service had little room for maneuver. It was, however, the intent of the Park Service to effectively impose those restrictions left at its disposal. The most important of these required that no transfer of grazing rights be made from one permittee to another without the personal approval of the National Park Service Director. The principle here was clear: no sale of stock necessarily carried with it the right to graze the animals at Bryce Canyon.

Between 1928-31 cooperation between the Forest Service and Park Service was absolutely essential. Nearly all of the land covered by proposed additions to the park remained under the Forest Service's protection. A "field agreement" between the two services, dated December 4, 1930, put
into effect the following measures for these lands: (1) no change of existing privileges to the detriment of current permittees; (2) administration of permits and fees by the Forest Service, in accordance with cooperative Forest Service-National Park Service plans; (3) no increase in the number of livestock permitted in areas contiguous to Bryce Canyon; (4) transfer of grazing permits allowed with a 20 percent reduction in each case; and (5) the elimination of grazing as a long-range goal. President Hoover's May 4, 1931, Proclamation was partially reflective of this agreement, stipulating that stockmen had the right to drive their animals across the southwestern addition to the park.

Inter-service cooperation during the years 1931-35 had the effect of eliminating grazing in the north-central area of Bryce Canyon. Encouraged, the Secretary of the Interior asked the National Park Service to study means for the speedy elimination of all grazing. A wide range of possibilities was given careful consideration by park personnel, and, in the end, their recommendation was to continue the December 4, 1930, Forest Service-National Park Service agreement for gradual reduction. In 1939 the Secretary accepted this recommendation, but wanted the National Park Service to cooperate more closely with the Grazing Service to find nearby ranges on which stock then grazing in Bryce Canyon could be easily transferred.

In 1940 the status of grazing at Bryce Canyon was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permittee</th>
<th>No. and Kind of Stock</th>
<th>Time on park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Subsequently, the trend toward gradual reduction continued. In 1944 Johnson sold his sheep and began to raise cattle. Findlay followed suit the following year. In 1946 Pollock sold his sheep, terminating all sheep grazing in Bryce Canyon. Johnson's permit was invalid in 1951. By 1953 the only permittees in the Bryce Canyon area were these:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permittee</th>
<th>No. of Stock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findlay Brothers</td>
<td>288 cattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Fork Cattle Association</td>
<td>484 cattle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This satisfactory trend was brought to a temporary halt in 1956 when the Johnson permit was reinstated. It had been unilaterally terminated by the National Park Service in 1951 because of nonuse. Unfortunately, the Forest Service was not informed, which constituted a breach of the December 2, 1927, Memorandum of Understanding between the two services. Then, between 1951-56 the local Forest Supervisor's office had continued to carry Johnson as a permittee. Although this was a temporary setback to the Bryce Canyon grazing termination program, in the long-run the incident was probably beneficial. It certainly had the effect of making Park Service personnel aware of the fact that a closer working relationship with the Forest Service was indispensable.

Of the two additional permittees, the Findlay Brothers were considered the more difficult problem. Their cattle watered at Riggs Spring on the Lower Podunk, a locale that was inside the park but which furnished very little forage. To get the Findlays to give up their permit inside the
park, Bryce Canyon personnel had to consider piping water from Riggs Spring outside the park. Relations with the other permittee, the East Fork Cattle and Horse Association, were generally good. In 1956 the Association voluntarily agreed to reduce the level of grazing by its animals within the park. Johnson's permit was not reinstated in 1957. He had divided his forest grazing permit among several members of his family. The Forest Service then refused to transfer to another operator that part of his permit which was applicable to park lands. The Findlays and East Fork Cattle Association doggedly maintained their permits through the 1963 grazing season. Both permittees continued to cherish the water supply at Riggs Spring. In order to exclude these cattle, the park scheduled a fencing program for fiscal year 1964. Riggs Spring was understandably given top priority.

Adequate funding during fiscal year 1964 enabled Bryce Canyon to pipe water from Riggs Spring to a trough outside the park's boundary. This part of the boundary was also fenced. Completion of a 13 mile sector of fence along the west boundary eliminated grazing on the East Fork permits. By the end of the calendar year 1964, permit grazing at Bryce Canyon had been eliminated.
Joint Administration with Zion

To furnish a comprehensive administrative history of Bryce Canyon is beyond the intent of this study. It is worth explaining, however, the unique administrative setup imposed on the park from 1929 to 1956, due—for the most part—to geographical condition. Because of its altitude Bryce Canyon was a seasonal park, open but 6 to 8 months of the year. The overwhelming majority of its visitors took advantage of the most clement weather between May 15 and October 15. When the Forest Service tended the monument, visitation in the winter was so slight a snow removal program for existing roads and footpaths was discouraged. The National Park Service expected this trend to continue, making the need for a separate administration in Bryce Canyon all the more difficult to justify.264

Late in the summer of 1927, Assistant Park Service Director Albright outlined to Director Mather his views on the future administration of Bryce Canyon:

I would like to see Zion, Bryce Canyon, and Cedar Breaks all administered as one national park administrative unit even though covering rather widely separated areas. All three areas could easily be administered from Zion Park headquarters. One permanent ranger and possibly one or two temporary men in summer would be all that Bryce Canyon would need. It would never be necessary to establish a superintendent there after the Zion-Mt. Carmel road is completed. It would be as easy then to get from Zion headquarters to Bryce Canyon as it is for us to go from Yellowstone Park headquarters to the Old Faithful geyser region.265
There is no evidence Mather or his immediate successor, Arno B. Cammerer, disagreed with Albright's assessment. On January 12, 1929, all rules and regulations for the government of Zion were made applicable for Bryce Canyon. Bryce Canyon personnel records for fiscal year 1930 show that none of Zion's permanent staff served more than 20 percent of their duty time at Bryce. Three temporaries, including a ranger-naturalist and ranger-checker, were employed at Bryce for 4 months during fiscal year 1930.

A park ranger was hired for 5 months, his name was Maurice Newton Cope. In May 1925 the Utah Parks Company had employed him for $130 per month to assist tourists at the newly opened Bryce Lodge. Since the tourist season wound down around September 1, Cope spent September to May teaching school in Tropic or in other gainful employment. In 1929 he was hired by the Park Service as a seasonal for the months of May to November. Superintendent Scoyen must have been pleased with Cope's versatility. From May 1930 to May 1931 Cope was employed both as a ranger-naturalist and park ranger. During the spring of 1931 he moved his family into the park. Thereafter, until Cope transferred to Zion in 1943, his family stayed with him during the tourist season and returned to Tropic for the school year. Maurice Cope became Bryce Canyon's first permanent park ranger in 1933.

Cope described his early Park Service duties in the following way:

When I went over with the Park Service, I had many things to look after. I helped to lay out all the trails and roads in the canyon and along the rim. We started to hire help to
build trails (Illustration 20) and make ready to build camp
grounds, rest rooms, chop wood and haul it for the campers,
assign the rangers to the checking station, help patrol, look
out for those who might violate the rules, look out for forest
fires and anything else that needed attention. About the last
of September everything would be closed down for the winter.
Each year travel would increase and that would mean more help.
We soon kept another man on duty during the winter so the
roads could be kept open. Each summer about 15 men were hired
to build new trails and maintain the other trails. 275

In 1933 Zion's Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent-Engineer, Park
Naturalist, Chief Ranger, and Chief Clerk served in their respective
positions to administer Zion and Bryce Canyon, as well as the newly
created Cedar Breaks National Monument. Only one park ranger,
Maurice Cope, was permanently assigned to Bryce Canyon. During the 1933
season, Bryce Canyon's seasonal force consisted of one ranger-naturalist
and two ranger-checkers. Laborers and mechanics were hired as needed
from local communities. 276

Local civic pressure for a "separate" Bryce Canyon appears to have first
surfaced late in 1934. On November 10, 1934, a committee of the
"Associated Civic Clubs of Southern Utah" convened at Delta. As a
result of this meeting, correspondence was directed to Bryce Canyon/Zion
Superintendent P. P. Patraw, asking him to explain why Bryce Canyon
continued under the administrative protection of Zion. Toward the end
of the year Patraw answered the committee, giving three primary reasons
for the current situation. First, Patraw carefully pointed out that
while the Federal Government was in the midst of spending enormous sums
for emergency employment relief, it was at the same time attempting to
reduce expenditures for the operation of government agencies.
Administrative appropriations for Bryce Canyon/Zion had, in fact, been pared from $54,300 for fiscal year 1933 to $46,390 for 1934. Second, the Superintendent explained the prevailing governmental trend toward an administrative consolidation of national parks and monuments. In 1934, Zion not only administered Bryce Canyon, but Cedar Breaks and two other monuments. To make this point, it was logical for Patraw to stress the geographic unity of Zion, Bryce Canyon, and Cedar Breaks. By extension, a "greater uniformity of administration" resulted from Zion's central office. Given the limited financial resources available for operating the parks, a pooling of equipment, supplies, and personnel was essential. Finally, Patraw cited the fact that Bryce Canyon was a seasonal park, inoperative for several months of the year.277

Patraw's response fully satisfied the committee. Yet, if spokesmen for the Associated Civic Clubs of Southern Utah concurred that parks in the area were "very capably administered," they were also determined to "advertise and do everything possible to increase the travel into these parks."278 In his letter to the committee, the Superintendent himself recognized that even though operating expenses had declined, there were "more buildings, roads, trails, and other physical improvements to maintain, in the face of rapidly increasing tourist visitation."279

Notwithstanding the numbing grip of the Great Depression, annual tourist travel to Bryce Canyon rose steadily between 1934-41.
Total Visitation to Bryce Canyon, 1929-42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% + or -</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>21,997</td>
<td></td>
<td>First year records were kept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>35,982</td>
<td>+63.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>41,572</td>
<td>+15.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>34,143</td>
<td>-17.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>32,878</td>
<td>-3.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>51,188</td>
<td>+55.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>63,703</td>
<td>+24.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>88,848</td>
<td>+39.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>94,331</td>
<td>+6.17</td>
<td>Rim road completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>101,851</td>
<td>+7.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>101,500</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>103,362</td>
<td>+1.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>124,098</td>
<td>+20.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>35,562</td>
<td>-71.34</td>
<td>First war year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Breakdown of Visitation to Bryce Canyon, 1929-42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Automobiles/Passengers</th>
<th>UPC Stage</th>
<th>UPC % of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>5,232/17,213</td>
<td>4,787</td>
<td>21.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>10,007/32,052</td>
<td>3,930</td>
<td>10.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>11,734/39,263</td>
<td>2,308</td>
<td>5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>10,469/33,152</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>9,450/31,982</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>14,555/49,638</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>18,536/61,008</td>
<td>2,695</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>25,770/85,170</td>
<td>3,678</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>27,625/90,135</td>
<td>4,196</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>29,961/97,589</td>
<td>4,262</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>30,263/96,613</td>
<td>4,882</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>31,549/98,773</td>
<td>4,589</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>38,384/119,171</td>
<td>4,927</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>11,490/34,648</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Union Pacific officials certainly cannot be faulted for failing to predict the Depression, especially its economic effect on their carriage trade. The breakdown of visitation statistics to the park for the 1930s does, however, tend to demonstrate Omaha's original underestimation of tourist travel to Bryce Canyon by private automobile. Utah Parks
Company's share of the total annual traffic was never again to approach what the company acquired during Bryce Canyon's first year of operation. Only the 3 prewar years of 1939 through 1941 approximated the total of Utah Parks Company passengers for 1929.

The visitation figures listed imply that whether the National Park Service liked it or not, it was compelled to increase expenditures for Bryce Canyon's physical plant. If roads are considered part of this physical plant, increased visitation by private automobile accelerated the need to construct the rim road. (See Park Roads section.) This and subsequent extensions in the park were wider and more expensive than earlier park roads, and were required to feature a judicious sprinkling of attractive view points, in keeping with the demands of a modern motoring public. New roads, of course, meant broader responsibilities for the posting of an adequate number of signs, and snow removal in the winter.

Bryce Canyon's campground was clearly no more than adequate by 1927 (see Forest Service Administration). By the early 1930s, the increasing volume of automobile traffic made it clear to park personnel that camping facilities needed to be expanded. New campgrounds, and the expansion of the original campgrounds, entailed new comfort stations, waterlines and sewerlines, and a more modern refuse disposal system. Trails, as well as roads and campground, had to keep pace with visitor traffic. Their proliferation and maintenance naturally required additional operating revenues.
During the period 1930-41, the number of permanent Park Service personnel at Bryce Canyon was "augmented" from 0 to 2. As noted, Maurice Cope's park ranger position was finalized in 1933. He was not joined by another permanent ranger until an authorization for fiscal year 1941. In that year much of both rangers' time was spent collecting automobile entrance fees the year-round. Visitations for 1941 was three and one-half times what it had been in 1930, with nearly four times as many automobiles. On the eve of World War II, park personnel and facilities were undoubtedly strained to meet the challenge. Because of World War II, visitation to Bryce declined precipitously. The Utah Parks Company closed all of its park facilities between September 1942 and May 1946. Visitor entry from 1943 through 1945 was as follows:

**Total Visitation to Bryce Canyon, 1943-45**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% + or -</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>8,075</td>
<td>-340.40</td>
<td>Gas rationed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>9,868</td>
<td>+ 22.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>25,812</td>
<td>+161.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Breakdown of Visitation to Bryce Canyon, 1943-45**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Automobiles/Passengers</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>UPC % of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>2,523/8,057</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>2,850/9,844</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>7,756/25,812</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately 80 percent of park visitation during the war years was composed of: (1) members of the armed forces, (2) local visitors, and (3) defense workers being transferred from one job to another.
comparison to 1944, there was a 296.19 percent increase in visits by members of the armed forces during 1945. Throughout the war maintenance of the park's physical plant was necessarily kept to an absolute minimum by a skeleton staff. Neither additional construction (see, Isolated Construction), nor significant improvements of any kind were even contemplated.

Although World War II offered Bryce Canyon a respite after years of furious expansion, postwar visitation literally overwhelmed facilities considered modern and reasonably capacious in the 1930s. To gauge the reaction of park personnel to the new state of affairs, the following excerpt from Bryce Canyon's June 1946 report is appropriate:

Travel continues to increase and to tax our facilities. The increased use of trailers in this area is significant and instead of being a fad as was prophesied a few years ago, it is apparent that they are becoming a permanent piece of traveling equipment which will call eventually for revamping our campground accommodations to include sewage [i.e. for each camp site], electrical and water connections.

During June 1946 alone 23,870 persons visited Bryce Canyon. Only 639 (2.7 percent) of these arrived by Utah Parks Company buses. Bryce Canyon's monthly report for September 1946 flatly stated that "... travel this season has broken all previous records." By how much is evident in the September 1946 report:

There were 39,246 cars entered [sic] the Park this year as compared with 7,756 cars last year, and 129,134 people as compared with 25,812. This is an increase of over 400%.

It is a fairer measure of Bryce Canyon's postwar visitation statistics to compare them to the last prewar years of 1940-41.
Total Visitation to Bryce Canyon, Prewar and Postwar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Visitation</th>
<th>% + or -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>103,362</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>124,098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>129,134</td>
<td>+ 4.06 (1941)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>159,043</td>
<td>+23.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>175,298</td>
<td>+10.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>192,097</td>
<td>+ 9.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Breakdown of Visitation to Bryce Canyon, 1946-49

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Automobiles/Passengers</th>
<th>UPC Stage</th>
<th>UPC % of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>39,246/125,262</td>
<td>3,872</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>48,492/152,262</td>
<td>6,132</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>51,752/169,045</td>
<td>6,253</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>56,055/186,956</td>
<td>5,141</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This crush of visitors and automobiles was accommodated with few complaints, even though the park's physical plant had, with few exceptions, not changed since 1941.\textsuperscript{291} By June 1947, however, parking in the lodge area had become a "distinct problem."\textsuperscript{292}

Bryce Canyon's administrative headaches in the early and mid-1950s were aggravated by the continued combination of: upward spiraling tourism, an outmoded physical plant, and an insufficient number of permanent personnel, visitation statistics for these years were:
Total Visitation to Bryce Canyon, 1950-56

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% + or -</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>209,397</td>
<td>+12.00(1949)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>223,822</td>
<td>+ 6.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>225,880</td>
<td>+ 0.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>242,820</td>
<td>+ 7.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>238,157</td>
<td>- 1.92</td>
<td>Separate fee system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>254,162</td>
<td>+ 6.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>257,570</td>
<td>+ 1.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Breakdown of Visitation to Bryce Canyon, 1950-56

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Automobiles/Passengers</th>
<th>UPC Stage</th>
<th>UPC % of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>63,301/204,122</td>
<td>5,275</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>66,041/219,869</td>
<td>3,953</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>66,564/220,643</td>
<td>5,237</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>75,586/237,037</td>
<td>5,783</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>72,331/231,380 293</td>
<td>6,747</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>unrecorded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>73,825/unrecorded 294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The visitation total for 1954 is somewhat misleading. During June 1954 the park's entrance station was not manned as many hours as in previous years, due to a lack of seasonal rangers. For all practical purposes visitation between 1950-56 increased each year. There were 23 percent more visitors in 1956 than 6 years earlier. With the exception of a new sewer system, completed in the fall of 1953, no additions had been made to the park's physical plant since 1947-48. In fact, some of the older buildings such as the Sunset Point shelter were demolished because of their dilapidated condition.

By the tourist season of 1955 Bryce Canyon's multiple needs were really a microcosm of the needs afflicting all Park Service facilities in the
Intermountain Region. In the summer of that year a campaign was begun by the Salt Lake "Tribune" to make its readers aware of deplorable conditions prevalent in national parks and monuments within Utah. On July 30, 1955, "Tribune" staff writer Don Howard devoted the second article in the series to Bryce Canyon. The park's Assistant Superintendent Tom Kennedy had told Howard that:

...the park should provide more parking space, more scenic viewpoints, more miles of trails and roads, more campgrounds, better museum, information and interpretive services...

Kennedy's message to Howard was difficult to misinterpret. Bryce Canyon had been backward and short of funds since the war. Over the years, joint administration with Zion had done little to improve matters. After the war it probably worsened them. There is no questioning that in the mid-1950s park personnel were demoralized. Bryce Canyon, like the vast majority of its sister parks, was adrift.

Separate Administration for Bryce Canyon

Had it not been for the implementation of National Park Service Director Conrad L. Wirth's "MISSION 66" program at the beginning of fiscal year 1957, Bryce Canyon would likely have indefinitely remained an administrative dependent of Zion. MISSION 66, an ambitious campaign to bring Park Service facilities throughout the country "up to par" by the Service's golden anniversary in 1966, evolved in three stages. Director Wirth initially requested that all Park Service facilities notify him as to what would be required to bring each up to the standards necessary for servicing mushrooming visitor traffic. Based on
feedback from the parks, 12 facilities were chosen for pilot studies. One of these was Chaco Canyon, administered by Glen T. Bean. Data collected from the pilot studies resulted in a MISSION 66 prospectus—used as the key document to update the entire National Park Service system. 300

In November 1955 Glen Bean provisionally accepted the Superintendency of Bryce Canyon, contingent on its administrative separation from Zion. Bean gave the following reasons for the split: (1) increased visitation; (2) the need for massive physical development, to be implemented by MISSION 66; (3) lack of attention to the park during winter months, especially with respect to roads and buildings; and (4) renewed local pressure for a "separate" Bryce Canyon, supported by a petition. 301 During August 1956 Director Wirth visited the park and helped to revise the current Master Plan. 302 The revised plan was finalized in January 1957. 303 This document opened the door to the modernization of Bryce Canyon's badly dated physical plant. The administrative split from Zion was made effective on July 1, 1956. Staff members added to carry the simultaneous responsibilities of administrative independence and implementation of the MISSION 66 program included a chief park ranger, chief park naturalist, park ranger, and the conversion of a clerk position to that of administrative assistant. 304 After almost 28 years of operation, Bryce Canyon was finally on its own.
OPERATIONS OF THE CONCESSIONER

Contracts

The contract for concession rights at Bryce Canyon was concluded on September 15, 1928, between the Department of Interior and the Utah Parks Company acting on behalf of Omaha. Since the railroad's land in Section 36 had been deeded to the Federal government to promote the Zion-Mt. Carmel road, the Utah Parks Company asked for and received a 20-year lease on all of the deeded parcels. This lease went into effect on December 31, 1928, and would thus not expire until January 1, 1949. Provisions were written into the September 15, 1928, contract, so that if the Utah Parks Company fulfilled the terms of its lease, an additional 20-year lease would follow. Union Pacific's subsidiary was guaranteed an annual 6 percent profit on its investments in the park. If the company did not receive its allowed profit in any given year such profit was cumulative. That is, the deficiency (without interest) would be added to the 6 percent priority of the following year or years until it was liquidated. Any profits in excess of the 6 percent were to be split with the government. If the profit split was chosen, the government was to receive 22-1/2 percent, the company 72-1/2 percent. If profits in excess of 6 percent were invested in park improvements, only 72-1/2 percent of such excess was allowable to the Utah Parks Company.
On behalf of Union Pacific, the Utah Parks Company retained ownership of Bryce Lodge, the cabins and other structures erected at the railroad's expense. Concessioner privileges paralleled those granted the Utah Parks Company at Zion, by virtue of the June 9, 1923, contract (see the section on Absence of Contractual Agreements). Basically, these included the right to provide accommodations and food to the general public, as long as charges for these services were reasonable and had been subjected to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Transportation and livery concessions at Bryce were an extension of those already granted the Utah Parks Company at Zion and the North Rim. Article II of the September 15, 1928, contract stipulated that if the Park Service took over operation of the public campground, the Utah Parks Company would furnish a "reasonable amount of water" to the government. It was understood that the government would, "at its own expense connect, furnish and install . . . additional pipelines" necessary for its activities. In later years this agreement was to cause problems for both parties.

How well did the concessioner fulfill its obligations? Fortunately, a detailed report filed in May 1935 by W. B. Burt, special agent for the Department of Interior's Division of Investigations, sheds light on the issue. Burt conducted his investigation at Bryce early in the spring of 1935. His basic conclusions summarized the quality of the Utah Parks Company during the early 1930s.
Burt assessed rates for lodging at Bryce Canyon as reasonable, "considering the seasonal operation." Premises were described as of "attractive appearance" with "adequate fire protection." Burt lauded the food: "Meals of excellent quality and sufficient to appease the most vigorous appetite are served." Then, as now, Ruby's Inn, which is just outside the park's northern boundary, offered the nearest competition to the Utah Parks Company facilities. In the special agent's opinion, the rooms at Ruby's did not compare with those at Bryce Canyon. As for food, Burt said:

I had lunch at the inn. It was not as good or as well served as the meals at Zion cafeteria and was more expensive. Bryce Canyon cafeteria is no doubt as good as the one at Zion.

Burt's complex assessment of the company's transportation service was generally favorable. He did point out that the fleet of buses and touring cars was obsolete, but "in excellent condition and comfortable." All vehicles had been painted and repaired for the coming 1935 tourist season. The Utah Parks Company had reduced rates since 1932, in keeping with the country's gloomy economic climate. Visitors to Bryce Canyon could conveniently take their automobiles to the company's garage for minor repairs, parts, washing and greasing, or a battery charge.

During the first few years of Bryce Canyon's operation, then, the Utah Parks Company was fulfilling its concessioner obligations in accordance with the contract of September 15, 1928. Despite difficult operating conditions, some of its services were outstanding. This is all the more surprising when the company's huge operating losses for the period are
taken into account. Utah Parks Company's annual reports showed losses for the southern Utah loop totaling $267,212.77 in 1932 and $160,396.12 in 1933. For the 8 months ending on August 31, 1934, profits at North Rim and Bryce Canyon totaled $6,299.16, but all other facilities showed losses.\footnote{316} The Utah Parks Company claimed it had suffered heavy deficits ever since its incorporation. Available figures do not contradict this, but as Burt logically observed, the company was probably claiming "unduly heavy depreciation charges."ootnote{315}

The Middle Years

Given Bryce's harsh climate, the lengthy period of inactivity imposed by the war took its toll on the Utah Parks Company's facilities. Late in the spring of 1945 the Utah Parks Company's maintenance staff was asked to estimate how much money was needed to reopen the southern Utah parks. On July 18, 1945, Omaha received the total figure, with breakdowns for each park. Exclusive of transportation the total was $325,849\footnote{316} with approximately a third—$107,751—earmarked for Bryce Canyon.\footnote{317} This was, of course, discouraging news for the Utah Parks Company and its corporate parent in Omaha, and prompted speculation that the Union Pacific would attempt to completely sellout its interests in Zion, the North Rim, Cedar Breaks, and Bryce Canyon.\footnote{318}

W. P. Rogers, who then managed the Utah Parks Company, vigorously opposed a sellout. On May 21, 1945, he directed detailed correspondence to Omaha, whose sole purpose was to dissuade the railroad from
implementing the idea to liquidate the Utah Parks Company. Rogers believed the Utah Parks Company would "undoubtedly pay good dividends in the future." It was Rogers' contention that, discounting depreciation charges, the Utah Parks Company had at no time lost money during the 1930s. It only suffered real deficits when forced to close its doors during the war. Rogers supported his case with figures:

During the depression years 1929 to 1935 our losses including depreciation averaged $186,217.39 per year.

When business revived during the years 1936 to 1942, inclusive, our losses decreased to a yearly average of $23,905.02 including depreciation.

During the war period 1942 to 1944 inclusive the loss yearly increased to $189,467.39 per year including depreciation.

In other words, if the Union Pacific's highest total investment in the Utah Parks Company is taken into account, between 1929-44 profit exclusive of depreciation was 11.2 percent.

**Utah Parks Company Financial Recap, 1929-44**

| Total investment:          | $3,404,272.92 |
| Total loss in operations:  | 1,960,446.13  |
| Depreciation charges, 1929-44 inclusive: | 2,344,721.49 |
| Profit, exclusive of depreciation: | 384,275.36 |

A return of 11.2 percent on the original investment was good, if one takes into account the period spanned the Depression and World War II. Rogers, then had every reason to believe that in the coming decade of postwar prosperity, annual profits would easily exceed those for the previous peak year of 1941. Following this line of reasoning, it made no sense to sell a company if the profits it earned over a relatively short period of time equaled or exceeded the sale price. There was also the issue of corporate prestige to consider. The Union Pacific was the
only railroad in the world serving three national parks (four including Yellowstone), a national monument and three national forests. Rogers conceded that Omaha had "probably" made an "unwise move" in the original Utah Parks Company project, but in his opinion the worst had been weathered, and it was incumbent on the progressive leadership of the railroad to capitalize on the future.

Rogers also wanted the Utah Parks Company to stay in the public transportation business. He again played on the profit motive, and furnished the following statistics for the last 5 years of the Utah Parks Company travel operation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Profit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>$151,378.97</td>
<td>$60,020.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>$145,618.79</td>
<td>$66,515.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>$178,087.38</td>
<td>$77,772.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>$172,754.06</td>
<td>$71,981.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>$171,929.84</td>
<td>$65,627.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The annual profits Rogers gave had been arrived at after every item of expense, such as depreciation, taxes, licenses, labor, and insurance had been charged against revenue. These figures were promising, but the Utah Parks Company could go back into the transportation business only after spending an estimated $206,900 as a capital investment to update its motor fleet with lighter, more economical buses.

Rogers was an intelligent man. But he, like the promoters of the Utah Parks Company in the early 1920's, failed to realize the ominous character of private automobile traffic into the parks—in particular,
its long-term implications for the future of a concessioner operation like the Utah Parks Company. Americans vacationed on wheels, and increasingly preferred them to be attached to the family car, rather than a train or concessioner’s bus. Statistically, it has been demonstrated that after 1929 the Utah Parks Company’s carriage trade never captured a significant chunk of tourism to the Utah park loop. After World War II the carriage trade would prove to be out-of-date. Rogers also seems to have conveniently ignored that during the first 20 years of its operation, Utah Parks Company depreciation allowances constituted an attractive financial safety valve for the Union Pacific. Yet, these would be largely written off by the end of 1948. After 1948 it would make little sense for the railroad to keep sustaining an unprofitable subsidiary.

The Road to Liquidation

Utah Parks Company Manager W. P. Rogers correctly anticipated the postwar boom, and its favorable effect on the company’s business. Available evidence from Bryce Canyon’s Monthly Reports indicates the lodge area served maximum crowds during the 1947 tourist season. In June 1949 the lodge area continued to operate at full capacity. These were good business years for the entire loop. In fact, the Utah Parks Company reduced the sum of its total losses since incorporating in 1923 from $1,960,446.13 through 1944 to $1,066,773.62 through the 1948 season. In 1947-48 Utah Parks Company’s transportation division brought in more than 6,000 people each year to Bryce Canyon (see the
section on Joint Administration With Zion)—enough traffic to at least warrant optimism. In 1948, when it came time to renew the company's September 15, 1928, contract for an additional 20 years, Utah Parks Company officers were eager to do so.

The first diminishing blow to the company's euphoric vision of postwar prosperity came in the summer of 1949. At the time the subcommittee of the House Public Lands Committee had convened in Washington, D. C., to examine the Park Service's policy toward park concessioners. The subcommittee was especially interested in adherence by park concessioners to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. One of its provisions ordered that within 8 years of the act's passage, the maximum work week be established at 40 hours, with additional compensation for overtime. Following the war, national park concessioners registered protests with the government. These had the effect of postponing the application of Fair Labor regulations to January 1, 1949. The Utah Parks Company, however, did not implement the regulations in its 1949 employee payment schedule and the subcommittee wanted to know why.

During the third week of July 1949 W. R. Rouse, "Assistant Western General Counsel" for the Union Pacific System, defended the Utah Parks Company's policy before the subcommittee. Rouse pointed out that in recent hearings held in San Francisco and Denver between the Secretary of the Interior and park concessioners, no evidence was introduced showing the need for regulations. Furthermore, no showing was made "that the working conditions of the concessioners' employes [sic] in the
national parks were in any way substandard or oppressive." Rouse quoted a statement by F. E. Warner, who was then W. P. Rogers' principal assistant. Warner had said that:

The imposition of the 40-hour week will result in a burden to the Utah Parks Company by way of added expense which the present schedule of rates charged will not permit and additional revenue will be required to absorb the additional expense.

Figures cited by Rouse showed that implementing the 40 hour work week throughout the Utah Parks Company loop would result in additional expenditures of $15,251.15 per month, or $59,143.08 for an operating season. The cost for additional dormitory facilities throughout the loop was calculated by Warner at $195,900. Figures given to the subcommittee by Rouse probably made the situation look worse than it really was. It is important to recognize, however, that for the first time a serious difference of opinion had surfaced between the National Park Service and the Utah Parks Company. While the implementation of time-and-a-half for overtime did not begin until January 1, 1952, and did not poison relations between the two parties, Omaha began to realize that further major investments in the Utah Parks Company might not be worth the risk.

H. H. Hoss, Attorney for the Western Conference of National Park Concessioners, testified before the subcommittee shortly after Rouse. Hoss carefully explained how a park hotel operator had to provide "a high capacity in order to meet peak needs," even though in the off-season levels of occupancy were low or nonexistent. Hoss strenuously objected to the annual 6 percent limitation on investments
by concessioners. His clients did not feel this was a fair return, given the risks involved. It is a fact that any profit deficiency added to the 6 percent priority of the following year or years derived no interest. Despite the current boom, postwar inflation did not make this an attractive proposition for a large-scale concessioner.

Between 1950-54 Utah Parks Company's passengers taken into Bryce Canyon by stage accounted for an average of 2.36 percent of the park's annual visitation—down from the 3.28 percent established in the postwar years 1946-49. In terms of actual volume, the years 1950-54 showed an average of 5,399 passengers—only 50 above the 1946-49 average. These were discouraging figures, since after the war the company had spent well over $500,000 to update its park facilities and transportation service. This inactivity did not justify such expenditures, and when coupled with markedly increased postwar labor costs, certainly inclined the railroad to drag its heels on the Utah Parks Company's further modernization.

After 1956, less evidence is available for gauging the state of the Utah Parks Company's operations in Bryce Canyon, but the park's monthly report for June 1957 did have this to say:

Business for the concessioner has been below that for June of last year even though park travel has increased. Bus tours have decreased considerably.

In his July 30, 1955, article on the park Don Howard of the Salt Lake "Tribune" had reported:

As in other operations of the Utah Parks Co., Union Pacific's subsidiary, facilities at Bryce have not been allowed to deteriorate as have those in Yellowstone. They are simply inadequate . . . .
By the late 1950s three major problems afflicted the Utah Parks Company's operation: (1) expensive labor, (2) obsolescence of facilities and transportation service, and (3) declining passenger traffic. The Union Pacific professed passenger traffic to be the most pressing of the three and acted decisively to cut its losses. After April 24, 1960, Union Pacific's summer season train, the "309," ceased operating between Lund and Cedar City. In lieu of the rail service, Omaha ran buses into Cedar City from Salt Lake City and Las Vegas.

Continuation of Utah Parks Company's concessioner and transportation service for another decade was in no small measure due to the competence of Tom E. Murray. On July 12, 1960, Murray replaced Fred Warner as Utah Parks Company's General Manager—a position Murray held until the company's dissolution in 1972. As the Utah Parks Company's facilities required increased maintenance, Murray's managerial insight was severely tested during the 1960s. In December 1969 it became common knowledge that the Union Pacific wanted out of the park concessioner business—publicity that did little to make Murray's last 3 years with the Utah Parks Company any easier.

Throughout the 1960s, Murray's most difficult problem with Bryce Canyon was the water supply. The September 15, 1928, and October 1948 contracts between the Department of Interior and Utah Parks Company expressly required the latter to furnish the government a "reasonable amount of water" (see Contracts). By July 1964 culinary water consumption was 75,000 gallons per day by Utah Parks Company facilities,
and 29,512 gallons by the National Park Service. This total approached the maximum delivery of the company's pumps. In 1965 all available sources of water, including Trough and Shaker Springs within the park, and shallow wells on East Creek outside it, were needed to satisfy the year's total of 300,311 visitors—a new park record.

The construction of more spacious water storage facilities and the elimination of defective supply lines enabled the Utah Parks Company—with National Park Service cooperation—to bear its contractual burden. National Park Service personnel, however, were becoming nervous. In October 1965 Bryce Canyon's Master Plan recommended that:

The present system of depending on sources of water owned and controlled by the concessioner should be changed at the earliest opportunity. These sources should become government property by gift or sale through negotiation.

The October 1965 Master Plan was critical of the relationship between the concessioner and National Park Service in two additional ways. Utah Parks Company's Bryce facilities were evaluated as "substandard," not meeting "present day expectations." The plan thus called for the gradual elimination of the Utah Parks Company's units. Space made available would be used for "public campground development." Bryce Canyon's October 1965 Master Plan also called the Utah Parks Company's transportation service a "preferential franchise . . . obsolete in present day operations." The plan characterized this service as disadvantageous and inconvenient to park visitors who were "trapped by the existing arrangement."
In retrospect the October 1965 Master Plan appears a callous, narrowminded document. Its authors naively believed in the sacred right of Americans to see their national parks from the comfort of bucket seats and captains chairs. Little thought was given to the future supply of fuel for these numerous vehicles.

The goal is the elimination of overnight accommodations in Bryce Canyon. Outside facilities have indicated an interest in expansion and Panguitch (27 miles distance) is not too far to drive with modern transportation.

It is true the railroad had become interested in the southern Utah parks for its own reasons. Not the least of these was profit. Yet, the Union Pacific's record at Bryce Canyon stands up well under scrutiny. Omaha had contributed enormously toward making Bryce Canyon a great national park. The October 1965 Master Plan might, at least, have recognized this fact.

Despite its superabundance of ill-conceived ideas and offensive tones, the plan did serve a purpose. It made clear and inevitable the imminent dissolution of the long partnership between the railroad and National Park Service. Omaha had already begun its retreat in 1960, and it is the case that throughout the 1960s the Union Pacific continually strove to sell off the Utah Parks Company rather than give it away.

Negotiations for a sale to General Host Corporation did take place in 1969. Late in that year meetings were held in Washington, D. C., between members of the House Interior Committee and Harris Ashton, President of General Host. While in Washington, Ashton also conferred with National Park Service Director George Hartzog. There is some
evidence General Host was not able to convince Pennsylvania Congressman John P. Saylor—a key member of the House Interior Committee—that it could do a good job. In particular, Saylor did not want the corporation to take over another operation until it had cleaned up its backyard in Yellowstone Park. Since 1966 General Host had, in fact, posted a dismal record as the concessioner in Yellowstone. Saylor prevailed. Early in 1970 the proposed General Host buy-out of the Utah Parks Company was cancelled.

Few prospective buyers had General Host’s financial resources, and the next 3 years would show the railroad had lost its last real opportunity to sell the Utah Parks Company. On March 10, 1972, the Union Pacific officially recognized the situation, donating all of the Utah Parks Company’s facilities and equipment to the Park Service. This property included the lodges, cabins, service stations, and curio shop facilities in Zion, Bryce Canyon, the North Rim, and the lodge and cabins located at Cedar Breaks. In addition, the railroad donated a laundry at Kanab, the Utah Parks Company complex at Cedar City, and the entire transportation fleet. In one fell swoop, more than $2,000,000 worth of property was given over to the National Park Service. Park Service Director Hartzog accepted the massive donation with the following statement:

We know that concessioners, like the Service itself, are facing new conditions and new demands. When a concessioner whose role has been so prominent for so long leaves the ranks, it underscores the changes which are taking place.
Under the terms of the donation, the Union Pacific allowed its subsidiary to continue in existence through calendar year 1972. This was principally done to give the Park Service enough time to select a concessioner for the 1973 season. Tom Murray affirms he spent much of his time in the spring and summer of 1972 showing prospective concessioners about the loop. In September 1972, TWA, a subsidiary of Trans World Airlines, was selected. This company is the current concessioner for Zion, Bryce Canyon, and the North Rim. Tom Murray officially stepped down as Manager of the Utah Parks Company on December 18, 1972.

**PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT**

**Park Roads**

**Rim Road.** Beginning in 1930 the National Park Service's long-term development of Bryce Canyon was predicated on the construction of a rim road which would eventually run from the park's northern boundary to its southernmost view at Rainbow Point. As conceived, the project was to comprise four sectors. The first was the entrance road which ran from the northern boundary to the lodge area. As early as 1923 the Forest Service had allotted money for an improved road to Section 36. By 1927 the road conformed to Bureau of Public Roads' standards. The Park Service planned to resurface this sector, but was otherwise satisfied with its general condition.
The second sector, termed 1-A, was surveyed in 1930 and involved approximately 10.40 miles of road. It ran from just north of the lodge area to a point approximately 3.43 miles north of the Garfield-Kane County Line. About 0.86 miles south of the lodge, two major spurs ran off the main line to the east. The shorter of the two spurs, 0.43 miles long, branched to the left and led to Inspiration Point. The other ran east for 1.43 miles then forked. A left branch ran for 0.57 miles to Bryce Point, and a right branch for 0.43 miles to Little Bryce Point. All roads in sector 1-A was to conform to the Highway Standards of 1929. It was to be 18 feet wide, surveyed, graded, and finished with crushed stone.

The contract for sector 1-A was awarded to the Union Construction Company of Ogden, Utah, on June 4, 1931. The Union Construction Company submitted the lowest bid of $135,855.70, which was only $372.20 higher than the estimated furnished by B. J. Finch, 12th District Engineer for the Bureau of Public Roads. The Union Construction Company was to begin the project on June 21, 1931, and was given 300 calendar days to complete it, exclusive of suspended operations by government order. A Bureau of Public Roads change order, dated May 17, 1932, shows that the contractor had completed about 90 percent of the project by that date, even though subjected to a major delay. The surveyed route of 1-A was not satisfactory to the Park Service or railroad, because it came too close to the lodge area. After lengthy deliberations, which forced the Union Construction Company to work around the area, the May 17, 1932, change order altered 1-A so that it ran some distance
"behind" the lodge. This change added $5,872.58 to the cost of sector 1-A. 356 On July 13, 1932, Bryce Canyon/Zion Superintendent Patraw conducted a final inspect of sector 1-A with technical personnel. He reported:

The work provided under the contract as amended has been completed in a satisfactory manner and I recommend acceptance. 357

Sector 1-B1 was the third of the four segments. It ran from the southern end of 1-A to Natural Bridges, a distance of 3.73 miles. The proposed road in 1-B1 had also been surveyed in 1930. Unlike 1-A, however, it was to conform to specifications in preparation for the Highway Standards of 1932. This principally meant the road would be 6 feet wider than sector 1-A. 358

On August 18, 1932, the Union Construction Company also won the contract for 1-B1, submitting a low bid of $56,895.20 359 B. J. Finch and his associates had estimated the job to cost $50,094.20, but accepted the low bid. 360 The Union Construction Company was to begin sector 1-B1 on September 8, 1932, and was given 150 calendar days to complete it, exclusive of suspended operations by government order. 361 Unfavorable weather conditions forced a suspension of operations on December 1, 1932, and construction was not resumed until May 10, 1933. 362 A Bureau of Public Roads Final Inspection Report, dated June 23, 1933, affirms that sector 1-B1 was completed on June 5, 1933. 363 Superintendent Patraw recommended acceptance of the work the following day. 364
Project 1-B2D had a twofold purpose. The first was to grade and base surface the rim road's fourth sector, termed 1-B2, from Natural Bridge to Rainbow Point—a distance of 8.74 miles. Project 1-B2D's second purpose was to reconstruct and base surface the Forest Service's old north entrance road. W. W. Clyde and Company of Springville, Utah, won the contract for 1-B2D with a bid of $115,368.80, and work was begun on October 10, 1933. Inclement weather forced the cessation of operations between November 30, 1933, and April 14, 1934, but by the cessation the north entrance road had been completed. Clyde and Company completed sector 1-B2 on September 21, 1934.

To protect the rim road from the park's northern boundary to the end of sector 1-B1—a distance of 12.54 miles—project 1-AlBI&D proposed a heavy oil surfacing. Progress on it was given in Bryce Canyon's Annual Report for 1935:

At the beginning of this report period [1 July 1934] the sub-grade preparation and tack coat were completed, and oil surfacing placed on about one-third of the total project. Asphalt-mixed gravel surfacing was placed on the balance of the distance, seal coat laid on the entire project, and the contract completed on August 21, 1934.

The contractor for project 1-AlBI&D is unknown but the total cost was $121,517. Section 1-B2's 8.74 miles were similarly treated with a bituminous surfacing. Reynolds-Ely Construction Company of Springville, Utah, was low bidder for this project with $58,475, which was $6,930 above the Bureau of Public Roads' estimate. Reynolds-Ely began work on July 3, 1935, and completed the project "at the close of September" 1935.
Summary: Rim Road

Sector one: 1. Termen north entrance road  
2. Length, 1.8 miles from park's northern boundary  
3. By 1927 met standards of Bureau of Public Roads  
4. Base surfaced in the fall of 1933 by W. W. Clyde and Company  
5. Oil surfaced in the summer of 1934 by unknown contractor.

Sector two: 1. Termen sector 1-A  
2. Length, 10.4 miles from southern end of north entrance road to 3.43 miles north of Garfield-Kane County line  
3. 7 miles belonged to rim road proper; remaining 3.4 miles consisted of spurs to Inspiration Point and another to Bryce and Little Bryce Points  
4. Completed June 1933 by Union Construction Company  
5. 1-A resurfaced in summer of 1934 by unknown contractor.

Sector three: 1. Termen sector 1-B1  
2. Length, 3.73 miles from 3.43 miles north of Garfield-Kane County line to Natural Bridge  
3. Completed June 1933 by Union Construction Company  
4. 1-B1 resurfaced in summer of 1934 by unknown contractor.

Sector four: 1. Termen sector 1-B2  
2. Length 8.74 miles from Natural Bridge to Rainbow Point  
3. Completed September 1934 by W. W. Clyde and Company  

By-pass Road - One result of National Park Service Director Wirth's visit to Bryce Canyon in August 1956 was his approval for inclusion in the park's Master Plan of a by-pass road to divert excess traffic away from the lodge area. Shortly afterward, the by-pass road was slated as
one of seven major projects for Bryce Canyon—all to be completed with MISSION 66 funds.\textsuperscript{372} Although only 1.25 miles in length, the by-pass was probably the most significant addition to the park's road system since completion of rim road's sector 1-82 to Rainbow Point late in 1934. On May 2, 1957, the first allotment of $31,700 was made available for the by-pass.\textsuperscript{373} Including funds anticipated for fiscal year 1958, the project was scheduled for completion in September 1958.\textsuperscript{374}

Survey work, tentative field alignment, and project organization were accomplished by May 1957. Zion's gravel crusher was transferred to Bryce Canyon, and was put to work stockpiling gravel on May 6, 1957.\textsuperscript{375} Later in the month, however, progress was obstructed. There were two problems. One stemmed from the desire of advisory personnel to realign the by-pass road. The other resulted from difficulties in purchasing suitable culverts. It appears the alignment problem between Washington, Region III, in Santa Fe and the park was ironed out in June 1957.\textsuperscript{376} The park's monthly report for June suggested the culverts were expected to arrive during the third week of July. Presumably they did. On July 29, 1957, the second allotment of $26,000 assured completion of the by-pass. By the end of July the roadway was finished except for an oil mat and seal coat.\textsuperscript{377} Then rainy weather held up application of the oil mat until early September.\textsuperscript{378} Execution of the seal coat and final landscaping actually did not terminate the project until September 1958.\textsuperscript{379}
Rapid Construction Phase

Generous appropriations to the Park Service by the Hoover Administration enabled the completion of some basic park facilities in Bryce Canyon between 1929-32. The location of these and other buildings in the rapid construction phase is included in the Architectural Data Section of this study. Because of delays in receiving plans, Park Service construction in Bryce Canyon did not begin until late in the working season of 1929. Rush work, supervised by the National Park Service Branch of Plans and Design in San Francisco, then resulted in the construction of a custodian's residence--now referred to as the Old Superintendent's Residence--two comfort stations and a checking station (entrance kiosk) off the north entrance road. By October 1, 1929, all of these buildings had been finished with the exception of the custodian's residence, which was 60 percent complete. It is known that no construction projects were carried over that year, so the custodian's residence must have been completed late in the fall of 1929.

In 1930, plans were laid and work begun on a new utility area. By September 30, 1930, two buildings occupied it. One was a warehouse measuring 64 feet by 30 feet, the other a small two-stall horse barn. President Hoover's final appropriations in 1930-32 resulted in four buildings for Bryce Canyon. During the spring of 1932, a 44 foot by 22 foot dormitory and mess house capable of seating 20 were completed. Two buildings were undertaken in 1932. A three-room
cabin for temporary employees was completed later in the year. A small office building—destined to become the park's first administrative center—was also completed in 1932, except for the laying of floors and painting. 384

Toward the end of Hoover's Administration, formerly generous allotments for National Park Service construction were cut off. The effect this policy had on individual projects is apparent in the construction of Bryce Canyon's office building. An appropriation of $2,000 had been designated for this structure, but 10 percent of this sum was allotted to the San Francisco Field Office, and another 10 percent was sliced off as an "Economy Act." This, of course, left only $1,600 for actual construction. Superintendent Patraw saw no way the original building plans could be implemented with available funds, so recommended the structure be scaled down and simplified:

... the plans will have to be changed to provide a single room only. This will be satisfactory if designs can be made for a building of log, to contain the main information lobby, and adapted for later addition of other rooms. 385

Patraw had toyed with the idea of allowing the allotment to revert, but Acting National Park Service Director Demaray made clear to him in August 1932 that future construction funds would be "awfully hard to get." On September 12, 1932, Patraw submitted a revised plan to the Director, which reduced construction costs to $1,701. Patraw felt that even more money could be saved when laying the foundation, so as to complete the office building within the $1,600 allotment. 386 Acting Director Demaray approved the revised plan on September 16, 1932. 387
During the early 1930s, only one significant building was erected by the Utah Parks Company. It was a cafeteria begun in the spring of 1932. This structure was designated the central unit in the Utah Parks Company's "housekeeping camp unit." Available evidence suggests the Utah Parks Company intended to use the cafeteria building as a center of operations once the lodge was closed for the season. It soon became evident the building was too small for this purpose. In April 1937 the company submitted plans to the Park Service for extending and altering it. These were approved with minor recommendations by the Washington Office on April 30, 1937. Remodeling work on the cafeteria began late in September 1937, and was finished during November of that year.

Title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA) generated the Public Works Administration (PWA). This was one of President Roosevelt's earliest and most lavishly funded "pump priming" agencies, whose purpose was to increase national employment by a quick infusion of money to private construction agencies. Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes was chosen to head the PWA from its inception in June 1933, so the Park Service stood to gain distinct advantages. Particularly—since advanced planning procedures in the Park Service dated from 1925. By March 1933 this advanced planning had been refined into 6-year programs—called "master plans"—for nearly all of the national parks and monuments.
Ickes was impatient to get the ball rolling on a wide variety of projects. When the Public Works Administration requested work drawings from the Park Service for potential construction projects, many preliminary sketches and building plans were available. The first Public Works Administration allotments to the National Park Service were made on July 21, 1933, with the Western Division receiving 106 federally funded projects. Bryce Canyon was awarded four of these, which included: (1) two employees cabins—Funded Project 8; (2) an extension to the office building—Funded Project 9; (3) a comfort station—Funded Project 11; and (4) an equipment shed—Funded Project 14. 395

Funded Project 8's allotment consisted of $2,700. 396 This sum was expected to cover total costs for wood frame buildings with shingle roofs, exterior wood siding, interior plaster board, and wood floors. Each cabin was to contain a bedroom, kitchen, and bath. Material for the cabins' construction was purchased by the park. In June 1934 a contract was awarded for labor and the additional materials necessary to complete the buildings. Only 10 percent of the construction was finished by June 30, 1934, 397 but in August of that year 398 both buildings had been completed for the sum of $2,698 399.

The purpose of Funded Project 9 was to move administrative activities out of the park's museum. 400 This project was funded for $1,800. 401 The office building's extension was to have a log exterior. Specifications included a shingle
roof, interior plaster board, wood floor, and lavatory. Building materials were purchased by the government. Bids had been solicited from local contractors for labor but there were no takers. Actual construction of the extension began by force account in October 1934. By June 1935, Funded Project 9's allotment had been expended without completing the interior. Despite this situation, the new wing was considered immediately usable.

Funded Project 11's allotment was also funded for $1,800. Construction materials for this eight-unit comfort station were purchased by the government and a contract easily secured for requisite labor. The building was completed on October 31, 1934, for the sum of $1,824.

Funded Project 14's allotment consisted of $2,160. The building, which was basically a three-stall shed, was completed in the fall of 1933, with the exception of a concrete floor. This was laid and the building terminated in September 1934. Final construction costs amounted to $2,135.

Except for the four projects discussed above, Bryce Canyon received no further Public Works Administration building funds. Fortunately, though, another of F. D. Roosevelt's alphabet agencies came along to increase the number of government buildings at Bryce Canyon. This was the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), whose role in the history of Bryce Canyon is given due attention in the section entitled "The
Civilian Conservation Corps in Bryce Canyon." During 1935 the park's first entrance station was razed and replaced with one situated near the north entrance road. This "checking station" was the first structure begun and completed by Bryce Canyon's CCC camp. Two additional building projects were begun by the CCC that year. One required the relocation of a comfort station from the old Forest Service campground to Sunset Point. Construction of a three-room employee's cabin was also started. Both of these projects were completed in 1937. As Bryce Canyon's CCC camp gained experience in rustic construction techniques, more sophisticated projects were attempted. The CCC's outstanding achievement in the park was a combination museum-overlook at Rainbow Point. This tasteful structure was finished in the summer of 1940.  

The Utah Parks Company's final construction project from start to finish was a male dormitory, put up in 1937. Significant alterations to 20 standard cabins in the lodge area took place in the spring of 1940. These consisted of bathroom additions, which provided 40 rooms with showers and toilets. Subsequently, these cabins proved extremely popular, and were usually the first standard cabins taken by overnight guests.

F. D. Roosevelt outlined the second phase of his "New Deal" in a message to Congress on January 4, 1935. The very first measure of the "Second New Deal" was the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act (ERA), passed on April 8, 1935. It was the ERA which signalized the Federal government's
retreat from direct relief to the unemployed. The primary purpose of the ERA was to establish a large-scale Federal work program for the skilled jobless. To implement the program, the Works Progress Administration (WPA) was created. In 1939 the Works Progress Administration became the Works Projects Administration. 417

In April 1938 Bryce Canyon's first ERA program was allotted $5,519 for 9,200 man-hours (60 cents per hour). A newly organized ERA crew then "took over from the CCC the task of forest insect control work on May 9 (1938) and completed the job in June." The remainder of the allotment was used to construct a garbage pit and to excavate sewage filtration trenches. In July 1938 another ERA allotment was granted the park: $5,200 for 92 man-months of employment. This money was spent for trail improvement, construction of campground tables, signs, museum equipment, and for remodeling the mess hall into a residence. 418 Available evidence indicates the ERA program was renewed again in April 419 and July 1939. 420

Beginning with the July 1939 allotment of $18,358 the ERA undertook the construction of a building. This was a rangers dormitory, built with lumber salvaged from the old dormitory, which was razed. Weather permitted work on the rangers dormitory until December 28, 1939. Construction was resumed on March 18, 1940. The July 1939 allotment also permitted the construction of 5 miles of boundary fence, the planting of trees and shrubs, the obliteration of old roads, insect control on the "Black Hills beetle" infestation in ponderosa pine, and a
number of miscellaneous landscaping jobs. Normally, the program
employed an average of 32 men per month. The final Emergency Relief
Appropriation Act funds received by the park were in February 1941.
This money was used to improve the "Tropic sector of the park
highway," and to cut logs on Forest Service land. An inventory of
all ERA jobs completed in Bryce Canyon is included in Appendix A of this
study.

The Civilian Conservation Corps in Bryce Canyon. Only 5 days after his
inaugural address, President Roosevelt outlined rudimentary plans to
employ a 250,000-man task force on a wide variety of conservation and
public works projects. These loose ideas soon united and gave birth
to a mammoth federal agency: the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC). On
March 21, 1933, Roosevelt explained the agency's objective was primarily
unemployment relief. The CCC was to be rapidly mobilized and put to
work on elementary tasks in forestry, land reclamation, flood control,
and miscellaneous public works. Four federal agencies were expected to
mold the CCC into an effective organization.

Labor was allotted the task of choosing candidates for the CCC. The War
Department received what was probably the most far-reaching
responsibility—that of administration. Toward this end, the country
was organized into nine corps areas. These in turn were broken down
into districts, each of which usually took in one or more states.
District CCC officers were conceived as intermediate clearinghouses for
the dissemination of information between corps headquarters and
individual CCC camps. It was, of course, the individual camp which constituted the key organizational unit of the CCC. Normally, each camp was to have as its Commanding Officer (CO), a Captain or First Lieutenant in the regular Army or Army Reserve. Less senior officers and enrollee leaders were to assist the CO in camp administration.\(^{427}\)

The Departments of Agriculture and Interior were assigned the use of CCC labor.\(^{428}\) Within Agriculture, the Forest Service was seen as the most logical choice for this task. Similarly, within the Interior the National Park Service stood out. Given the labor requirements of each bureau, the field organization of Forest Service and Park Service CCC camps evolved in different ways. As a rule, fewer advisory personnel with technical backgrounds were attached to Forest Service camps. Each CCC camp working within and National Park Service facility usually had an experienced engineer, technical forester, technical landscape architect, and a number of history and wildlife technicians. All advisory personnel took their cues from a project superintendent. Forest Service and National Park Service camps were often split up into "stub" or "spike" camps. Each was supervised by an onsite foreman.\(^{429}\)

Establishment, Administration, and Contribution of NP-3. By June 30, 1935, there were no fewer than 2,110 CCC camps throughout the country--19 of which were located in Utah.\(^{430}\) Bryce Canyon was placed in the nine corps areas, headquartered in San Francisco. The park's district CCC office was in Fort Douglas. Bryce Canyon received its CCC camp--designated NP-3--the spring of 1934. Late in April of that year
an advance party from Zion's camp--was sent over to Bryce Canyon to establish a water supply for NP-3. In a report to the Chief Architect of the Park Service, dated May 10, 1934, Resident Landscape Architect Harry Langley described the selection of NP-3's campsite:

I reviewed the campsite with the Army officers in charge and think they have chosen a good location. It is the same place where a road contractor [Union Construction Company] established camp when building section A[1-A] of the Rim Road and is approximately three miles south of headquarters area. Water is supplied from a spring used by the Utah Parks Company years ago and considerable work was necessary on the pipeline due to lack of maintenance since it was abandoned.

The day after Langley's report the main contingent of NP-3, consisting of CCC Company No. 962, moved over from Zion. Within days the campsite sported a frame messhall, recreation building, latrine, and a number of tents to quarter enrollees. Illustration 39 shows NP-3 as it appeared on December 3, 1934. The Army personnel, camp Superintendent and Foreman used to administer NP-2 were brought over from Zion to Bryce Canyon. As a result, "good cooperation and efficiency" among the enrollees of NP-3 characterized the working season of 1934.

During that first year, CCC personnel at camp NP-3 undertook the following projects:

1. Campground development. This entailed improving 3 acres of public campground. Roads and parking spurrs were constructed; grounds were subdivided into individual campsites. A 500 foot walk from the campground to the lecture circle, comfort station, and cafeteria was graveled. Logs were cut for seats and positioned around the campground lecture circle.

2. Sloping of road bands. Much of the 7,500 square yards completed were along section 1-B1 of the rim road. Erosion was thus minimized and the roads' appearance enhanced.
3. Roadside cleanup and improvement. Down timber was cut and removed for 18 miles along the north entrance road and rim road proper.

4. Under-rim fire trail. A horse trail, 18.8 miles in length, was constructed from Bryce Point to Rainbow Point. As part of the 18.8 mile section, a stub trail was put in from the main trail to rim road. The project's purpose was to protect forested areas under the Paunsaugunt rim from fire.

5. Fairyland Trail. An existing trail from Campbell's Canyon, near Boat Mountain, to the head of Fairyland Canyon was improved.

6. East boundary fence, 7.25 miles of fence were constructed from Tropic highway south along the park's east boundary to approximately the center of Section 8 in T. 37 S., R. 3 W.

7. Improvement of Boat Mountain Road. A minor road was constructed for about a mile, from the north entrance road south of the checking station to the rim of Fairyland Canyon.

8. Erosion control, 325 check dams were positioned in gullies. These were constructed of peeled logs salvaged from the rim road right-of-way.

Projects 2, 3, and 7 were completed in 1935, with 5, 6, and 8 presumably finished that year. Project 4 was completed to Rainbow Point in 1935, and the stub trail begun the following year. Campground development (Project 1) was terminated in the spring of 1936. The improved campground was opened to the public on June 1, 1936.

Having completed its first working season at Bryce Canyon, Company 962 moved to Zion on October 29, 1934, and reassumed the CCC designation NP-2. About 25 enrollees were left behind in Bryce Canyon as a stub camp to continue some of the projects enumerated above. Later, these men secured NP-3 for the winter months.

The following May, Company 962 moved from Zion to Bryce Canyon. Assistant Landscape Architect A. M. Doerner had gone over to Bryce
Canyon earlier in the month to prepare projects in advance of the company's arrival.\textsuperscript{437} During the 1935 working season, NP-3's morale was reputedly high,\textsuperscript{438} but the necessity to establish spike camps at Pipe Springs National Monument, and Henrieville, east of Bryce Canyon, reduced camp strength.\textsuperscript{439} By September 1935 there were only 80 odd enrollees at work in Bryce Canyon, compared to 1934's full complement of more than 200. Apparently, in September 1935 many enrollees left NP-3 to "go to school or to accept jobs."\textsuperscript{440} To worsen affairs, Bryce's monthly allotments that year for overhead, maintenance, equipment operation, and the purchase of materials were "drastically curtailed."

Even so, during the 1935 work season three new projects were undertaken: (1) the checking station, (2) the comfort station at Sunset Point, and (3) an employee's cabin. These, the first CCC buildings in Bryce Canyon, are referred to in the section titled "Rapid Construction Phase." Company 962 broke camp on October 28, 1935, and returned to Zion for the winter. Camp NP-3 was reestablished at Bryce Canyon on May 1, 1936.\textsuperscript{441} New work projects included the following:

1. Improvement of service roads to park buildings, museum, and cafeteria.

2. Construction of parking areas at Lodge and White Man's Bench. This project included grading and surfacing.

3. Construction of miscellaneous foot trails.

4. Insect pest control, including the felling and burning of trees.\textsuperscript{442}

Beginning in 1936 insect pest control absorbed much of the CCC's work activity in the park. Trouble was anticipated in July 1936 when it was reported that:
An epidemic of bark beetles appears to be developing in the coniferous trees of the park and adjacent Powell Forest. Further studies of the situation are planned during the coming fall.

Later in the year Entomologist Donald DeLeon supervised CCC crews who felled and burned 1,617 Douglas firs and 890 ponderosa pines. These infected trees were spotted over an area of approximately 10,000 acres. Company 962 moved back to Zion for the winter on October 30, 1936.

Senior Project Superintendent F. R. Rozelle supervised both the Zion and Bryce Canyon CCC camps. Periodically, he or one of his immediate subordinates was responsible for submitting a narrative report to the CCC's district office in Fort Douglas. Fortuitously, several of these for the 1937 work season have survived. In the accumulation they permitted a reasonably detailed account of CCC activities in Bryce Canyon that year. An excerpt from Rozelle's "General Work Report" for the period ending May 31, 1937, follows:

Both camps for the month of May have been in excellent condition. Camp NP-3 in Bryce Canyon National Park seemed glad of the change from Zion to Bryce and at this time are [sic] comfortably quartered. The mess hall and all buildings have been reconditioned and the general appearance outside as well as inside is neat and orderly.

The strength of the Camp is 113, Captain C.B. Whitney Commanding, Lieut. Carnahan Adjutant, Dr. Anderson in charge of the infirmary and Von Robertson Educational Advisor. A great many boys left during the month to accept jobs near their homes or assist their parents in work at home. During the month two enrollees, Davis and Lohr, were given appointments as assistant Technicians. A small sub camp is being maintained at Zion . . .

. . . The Douglas Fir beetles have swarmed and during the month of June all insect pest control will be confined to the
pine. This must be completed about June 20th [1937]. The work is still being directed by Dr. DeLeon.

... The engineering in Zion, Bryce and Cedar Breaks is under the direction of Frank Huston who also directs the work at Boulder Dam, Farmington Bay, Timpanogos and Lehman's Cave[s]....

The landscaping is directed by Harlan Stephenson who also has the same number of camps, monuments, parks, etc. to look after.

The usual amount of classes are being conducted with about the same amount of interest. Inasmuch as the entire camp at Bryce is engaged in insect pest control Dr. DeLeon was prevailed upon to give an occasional talk on the work in which the boys are engaged. These talks have been very interesting and beneficial.

Trips are taken to nearby towns as usual for dances and ball games.

The following were new CCC projects for 1937:

1. A fence along the west and north park boundaries. It included a cattle-guard and an underpass at the park's north entrance.

2. Expansion of the public campground, including campground roads, spur, parking areas, 20 fireplaces, and extension of water and sewer lines.

3. Two drinking fountains. One of these was located at Sunset Point, the other near the Administration Building.

4. Plowing snow from all park roads except those in the immediate vicinity of the headquarters area. The State Road Commission took care of the administrative area.

5. Maintenance on the under-rim fire trail.

Insect pest control was continued in 1937 and must also have included roadside cleanup. The CCC's narrative report for July 1937 indicated that during the month a small crew was engaged in the removal of tree debris within sight of the rim road. It is known this debris was the result of the insect control program. After picking up logs and smaller branches, the CCC crew hauled them to the park's utility area where the
wood was separated into "saw timber, barrow logs and fire wood." 448

Through July 1937 the strength of NP-3 stood at 165. It was reported for the month that new enrollees looked young and undersize, but seemed "to be adjusting themselves to the work and camp life very nicely." No recent changes had been made in Army or advisory personnel—a situation NP-3's personnel found "very satisfactory." 449

In August 1937 project work throughout the park was on schedule. Enrollees spent their off-duty hours in a variety of ways. Baseball was particularly popular with Company 962. During the month three games were played in nearby towns. On August 21 the company hosted a barn dance in NP-3's messhall, with music provided by the company "orchestra." The event was "well liked by the guests." In addition to baseball, at least one other recreational trip was taken that month. Available evidence suggests the camp's educational advisor took his job seriously. A number of new classes were organized at NP-3 in August. Use of the steel square, taught by General Foreman A. O. Johnson, was considered one of the best classes that month. 450

Much of any CCC camp's stability depended on the retention of "Local Experienced Men" (LEMs). 451 Usually about eight LEMs were attached to NP-3. Since these men were generally older and possessed a skilled trade, they were only apt to use CCC employment—with its $30 a month
salary—as a makeshift measure. In September 1937 a sufficient number of LEMs left Bryce Canyon's camp which temporarily caused apprehension. Camp stability also tended to suffer when well liked Army or technical personnel were transferred to other billets. In September the Bryce Canyon camp's adjutant, Lieutenant Carnahan, was transferred east for an indefinite period of time. NP-3's district medical officer, Dr. Anderson, was also moved to another assignment that month. On October 1, 1937, Company 962 withdrew to Zion for the winter. A crew of 18 men and a foreman were left behind to complete unfinished projects and winterize the camp.

The cycle was renewed in March 1938 when a stub camp was sent over to Bryce Canyon from Zion. Its threefold task was to prepare NP-3 for reoccupancy, get a jump on insect control work, and aid in snow removal operations. Company 962's main contingent was transferred over to Bryce Canyon on May 23. In July 1938 Lieutenant Victor E. Warren was transferred from the Farmington Bay State Camp to NP-3 as second in command. Several days later Lieutenant John T. Hazzard was relocated from the Duck Creek Forest Camp to NP-3, relieving Lieutenant Merwin H. Smith as Commanding Officer. At the beginning of August 1938 the strength of NP-3 was 177.

NP-3's project work schedule in 1938 was basically a continuation of jobs begun the previous year. Large crews were assigned to road bank sloping and trail maintenance. Insect control and the salvage of wind-thrown timber were also given some attention. Completion of the
comfort station at Sunset Point was delayed until the end of the working season, because all plumbing and inside finishing were assigned to foreman A. O. Johnson and one helper. According to Rozelle skilled and semiskilled workers in Company 962 were nil, and with the limited funds available it was not possible to employ skilled labor. 457 As in years past, Company 962 withdrew to Zion during the month of October. 458

By the beginning of July 1939, Company 962 was energetically participating in a number of new projects. 459 Among these were the following:

1. Museum-overlook at Rainbow Point. This building is referred to in the section on Rapid Construction Phase.
2. Operation of a rock crushing plant. Gravel was stockpiled in the utility area for surfacing park roads.
3. Insect control work on the Black Hills beetle. This project also included the salvage of logs from infested pines (Illustration 41).
4. Assistance to the Garkane Power Company. The company erected a powerline from the north boundary to the park's residential area.
5. A parking area adjacent to the headquarters building.
6. Footpaths at Rainbow Point.
7. Guide and contact station work.
8. General maintenance of roads, trails, buildings, and boundary fences.
9. Road signs and a park entrance marker of special design.
10. Landscaping and planting work.

Projects 4 through 10 were completed during the 1939 working season. 460 Project 1 was finished in the summer of 1940, and project 2 by the end of the 1940 working season. 461 Only project 3 was open-ended.
962 returned to Zion on September 1—somewhat earlier than usual. A side camp of 30 men stayed at Bryce Canyon until November 30, 1939, spotting infested ponderosa pines.

After September 1, 1939, NP-3 was not occupied by company 962. Only CCC stub camps operated at Bryce Canyon from the spring of 1940 to July 1942. During 1940 stub camps participated in three projects. These included:

1. Continuing insect control work on the Black Hills beetle,
2. The production of 4,000 cubic yards of crushed rock for road maintenance, and
3. The construction of a cattle guard in Tropic Canyon.

Stub camps were located in Bryce from July 1 to August 29, 1941, and April 16 to June 30, 1942. Work concentrated exclusively on the insect control program. By the end of the 1942 fiscal year, this work had soaked up 14,603 man-days of labor. Appendix A of this study furnishes an inventory of all CCC work performed in Bryce Canyon between April 1933 and July 1942.

**Trails** — A map that was drafted in 1931 characterizes the trail system in Bryce Canyon prior to the CCC's arrival. During the first few years of its existence, all trail construction in Bryce Canyon was modestly handled by force account operations. These reached their peak in appropriations for the 1931 fiscal year, when a total of 4-1/2 miles of foot and horse trails were constructed. The following segments were planned and completed by the fall of 1931: (1) Sunset Point to Bryce
Point, (2) Bryce Point to Peek-a-boo Canyon, and (3) Sunrise Point to Campbell Canyon. To prevent indiscriminate riding between the lodge and rim, a short bridle path was also laid. All work in fiscal year 1931 was accomplished with available park forces. Spring trail maintenance was carried out between 1932-34, but a shortage of funds appears to have interrupted new trail construction.

Information in "Establishment, Administration, and Contribution of NP-3," discussed previously, demonstrates that insect control and road work absorbed most of the CCC's time in Bryce Canyon. However, a review of these yearly projects also indicates enrollees made a few significant contributions to the park's trail system. In the 1934 work season, Company 962 inaugurated construction on the Under-Rim Fire Trail and Fairyland Trail. Then, for the next two work seasons, it abstained from new trail work in Bryce Canyon. In fact, only routine maintenance was performed by "day labor" during the 1935-36 working seasons. On June 1, 1937, three trails were begun by Company 962. The longest trail, by far, led from the administrative area to Bryce Point. One of the two shorter trails led from the campground to the rim—the other from the museum to the rim. Park trails were given spring maintenance by day labor in 1938. Later in that year an Emergency Relief Appropriation Act allotment financed some trail improvement work in unspecified areas of the park. The CCC's final contribution to Bryce Canyon's trail system was in May and June of 1940, when the stub camp responsible for completing the museum-overlook at Rainbow Point also constructed footpaths in the vicinity.
Liquidation of Camp NP-3 - Despite President Roosevelt's continued support, the CCC increasingly became a subject of public concern. This was all the more true from 1941 on, when employment began to rise and the country turned its attention from domestic relief to national defense. The agency's fate was debated by a Joint Committee of Congress on November 28 and December 4, 1941. Given the Committee's conservative membership, it was no surprise when it recommended the CCC's abolishment by July 1, 1942. President Roosevelt and Officials of the CCC continued to scrap for the agency, but a lack of Congressional support nullified these efforts. The decisive stroke was applied on June 5, 1942, when the House voted 158 to 151 against further subsidies for CCC projects. Instead, $500,000 was appropriated for the agency's liquidation.

It was easy enough to disband enrollees and transfer vehicles and equipment to Zion for distribution. The disposition of NP-3's buildings, however, was considerably more complex. Available evidence implies Bryce Canyon/Zion Superintendent Paul R. Franke petitioned the War Department for retention of NP-3's six rigid buildings. These included the following: (1) messhall, 20 feet by 138 feet; (2) recreation building, 20 feet by 40 feet; (3) storehouse, 27 feet by 27 feet; (4) blacksmith house, 7 feet by 13 feet; (5) maintenance shop, 27 feet by 30 feet; and (6) a minor shed of unknown dimensions. All had been erected in 1934, and all were in "poor" condition by September 1942 due to the flimsy construction and Bryce Canyon's harsh winter climate. On August 24, 1942, Superintendent Franke received
notification, via Region III in Santa Fe, that his dubious request had been approved. 477

That the buildings soon became a burden is borne out in correspondence dated August 11, 1943, and directed from Acting Park Superintendent Dorr G. Yeager to the Regional Director. Yeager explained that Superintendent Franke had originally wanted the CCC buildings to house anticipated construction and work crews. In Yeager's words:

> It appears, however, that such crews will not be used for several years, due to curtailment of funds and construction in general. In the meantime, it is [i.e. the abandoned camp] a constant maintenance problem which we are unable to meet, and it was our thought that the simplest solution would be to invite bids for the demolition of the structures and cleaning of the area. 478

In response to Yeager's memo, Acting Regional Director Ross A. Maxwell explained that the "simplest solution" was not necessarily in accordance with government regulations:

> ... these buildings must be declared surplus to the Procurement Division if they are no longer needed in your area. If the Procurement Division finds another Government agency that can use them, they may be transferred. If they are not needed by other agencies, they can be sold to outsiders. The structures should be disposed of by transfer or sale by the Procurement Division. 479

On the last day of October 1943, NP-3's buildings were braced to "protect them from the weight of snow. ..." 480 The next known reference to the structures is in the park's Monthly Report for October 1945. It is implied the Procurement Division was not able to find another government agency that needed the buildings. Consequently, bids for the buildings' scrap value were solicited. This resulted in an acceptable offer by a Mr. Evan S. Lee, who began dismantling the CCC
complex in September 1945. Until 1961 the old campsite was used as an overflow campground. In August of that year this makeshift facility was obliterated. The area was seeded and boulders were positioned across the former entrance to discourage would-be visitors. Not a trace of the old campsite is now visible.

Recent Construction Phase

Isolated construction - After the completion of the museum-overlook at Rainbow Point in the summer of 1940, no building was erected at Bryce Canyon until the summer of 1947. This was a Standard Oil Service Station sited near the lodge. A scarcity of information forces the conclusion that the Service Station was constructed after an agreement between the oil company and Omaha had been reached--as well as another between the concessioners and Park Service.

Harmon Brothers Construction Company of Salt Lake City was the successful bidder on the project. Both park Superintendent Charles J. Smith and Regional Landscape Architect Harvey Cornell approved the building's location in June 1947. Work began on July 16, 1947. By the beginning of August the roughing in of the structure's concrete walls had been completed. The following month gasoline storage tanks with a capacity of 20,000 gallons and pumps were installed. Rough framing and rock masonry were "about 75 percent completed on the main building." Rock masonry work was subcontracted by Olson and Son of Springfield, Utah. Surprisingly, it was reported that "suitable rock in
sufficient quantities proved to be a problem at the outset of the job.\textsuperscript{485} Park records indicate the Service Station was completed in 1948 at a cost of $29,275.\textsuperscript{486}

**MISSION 66 Construction** - After construction of the Service Station, no additional buildings of any significance were begun in Bryce Canyon until the MISSION 66 program got under way nearly a decade later. Once underway, MISSION 66 promised to eventually alleviate the park's critical need for: (1) employee housing, (2) an adequate visitors center and administration building, (3) a modern maintenance yard, and (4) campground facilities. Park personnel understandably perceived that the need for employee housing was most urgent.\textsuperscript{487} To mitigate this demoralizing situation, 13 single-family residences and a four-unit apartment were constructed with MISSION 66 funds between 1958-64. This new employee housing was put up in three stages: (1) 7 three-bedroom residences in 1957-58, (2) a two-bedroom residence and the apartment in 1960, and (3) 5 two-bedroom residences in 1963-64.

The C. M. Moss Construction Company of Santa Clara, Utah, won the contract for the three-bedroom houses in August 1957 with a low bid of $130,073.50.\textsuperscript{488} An examination of construction progress reports for these buildings suggests the following observation. Moss, like contractors before and after, underestimated the constraints on routine construction practices imposed by weather at 8,000 feet of altitude. Seventeen days of precipitation in October 1957 caused the contractor to
struggle with his schedule. To complete the buildings on time, Moss was forced to hurry exterior work. This necessitated the "exterior rehabilitation" of all seven houses in the summer of 1961.

With the exception of construction costs, information for the employee housing put up in 1960 is practically nonexistent. On the other hand, park records have much to say about the five houses constructed in 1963-64. Perhaps the most interesting information is from the park's Monthly Report for June 1963, which bemoaned that modifications desired by park personnel were not included in plans for the structures:

Many of these items are required for proper construction at this 8,000 foot altitude where snow depths of three to four feet and temperatures of 25 degrees below zero are not uncommon. While these items had been brought to the attention of the Western Design Offices many times in the past several years, we have still not been able to have them recognized.

Notwithstanding these deficiencies in conception, the contractor for the project--Valley Builders of Gunnison, Utah--did a fine job. When the buildings were conditionally accepted on February 7, 1964, it was remarked by the park's Maintenance Supervisor that:

The quality of the construction in these five homes is much better than some of the other homes built here previously.

As a result of National Park Service Director Wirth's visit to Bryce Canyon in August 1956, the park's revised master plan called for a new Visitor Center. Wirth appears to have pushed for a location adjacent to the north entrance road. The Director also wanted the new entrance station to be as close to the Visitors Center as possible. Architect Cecil Doty of the Western Office of Design and Construction visited the
park early in September 1956 to sketch preliminary plans for the center. Apparently, Doty and park personnel did not discuss the building's orientation at length, because Superintendent Bean was surprised when final plans called for the structure to face south instead of east.

Park personnel began transferring from the Old Administration Building to the new Center on June 1, 1959. It was possible to carry on park business and moving simultaneously. Bryce Canyon's administrative assistant was especially impressed with the building, remarking that:

Adequate space, new equipment and an office atmosphere is really a new experience for Bryce Canyon... the office space will undoubtedly make for more efficient and smooth operation of assigned tasks... The visitors center and new entrance station were completed for the respective costs of $224,402 and $2,760. A formal dedication was not held until June 1960.

MISSION 66 fulfilled the park's need for a modern maintenance yard in two stages. During 1959 a utility building and shops were erected. The yard was rounded out in 1964-65 with the addition of equipment storage buildings and an extension to the existing utility building. Detailed information is only available for these later projects. Valley Builders of Gunnison, Utah, was low bidder and won the contract on June 30, 1964. Architects Cannon and Mullen of Salt Lake City furnished the architectural drawings. Construction began on August 4, 1964, and Valley Builders was given 180 days--that is, until January 30, 1965--to
complete the project. A hitch occurred when it was determined that ready-mixed concrete ordered from Panguitch was not satisfactory. The contractor then moved his concrete mixer onto the job site and did this work himself. Construction otherwise proceeded without delays. Between 1959-65 construction costs for the maintenance yard totaled $130,071.

Between 1957-65 MISSION 66 funds permitted the construction of six comfort stations at North and Sunset Campgrounds, a complete revamping of one campfire circle, and the construction of another. Early in the MISSION 66 program, Witt Construction Company of Provo, Utah, won a contract for two comfort stations at North Campground with a low bid of $23,770. Substantive work on these began in April 1957. Inclement weather delayed progress, but the buildings were ready for acceptance in September. Monthly Narrative Reports for the construction period evidenced that park personnel were complimentary of the workmanship put into these structures. During 1961-62 the new Sunset Campground received four comfort stations--each costing $7,131. Besides work on the maintenance yard, the contract awarded Valley Builders on June 30, 1964, specified the modernization of dated facilities at North Campground and construction of a new campfire circle facility at Sunset Campground. Drawings for these projects were issued from the Park Service's Western Office of Design and Construction. The contractor was originally given 90 calendar days to complete the project from August 3, 1964. However, administrative decisions and adverse weather caused construction delays. This necessitated several change
orders to give Valley Builders needed extensions. Final inspection and acceptance of the campfire circles was not made until July 12, 1965. Illustrations 43-45 show the campfire circle at North Campground before, during, and after modernization. Illustrations 51 and 52 similarly show the campfire circle at Sunset Campground during and after construction. Costs for the renovation at North Campground amounted to $8,050 plus incidental equipment. Facilities at Sunset Campground cost $13,681.94, exclusive of projection equipment.

Over the decade 1957-67, MISSION 66 expenditures for buildings and building-related projects in Bryce Canyon totaled $1,534,600. The following table furnishes a breakdown for the period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>MISSION 66 Building and Building-Related Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>$114,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>510,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>301,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>53,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>79,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>229,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>54,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>179,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Major reasons for the failure to stylistically bridge the rapid and recent construction phases at Bryce Canyon are apparent. During the MISSION 66 period, limitations on time and money made a continuation of the rustic style improbable. Consequently, if the MISSION 66 program
failed with use of rustic architecture, it was mainly because of the economics and modern construction schedules. Notwithstanding arguments to the contrary, there also seems to have been a basic unwillingness on the part of certain technical personnel in the Park Service to build using rustic design. It is known that Cecil Doty, who was the Park Service Supervisory Architect in the mid-1950s, had forsaken rustic for functionalism as early as 1940-41. Finally, maintenance problems with rustic buildings counteracted a continuance of the style. As Tweed has pointed out:

Most of these structures had been designed with their exterior appearance as the dominant factor, a trait that often made their repair or renovation difficult. In the numerous mixed stone and wood buildings dry rot often became a problem.

It was dry rot that forced removal of the Utah Parks Company shelters at Sunrise and Inspiration Points as early as 1945. Recent restoration work on the Old Administration Building had to be accomplished with epoxy because of difficulties presented by the replacement of entire logs.

Inclusive of the by-pass road (covered in the section on "By-pass Road") MISSION 66 funds programmed for Bryce Canyon's road and trail system totaled $894,000. No significant extensions of roads or trails in the "precious area" were contemplated. The goal was merely to improve existing networks. Insuring the park's water supply was another major project brought to a successful conclusion with MISSION 66 funding. By the beginning of the 1964 fiscal year $151,421.80 had been spent to extend and reinforce waterlines.
In review, MISSION 66 was responsible for the completion of seven major projects in Bryce Canyon. These included the following:

1. Modernization of the park's road and trail system, including a new by-pass road,
2. Construction of Sunset Campground, and the modernization of campground facilities elsewhere in the park,
3. Extended waterlines and sewerlines,
4. A new Visitors Center,
5. New housing for park employees,
6. A new maintenance yard, and
7. Guard rails for some of the park's prominent scenic views.

MISSION 66 definitely helped to mend fences throughout Garfield County. Because of the program local Utahns felt Bryce Canyon's facilities had finally been brought up to standards with Zion's. There is little doubt MISSION 66 also created long lasting goodwill toward the Park Service in Salt Lake City.
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## APPENDIX A

### BRYCE CANYON NATIONAL PARK, UTAH

Civilian Conservation Corps and Emergency Relief Appropriation Act
Work Accomplished Under Supervision of the National Park Service
April 1, 1933 to July 8, 1942

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Units of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 Cabin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 Residence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 Employee's Dormitory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 Comfort Station</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 Comfort Station</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 Pit Toilets</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 Pit Toilets</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 Lookout-Rainbow Point</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Station</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move Messhall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Fence</td>
<td>3204 rods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerline</td>
<td>3.2 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation Improvement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerline</td>
<td>700 linear feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer System</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone lines</td>
<td>1.9 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Fountains</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterline</td>
<td>2300 linear feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireplaces</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle Guard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Cattle Guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Road Signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Monuments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Campground tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Lecture Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Minor Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Fire Danger Weather Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Minor Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Foot Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Trail Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Horse Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Check dams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>Roadside Cleanup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609</td>
<td>Insect Pest Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705</td>
<td>Landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td>Moving and planting trees and shrubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>Parking Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711</td>
<td>Campground Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713</td>
<td>Razing Undesirable Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713</td>
<td>Demolish Old Dormitory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>713</td>
<td>Obliteration of Old Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716</td>
<td>Footpaths--Rainbow Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1004</td>
<td>Wood Eradication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1012</td>
<td>Preparation and Transfer of Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1012</td>
<td>Preparation and Transfer of Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1012</td>
<td>Salvage Beetle Timber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1012</td>
<td>Stockpile-Road Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1023</td>
<td>Lineal Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1025</td>
<td>Topographic Surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Windthrown logs salvaged and sawed into lumber
- 12', 14', and 16' lengths—average 24" diameter, salvage from insect control work
- Salvage beetle infected timber which was sawed into lumber for future CCC use
- Road material for highway maintenance
- Surveys throughout the park.
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8. Presnath, p. 3. "Both Johnnie and Dick were raised in the Bryce region, Johnnie having been born near the site of Escalante between 1870 and 1875, and Dick being still older with no memory of his birth place. They belong to the Av-o-ats-in, a Paiute clan which once roamed over all the Pink Cliff country east of the East Fork of the Sevier River, a country which they called Av-o-av, and which we now call the Paria Valley."
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15. The earlier study is titled Geology of the High Plateaus of Utah with Atlas. Both of Dutton’s studies were published by the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

16. Bailey’s description is often erroneously cited as the earliest known of Bryce Canyon. Actually, this distinction rightfully belongs to Grove Karl Gilbert, based on the excerpt cited from his 1872 notebook. The source for Bailey’s description can be traced to the files of the Public Survey Office in Salt Lake City. In the mid-1930s the District Cadastral Engineer in Salt Lake, G.D.D. Kirkpatrick, found the description and sent it to the Zion-Bryce Canyon Superintendent, P. P. Patraw, Zion-Bryce memorandum for the press, October 1935, Denver Federal Records Center, Accession 52-A-100, Container 746149-50.500, publicity, Bryce Canyon. Captain George M. Wheeler, for whom the Wheeler survey was named described Bryce as "a work of genii now chained up in a spell of enchantment while their structures fall in ruins." This statement, written in the mid-1870s, also antedates Bailey’s. See America’s Wonderlands. The Scenic National Parks and Monuments of the United States. Washington, D.C., The National Geographic Society, 1959, p. 191. "Bailey 'lost' two days at Bryce...looking for his large meerschaum pipe, which was usually chained to him. The hunt was unsuccessful, but the pipe turned up several years later." Utah. A Guide to the State, compiled by Workers of the Writer's Program of the Works Progress Administration for the State of Utah. American Guide Series, New York: Hastings House, 1941, p. 460.
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Railroad Collection 513 is housed in the Division of Documentary Resources. It contains papers donated to the society by the Denver and Rio Grande Western Railroad. Boxes 15 (1915-16) through 23 (1930-35) were examined to gauge the role of Marysvale in the regional development of southwestern Utah. Several illustrations in the study were found in this collection.

Union Pacific Archives, Omaha, Nebraska

Boxes 1324 and 3649 contain several hundred Union Pacific Archives documents on microfilm. Intracorporate correspondence pertaining to Utah Parks Project in the early 1920s characterizes the contents of Box 1324. Four topics in the study were derived from this correspondence: (1) the Lund-Cedar City spur, (2) the Cedar City complex, (3) the National Monument period, and (4) Utah Parks Company's initial construction phase at Bryce. Box 3649 contains invaluable documents regarding the incorporation, operation, and liquidation of the Utah Parks Company.

Union Pacific Archives' "Utah Parks Information File" was canvassed for pertinent press releases. A complete set of The Union Pacific Magazine is also on file.
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Information for Ruby Syrett's Tourists' Rest complex, and a regional road map dated January 1922 are located in the Charles R. Mabey Correspondence, 1920-22 (SE-1.20.4).

Utah State Historical Society, Salt Lake City

Worthwhile finds: (1) the Iron Mission prospectus, and (2) Mark Anderson's papers on microfilm a-622.
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Several documents used in the study are found in the park's library. The most important of these is Horace Albright's memorandum to Mr. Chatelain, dated August 4, 1933. Narrative Reports for Bryce's Civilian Conservation Corps camp—dated 1937-38—are outstanding documents, whose repository is the park's vault.
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