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PREFACE

There has been an ongoing discussion in our office on what purpose an administrative history serves. Is it a broad analysis of the creation, management, and future direction of a Park Service site, as seen from an "objective" viewpoint? Or should it be a compendium of details that the current managers of a site can easily access to help in day to day decisions? I have attempted to do a little of both with this volume on the administrative history of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. Hopefully, it is a cohesive narrative and informative reference book which is also enjoyable to read.

The research for this history has led me in a number of directions that I suggest a future historian of Fort Vancouver pursue further. I was able to borrow files from the National Archives and Federal Records Center in San Bruno, California with the courteous assistance of Richard Boyden. I am sure that a more systematic research trip would reveal more detail for the development of Fort Vancouver during the 1960s. The Federal Records Center in Seattle also contained a wealth of information.

Oral interviews are, of course, invaluable for an administrative history. I was extremely lucky that some of the early participants in the creation of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site are still alive and kicking. For instance, Frank Hjort, the first superintendent, and Donald Stewart, the first president of the Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society, were both kind enough to grant me interviews. I also received a lengthy and informative letter from John Hussey, father of all Fort Vancouver historians. With their help, I was able to bring the early years of this administrative history to life. However, time and budget constraints have kept interview and research time to a minimum. I hope that a future Fort Vancouver historian takes the time to search out participants such as Louis Caywood, Jake Hoffman, and Lester Ross.

It has been suggested that Fort Vancouver perhaps merits an Archaeological Administrative History separate from this volume. Bryn Thomas' recent overview of archaeological studies at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site comes close to fulfilling that need. His comments and insights into the last 20 years of archaeological excavations were extremely helpful to me in preparing this current history.

Besides those individuals mentioned above, I would also like to offer a hearty thanks to the many staff members at Fort Vancouver, especially Superintendent Dave Herrera, David Hansen, and Bob Appling, who helped me find materials, took time to answer my incessant questions, and, above all, showed me how much the history of their particular site means to them. I would also like to thank two past Fort Vancouver historians who most inadvertently inspired me: Jerry Wagers, for saving tidbits on notecards in hopes of writing his own administrative history, and Robert E.S. Clark, for compiling dozens of bound volumes of Park Service correspondence and superintendent's reports which otherwise might have been lost. Lastly, thanks to colleague David Louter, who, in preparing his administrative history on Craters of the Moon National Monument, broke much uncharted ground for those who followed. To all these individuals, both present and past, I dedicate this work.
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Chapter One

Overview

Fort Vancouver National Historic Site has special problems as well as special advantages. Located off of Interstate 5 in Vancouver, Washington, on the north shore of the Columbia River across from Portland, Oregon, Fort Vancouver is an open 208-acre park in the midst of an otherwise urban setting. Though Mt. Hood, to the east, and the nearby Columbia River are reminiscent of the area's older natural setting, two major highways border the site on the west and south. Light industry, a small airport that extends onto Park Service property, and Portland International Airport across the river also remind visitors that the slow pace of the 19th century has been left far behind.

Ironically, this busy urban environment can be attributed directly to the influence of the Hudson's Bay Company's trading post. Between 1825 and 1845, Fort Vancouver served as an important center for the Northwest fur trade. But the site's significance goes beyond the fur trade; Fort Vancouver was also at the western terminus for American settlers traveling the Oregon Trail, thus a symbol for the expansion of national boundaries to the far western frontier of the Pacific Ocean. Many historians have called Fort Vancouver the "cradle of civilization" in the Northwest, both because the Hudson's Bay Company constructed one of the earliest schools in the area and because the fort was a way station or point of departure for missionaries proselytizing among native peoples already settled in what later became the Oregon Territory. Perhaps more importantly, Fort Vancouver's Chief Factor John McLoughlin facilitated agricultural development in the Northwest; European seed stock and fruit trees given to the American settlers helped new gardens and orchards blossom throughout the region.

Though Fort Vancouver was eventually abandoned by the Hudson's Bay Company, the significance of its activities and enterprise lingered in the collective memories of the local people, many of whom were descendants of retired Hudson's Bay
Company employees. For years local and state groups fought for legislation to authorize a national monument which would recognize the site as an economic, cultural, and military center of early Pacific Northwest development.¹

Though everyone could agree that Fort Vancouver should be cherished as a national symbol, not everybody agreed on what form that symbol should take. Indeed, the Park Service could not always agree on appropriate goals for development at Fort Vancouver. When the monument was authorized in 1948, the enabling legislation referenced the 1916 act which established the National Park Service. These acts contained two basic, and seemingly contradictory, directives for Park Service policy: first, the park site must be preserved and second, the public must have use and enjoyment of the site.² At Fort Vancouver these policies raised several questions: What was there to preserve? And how could the monument be developed to provide for public use and enjoyment? The answers were never easy or obvious. Without any remaining historic structures or features above ground, the Park Service faced an interpretive puzzle. They had to decide if preserving an empty open space or an on-going archaeological excavation would provide the best use of public space. At Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, the Park Service often found the best management strategy to be compromise.

Today, the prominent attraction at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site is the reconstructed Hudson’s Bay Company stockade, including many of the buildings inside the fort: the bakehouse, blacksmith shop, Indian Trade Shop, and the Chief Factor’s House where Dr. John McLoughlin once governed the fort. All of these reconstructed buildings are on the List of Classified Structures and the entire site is on the National Register. On a gentle rise overlooking the reconstructed fort is a MISSION 66-style Visitor Center which houses Fort Vancouver NHS’ museum and visitor services. The old Vancouver Barracks parade ground provides open space on the northern half of the park for visitors, who also enjoy an uninterrupted view of the fort stockade from the Visitor Center. The Park Service property also includes the site of the historic Kanaka Village, west of the stockade, where most of the Hudson’s Bay Company employees at Fort
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Vancouver once lived. Though nothing of the village, pond, and salmon house, remains above ground, Park Service plans have always included the restoration of a portion of this landscape for interpretation, based on historic and archaeological evidence. Other features of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site include the western half of Pearson Airpark and approximately three-quarters of a mile of Columbia River waterfront, which is separated from the stockade area by SR 14, a frontage road, and the airfield runway.

Though reconstruction and further land acquisition are currently the focus of Fort Vancouver's planning program, they were not always Park Service policy nor the obvious outcome of management decisions at Fort Vancouver. In the 1950s, the Park Service was reluctant to reconstruct at any historic site. Instead, it emphasized restoration of surviving structures or preservation of the integrity of a site. Fort Vancouver National Monument, as it was then designated, benefited from this policy in the late 1940s and 1950s, since the monument's most important cultural resources were the archaeological excavations and the curation of artifacts they uncovered. With Park Service funding, Archaeologist Louis Caywood and Historian John Hussey were able to document thoroughly Fort Vancouver's cultural resources and history up to that time.

Under Park Service policy, the general criteria for reconstruction at a park included the disappearance of the structures which are essential to public understanding and enjoyment, the existence of sufficient historical, archaeological, and architectural data to permit accurate reproduction, and the ability to locate the reconstructed structures on the original site. Fort Vancouver seemed to fit these criteria perfectly. Not only did Louis Caywood locate the original site of the 1840s fort, but together, Caywood and Hussey's labors provided a strong basis for accurate interpretation and structural replication at Fort Vancouver. In addition, community groups continued to demand reconstruction of the Hudson's Bay Company post so they might celebrate the region's past as well as provide tourist dollars for the region's future.

However, the Park Service remained reluctant to reconstruct the fort in the 1950s. Their reticence to embark on a reconstruction was reinforced by two factors: lack of funding and the existence of an avigation easement over the fort site, held by the City of
Vancouver, that prohibited any activities or construction that would interfere with the operation of Pearson Airpark. It would take the election of Julia Butler Hansen to Congress in 1960, to overcome these two obstacles. As the representative for Washington State's Third District, she took a personal interest in the monument and, within a year of her election, sponsored legislation that both enlarged the boundaries of the park and changed its designation to Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. Throughout her career, Julia Butler Hansen supported the site with funding for specific projects, including reconstruction. With her assistance, the avigation easement over the fort site was modified, allowing a portion of the stockade wall to be rebuilt in 1966. Subsequently, Representative Hansen, as chairman of the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, secured funding for reconstruction of the entire stockade and several buildings within.

Besides careful documentation and planning, the fort's reconstruction required the Park Service's cooperation and compromise with the fort's neighbors. Since Fort Vancouver's development plans depended on further land acquisition within the old Vancouver Barracks, the Park Service had to cooperate and coexist with other federal and local agencies whose properties surrounded the historic site, including the Army and the City of Vancouver, which owned Pearson Airpark. Indeed, land and land management has continued to be one of the primary issues in the administration of the Fort Vancouver site: who owns it; who administers it; who uses it and for what purpose; how it is sold or exchanged; and how the boundaries of use and ownership are defined. When it comes to the management of Waterfront Park, the operation of Pearson Airpark, or the recreational use of park grounds, the debates over these questions have been especially rancorous.

The compromises these issues have required have contributed to the identity crisis which has troubled Fort Vancouver since it was established. Yet, Fort Vancouver not only survives, but is continuing to move in directions that reaffirm the congressional mandate to preserve and interpret the Hudson's Bay Company and its role in Pacific Northwest history. For instance, the recently reconstructed fur store is not just a new
interpretive venue; it will also serve as a cultural resource study center, which promises to draw scholars, researchers, and archaeologists to examine its collections and deliberate on the cultural importance of Fort Vancouver and the fur trade. The unexcavated portions of the site also represent a potentially rich archaeological source for further information concerning the activities of the Hudson’s Bay Company. Finally, a cultural landscape report, currently under development, updates the site’s master plan and underscores the long-standing commitment to interpreting Fort Vancouver’s historical identity. Though Fort Vancouver is faced with dramatic changes if the Vancouver National Historical Reserve is initiated, the decisions the Park Service makes in the next five years will define Fort Vancouver’s role and development for the foreseeable future.
CHAPTER TWO
The Creation of Fort
Vancouver National Monument

The creation of Fort Vancouver National Monument and its eventual development as a national historic site has deep roots in 19th century land use. Following the establishment of the 49th parallel as the international boundary between Great Britain and the United States territories in 1849, the Hudson's Bay Company moved its principal administrative headquarters and supply depot from Fort Vancouver to Fort Victoria, British Columbia retaining only a minimal presence at the fort, in 1849. That same year, the U.S. Army established a presence in the Northwest with an encampment on the hill above the fort that would become the nucleus of a 640-acre military reservation which encompassed the stockade of Fort Vancouver. In 1860, the Army officially took control of the property left by the Hudson's Bay Company. Archaeological evidence shows that a fire in 1866 destroyed a portion of the Fort Vancouver palisade and some structures, but time and scavengers destroyed most of the buildings in the old post. Alternately named Columbia Barracks, Fort Vancouver, and finally Vancouver Barracks, the Army barracks soon covered any remaining traces of the once dominant Hudson’s Bay Company post by the turn of the century.¹

The U.S. Army may have taken over the administration of the site, but Fort Vancouver and the fur trade it symbolized were not forgotten. Indeed, the fort’s disappearance perhaps lent more mystique to the symbol. In 1910 a commemorative stone monument was placed near a fort site mentioned in notes made by Lt. Col. B.L.E. Bonneville in 1854.² Because of local interest, the War Department, under the authority of the Antiquities Act of June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225), which protected and preserved historic and prehistoric sites on lands controlled by the United States, designated the site
of the Hudson’s Bay Company fort a national monument on July 17, 1915.\(^3\)

With the coming of World War I, the momentum to establish a monument collapsed before Congress could allot funds. In November 1917, the U.S. Army Signal Corps’ Spruce Production Division built a mill on the large field where the fort had been. Some 30 thousand officers and men produced an average of 9 million board feet of spruce lumber monthly on the 50-acre site. Though the spruce mill only operated until August 1919, the buildings remained on the site for several years after the War’s end. Even during the archaeological excavations of the early 1970s, the spruce mill foundations sometimes obscured the Fort Vancouver structures.\(^4\)

It was not until the summer of 1921 that the site of the Hudson’s Bay Company’s Fort Vancouver was more accurately located when Army civil engineer Felix Robinson finally found the Colonel Bonneville map of 1854 for which the Oregon and Washington historical societies had searched some 15 years.\(^5\) With interest peaked, members of Washington’s congressional delegation prepared legislation to recognize the fort and its significance. In 1922 Senator Poindexter introduced a bill for $30,000 to restore the stockade, but the bill never returned from committee. Again in early 1924 Senator Wesley Jones and Representative Albert Johnson introduced bills for $30,000 for restoration of the fort site, but both measures failed.\(^6\)

Undaunted by the failed legislation, the Oregon Historical Society and the Washington State Historical Society planned to place a historic marker to commemorate the site of Fort Vancouver for its 100th anniversary in 1925. The Fort Vancouver Centennial Corporation, led by local businessman Glenn Ranck, organized the celebration. On June 7, 1924 W.P. Bonney, secretary of the Washington State Historical Society, wrote to T. C. Elliott, curator at the Oregon Historical Society, that a certain "Mr. McWhorter suggested that one panel [of the commemorative marker] should carry a design, showing the uncivilized condition of the locality when the H.B. Co. first went there."\(^7\) Other local citizens and associations wanted to put their special mark on the celebration. Much to T.C. Elliott’s consternation, "Mr. T. Foster Hidden, as Sec. of Vancouver Hist. Soc., has written me that their present idea is for [a commemorative]
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marker to be placed in their Auto Park, which is no where near to the site of the original Fort. But, before any of these projects got off the ground, the Directors of the Fort Vancouver Centennial Corporation disincorporated, ending the plans for the 100th year celebration.

Commemorating Fort Vancouver, however, was an idea that would not die. Late in 1924, Glenn Ranck persuaded the Prunarians, an association of local prune growers and other Vancouver businessmen organized in 1919, to ask U.S. Representative Albert Johnson to introduce another bill in Congress to restore the old stockade. Even the Vancouver Barracks commander favored the restoration and promised that the remaining buildings of the Spruce Division cut-up mill would be removed from the site to accommodate the restoration. The Prunarians were successful; Representative Johnson introduced a $60,000 bill to complete restoration of the Hudson’s Bay Company fort by July 1, 1925 in time for its centennial celebration. Calvin Coolidge signed the bill (43 Stat.1113; HR 10472) on March 4, 1925, which once again had no funding.

Without any appropriations, it was too late to restore or properly mark the fort site in time for the celebration of the Fort Vancouver centennial. Instead, a small parade passed through downtown Vancouver on March 19, 1925, to commemorate the establishment of the original fort. Forty acres at the Barracks were leased for the celebration and the executive committee of the Old Fort Vancouver Centennial Board still wished to generate interest in restoration of the stockade.

Not until 1930 did a legislator again attempt to raise funds to preserve the site. Senator Wesley Jones introduced another bill calling for the "reconstruction of the historic edifice upon its exact site in Vancouver Barracks." This bill requested $30,000 for reconstruction of the fort, to be completed by July 1, 1931. Brigadier General Paul A. Wolf, the commander at Vancouver Barracks, wished to locate the exact site of the fort and determine how it was originally constructed. But, again, Senator Jones's bill was sidetracked and eventually killed during a committee study. Two years later similar legislation met the same fate.

A more concerted effort to create a monument on the Fort Vancouver site came
Chapter Two

in early 1935. Fay Peabody, chairman of the Old Fort Vancouver Restoration Committee, an entity created by the Vancouver Chamber of Commerce, wrote to Washington State Governor Clarence D. Martin on February 28. She described the new plans for restoration, which included obtaining the original Fort Vancouver site at Vancouver Barracks where a replica would be erected, rebuilding the Chief Factor's house and other log buildings, and constructing a museum. "Bearing in mind, that our picturesque Northwest is the youngest, most beautiful and romantic section of the country," wrote Fay Peabody, the fort should be reconstructed "in memory of the struggles of the brave Pioneers who so heroically suffered deprivations to conquer and civilize the land that has become so rich and plentiful."\(^{15}\)

Fay G. Peabody's and the Vancouver Historical Society's efforts to gain the support of Governor Martin and Washington State Senator H.L. Nelson were helped along by the mayor of Vancouver, the Chamber of Commerce, the Board of County Commissioners, as well as Senator Schwellenback and Congressman Martin E. Smith.\(^{16}\)

In addition to the fort restoration, Fay Peabody wanted to build a shrine for the oldest apple tree that still stood in the area, including a museum and commemoration of the local apple industry. Her cryptic proposal called for the "Erection of small Registry House, (Old English Rustic Summer House) Housing Concrete Pedestal, to which Large Registry Book is chained--Inside on wall Bronze Tablet or Placque, containing genuine History, ...Adjoining property to be beautifully landscaped, creating Picture to be remembered by all."\(^{17}\)

If nothing else, Fay Peabody's efforts prompted Washington Congressman Martin Smith to contact Harold L. Ickes, secretary of the Interior, to request that the newly appointed Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments conduct a field study on the feasibility of reconstructing Fort Vancouver.\(^{18}\)

A coalition of Vancouver civic groups--the Chamber of Commerce, the County Planning Commission, and the City Planning Commission--headed by Howard J. Burnham, the chairman of the Vancouver City Planning Commission, also requested that the National Park Service, Branch of Historic Sites and Buildings, look at three possible sites for
reconstruction. Under the direction of Charles West, undersecretary of the Interior, Olaf T. Hagen, acting chief of the Western Division Branch of Historic Sites and Buildings, conducted the investigation.

Each member of the Vancouver coalition had their own interest in a particular site being considered. The Vancouver City Planning Commission preferred the site which Fort Vancouver occupied from 1825 to 1828, on which the State Deaf School was located. "Not only does this location on the brow of the hill offer an unobstructed view of the Columbia," wrote Howard Burnham to Olaf Hagen, "but, with the proposed relocation of the Evergreen Highway (US 830), the hillside lends itself to effective landscaping as viewed from the lower road. Then, too, this is the actual site of the original Hudson's Bay Company development of the region." The Chamber of Commerce also wanted to option or acquire this land immediately south of the State Deaf School if the restoration project was to be approved. A second possible site was riverfront property which "falls short of being satisfactory," according to Hagen. The Port of Vancouver owned the land and did not care to donate it for a monument. The riverfront property was also subject to overflow from the Columbia River in the spring. Oddly enough, the Vancouver coalition did not consider the present site, the site occupied by the Hudson’s Bay Company from 1829 to 1860, to be feasible. Howard J. Burnham lamented that "any attempt to acquire a portion of the Military Reservation would at best entail a delay of years. Consequently, we see no reason for even considering any of the land adjacent to the Old Apple Tree."19

In Olaf T. Hagen's final "Report on the Preliminary Investigation of the Proposed Old Fort Vancouver Restoration," of May 30, 1936, he agreed with this assessment. He only investigated the first two sites. The present site was identified as a long shot as it was within the limits of Pearson Field, an Army Reserve aviation field, and the War Department would probably "strenuously oppose any efforts to deprive them of this area for historical purposes or sentimental reasons."20 Perhaps more sobering, though surprisingly modest to us today, was the estimated cost of the project: $49,630 to reconstruct the bastion, stockade, dwellings, museum, trading post, factor's house, and
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shrine for the oldest apple tree. The cost did not include archaeological work. Hagen, however, cautioned that though the original fort site deserved attention as a historic site, the restoration project fell into a different category all together; it would be regarded as a "creative development rather than a project for preservation." As such, Hagen recommended that "final action be delayed" until further study and concrete plans could be made.21

Perhaps because of Hagen's remarks on the unavailability of the original fort site, two years later on November 19, 1937, the Senate Military Affairs Committee introduced a bill to allow the City of Vancouver to construct and maintain a memorial on the western edge of Vancouver Barracks, including a replica of Fort Vancouver.22 The bill passed the House on March 21, the Senate on March 25, and was signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on April 5, 1938 (52 Stat. 195; HR 8460). However, it was a permissive measure only and local interests once again found themselves without the means to follow through on the reconstruction proposal.23

In May 1938 the Washington State Historical Society asked that the location of Fort Vancouver be delineated with stone markers flush with the ground. This plan was opposed by some of "the younger officers, then at [Vancouver Barracks] for the reason that it would interfere with their games of polo, and the project was accordingly dropped."24 Perhaps a minor consolation, on June 12, 1938, the "Oregon Society of the Daughters of 1812 erected a historical marker at the approximate site of the old Hudson's Bay Company's graveyard northeast of the 10th street entrance to the Barracks." They prepared an elaborate dedication ceremony.25

Possibly because of the disappointments in 1938 the Old Fort Vancouver Restoration Committee disbanded. However, on March 9, 1940, the Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society formed to continue the local support for a monument at Fort Vancouver. The original board of directors included Henry Rasmussen, president, Ray Bachman, the publisher of The Columbian, Roy Seeley, Chas. Mook, P.M. Kane, H.J. Kesler, and Marion Sexton. According to Donald Stewart, a founding member of the Historical Society and Vancouver architect, the society made an
agreement with the Army, in conjunction with the 1938 legislation, to lease an acre of land near the oldest apple tree where Interstate 5 now runs through the Barracks in order to reconstruct a model of Fort Vancouver. Donald Stewart, a local architect, drew up the plans for a scaled-down model of the fort. However, the outbreak of World War II prevented the historical society from pursuing this miniature version of a reconstructed fort.26

Two events dramatically changed the direction of efforts for recognizing Fort Vancouver. The war ended and, on December 6, 1946, the Army declared a large portion of Vancouver Barracks, which was no longer needed to house troops, as surplus property. The War Assets Administration acted as trustee to distribute the surplus property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

Though Burt Brown Barker, then president of the Oregon Historical Society, remembers that his organization "originated the movement to secure the land and actually put on the campaign to get the bill passed," the Washington State Historical Society, the Oregon Historical Society, and the Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society, which was reactivated on January 15, 1947, pushed Congress to obtain the needed surplus property and declare the original site of Fort Vancouver a national monument.27

Indeed, Chapin D. Foster, director of the Washington State Historical Society (WSHS), contacted Howard J. Burnham, then owner and president of the Clark County Title Company in Vancouver and active in the WSHS, to ask him how best Washington could preserve the site of Fort Vancouver since it had been declared surplus property. Burnham suggested that they try to interest Congress in the project. As Burnham wooed Washington legislators, local Portland businessman Alfred A. Loeb began a letter-writing campaign to Oregon Senator Guy Cordon. Loeb stressed in his letter to Cordon that a national park or monument at Fort Vancouver would be both historically significant and economically lucrative to Portland and Vancouver, bringing in "millions of dollars yearly." He recommended "that portion of Vancouver Barracks from and including the row of Officers’ houses south to the Evergreen Highway and from McLoughlin Road on the
West easterly to the Eastern boundary of the reservation" be included in the site. Ironically, Loeb's proposal did not include the original fort location because there were still Army buildings there, though a "plaque could be put on the spot and four concrete posts could be erected to give an outline of the original site."  

For the first time since the Olaf Hagen report, the National Park Service also showed interest in developing plans for the Fort Vancouver site. By October 1946, the Park Service regional historian, Dr. Aubrey Neasham, recommended that an archaeologist be sent to Vancouver to examine the area to locate the old stockade and its extant buildings before boundaries were recommended for legislation.

In December 1946, the Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society selected a new board of trustees which included local architect Donald J. Stewart and Howard J. Burnham. Though not directly in touch with the Park Service at this time, the board resolved, with the urging of the Washington State Historical Society, to ask the National Park Service to restore and administer 75 acres at the old fort site. The areas that the historical society wished to preserve included:

(1) That area South of what is known as officers' row to East Fifth Street from the present Eastern boundary of Vancouver Barracks Military Reservation to McLoughlin Road, and (2) That area within two (2) hundred feet of what is known as the First Apple Tree now enclosed within a chain fence (3) The building known as "General Grant's quarters," and (4) The Military Cemetery.

By January 1947, the Park Service realized the urgency of local efforts to establish a monument and stepped up its own efforts to locate the fort and its surrounding archaeological sites. In the spring of 1947 both Washington and Oregon state legislatures passed resolutions urging Congress to set aside land in Vancouver Barracks for a national monument. The Park Service contacted the Hudson's Bay Company and received copies of a detailed map of the fort drawn by Lt. Vavasour of the Royal Engineers in 1845. However, unlike the Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society, the Park Service did not see the value of reconstructing the fort. Secretary of the Interior Julius H. Krug informed Howard Burnham that "the agency will probably find it necessary to have recourse to museum or memorial treatment and site preservation rather than restoration, inasmuch as the Hudson's Bay Company's buildings
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have long been destroyed and conjectural reconstruction based on sketches or paintings would have limited value."33 The Park Service was more interested in preserving cultural resources than bringing in tourist dollars, even if it meant "millions of dollars yearly."

As the Park Service and local historical societies began to work together to develop a plan to protect the fort site, the City of Vancouver made its own bid to the War Assets Administration for some 135 acres of surplus land in the Vancouver Barracks, "including Pearson airfield, plus rights of way for four east-west streets and one north-south street." Despite the Park Service's effort to establish a monument, the city wanted to appropriate 29 acres "between McClelland Road on the south and Grant Street on the north" to create its own Fort Vancouver. To the north of Grant Street, the city wanted land to build General U. S. Grant's log house, locate a public library, and establish a recreational park north of E. 13th Street and south of E. 18th.34

On March 12, 1947, the Park Service Region Four Director O. A. Tomlinson traveled to Vancouver to confer with the Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society and the Vancouver Chamber of Commerce about the potential monument. (The National Park Service's Region Four, which later became the Western Region, had headquarters in San Francisco and would oversee the administration of any monument created in the Pacific Northwest.) After much discussion with the War Assets Administration, the National Park Service made formal application to the War Assets Administration for the old Fort Vancouver stockade site in Vancouver Barracks.35

In conjunction with the application for surplus land, U.S. Representative Fred Norman asked Newton B. Drury, director of the National Park Service, to draft legislation to authorize Fort Vancouver National Monument "withholding from further disposition a general area of about 200 acres of the present Vancouver Reservation."36

Since both the Park Service and the city wished to obtain a portion of the land south of 5th Street where the fort had been located, the War Assets Administration had to reconcile the two requests. Park Service Historian Aubrey Neasham and Planner B.F. Manby visited the site in April 1947 and met with city officials and the War Assets
Administration to clarify their respective applications for surplus land at Vancouver Barracks. The Park Service could not go forward with its plan for a monument without locating the original fort site which had been generally situated with the help of a map created by Lt. M. Vavasour of the Royal Engineers in 1845. But the city, whose application for surplus property had been filed before the Park Service, had to agree to revise its plans.37

Unfortunately, the War Assets Administration representative, C.E. Zimmer, who was handling the Park Service application, fell ill in early April and two other agents took over. They planned to give the city full title to the entire Pearson Airfield parcel and the fort site while the Park Service application was in Zimmer's desk.38 The change of War Asset Administration players seems to have changed the outcome of the earlier negotiations between the Park Service and War Assets Administration. O. A. Tomlinson, Park Service regional director, explained it to his boss in Washington, DC:

It appears that because we signified our desire not to accept the whole of Pearson Field and then give the City of Vancouver a special use permit for that part to be used as an airport, the War Assets Administration felt they could accomplish the same result by deeding to the City of Vancouver the entire field with the understanding that they would in turn grant the Park Service a permit to use the Hudson Bay Stockade area.39

Of course, the City of Vancouver saw the situation from a different angle. Before the surplus land issue was even settled, it had graded land south of 5th Street in preparation for construction of several hangars for Pearson Airpark. It was not until April 23, 1947, that the City of Vancouver agreed to withdraw its application for the 15-acre tract south of 5th Street covering the southern portion of the fort site. The Park Service revised its own application to encompass the fort site land, but only after Regional Planner B.F. Manby agreed to several concessions to the City of Vancouver:

"1. To adjust the east and south boundaries, 2. To place only flat markers at the fort site, and 3. to restrict visitors from walking out onto the fort site."40 But, again, the compromise agreed to by the Park Service was not so simple. The city did not immediately agree to release the fort site for use as a monument.

In May 1947, in a letter to W.K. Peery of Vancouver, Chapin Foster requested a
progress report on the monument legislation and the Park Service plans for reconstruction. He was disappointed in the small 15-acre tract of land requested for the initial site; "I wondered just what they had in mind, or if they are thinking of a mineature [sic] restoration rather than full-scale." What the Park Service had in mind, however, was more ambitious than just preserving the old Fort Vancouver fort site. By the fall of 1947, $7,500 was earmarked for Louis Caywood to excavate the fort site and Tom Vint, Ronald Lee, and Aubrey Neasham had devised a plan which placed an overlook museum on the east end of the parade ground. In order to accomplish this, the Park Service needed further negotiations with the Army for surplus land as well as a concerted effort to pass legislation and funding to create a monument. But, the Park Service had limited its application for land to the small site of the original fort, barely large enough to be considered a "Historical Marker Site." By September 1947, Vint, Lee, and Neasham convinced the National Park Service of the significance of Fort Vancouver and the need for more land including the Barracks parade ground. The regional office, however, insisted that congressional appropriations had to be assured before the Park Service could commit to the monument land, thus producing a chicken-and-egg situation.

Because of the conflicting applications for surplus land, many local supporters of the proposed monument were worried that Congress would not designate enough land for the purpose. Burt Brown Barker of the Oregon Historical Society was especially adamant about the need for including not only the fort site but the Parade ground north of Evergreen highway as well. "We want all the land south of the highway," wrote Barker to Senator Guy Cordon, "excluding, if we must, the flying field. I realize that flying fields as small as the one in Vancouver will very soon be outdated. But the significance of this old post will last as long as we are an independent people."

And though the city had verbally agreed to release the fort site earlier that year, it changed its position when the Civil Aeronautics Administration expressed objections to using the fort site for anything but airport-related activities. Indeed, the City of Vancouver's Mayor Verne Anderson indicated that the city might want to establish the
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Remains of the post molds of Fort Vancouver's west stockade wall of 1828-29, found by Louis Caywood in excavation of 1947. (Louis Caywood.)
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monument itself. In November 1947, the National Park Service met with the city, the War Assets Administration, and the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The city decided it did not want to release the airfield property from its surplus land application for a national monument. Raymond Hoyt’s teletype to the regional director said it all: "Meeting with CAA, WAA, and City not at all successful. Will report in person Friday." 45

Not only did the City of Vancouver decide it would maintain its original application which included half of the fort site, but the mayor said the city also wanted to acquire the parade ground as a city park which he then wanted the Park Service to administer. 46 It took the intervention of National Park Service Director Newton Drury in December 1947 to force the War Assets Administration to delay its decision on any disposition of the surplus land until legislation was enacted to define the boundaries of Fort Vancouver National Monument. 47 The delay triggered a new round of negotiations with the city and a new opportunity for compromise.

But, the city’s resistance to the proposed monument continued into the following spring. On March 23, 1948, when Congressman Russell V. Mack introduced a bill (H.R. 5957) calling for 125 acres for a national monument, the City of Vancouver voiced dismay at the size, thinking it would be much smaller. 48 Surprisingly, Mayor Anderson called a meeting for March 30, 1948 and announced that the city would relinquish its claim to the fort site on Pearson field provided that the Park Service restrict the use of the site. The city also withdrew its application for the parade ground. Instead, the city would apply for surplus riverfront property and build a park. 49

Perhaps this concession to the Park Service was in exchange for another concession the city wanted. In April 1948, Mayor Verne Anderson called a meeting with Donald Stewart, president of the Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society, and Ray Bachman, publisher of the local newspaper The Columbian, to discuss the amount of acreage to be requested by the pending monument legislation. No representatives from other interested agencies, such as the Oregon Historical Society or the Washington State Historical Society—in particular Burt Brown Barker or Howard Burnham—were
invited. The mayor assured Representative Mack that "all interested parties were present, including representatives of the various government agencies involved in the area incorporated in the original Vancouver Barracks property." Mack indicated that the National Park Service had estimated that "the acreage they would require at any time would not be in excess of about 70 acres and that if the maximum were placed at 90 it would be sufficiently high to take care of any error." In fact, the letter from C. Gerard Davidson, assistant secretary of the Interior, supporting the legislation asked for 125 acres for the initial monument.

According to Donald Stewart, certain members of the community feared that the 125-acre limitation would jeopardize the passage of the monument legislation; Congress might reject the whole package if it called for too much land. Others have suggested the city thought that the monument might take up too much valuable real estate, such as Pearson Airpark. It was also no secret that members of the business community and local City government always resisted interference by government agencies in local affairs. The Park Service presence meant one more bureaucratic busy-body breathing down their necks.

Soon after his meeting with the mayor, Representative Mack proposed an amendment to H.R. 5957 to change the size limitation for Fort Vancouver National Monument from 125 acres to 90 acres. Upon hearing this, Burt Brown Barker telegraphed Senator Guy Cordon asking why Mack had reduced the acreage of the proposed monument. Barker recalled later to Park Service historian John Hussey that "Senator Morse and I called on Representative Mack and he explained that a party of local people had opposed the passage of the act, and that he compromised with them by striking out 125 acres and making it 90 acres. Howard Burnham feared that the reduced acreage would be insufficient to include significant areas such as Kanaka Village which contained important archaeological sites. Political compromise again endangered the future of Fort Vancouver.

After the meeting between the mayor, Donald Stewart, and Ray Bachman, and Mack's subsequent legislative amendment, Howard Burnham called another meeting of
the Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society to introduce a different resolution to support "a grant of up to 125 acres for Fort Vancouver National Monument." Further, Burnham wished to castigate "as unauthorized and in direct contradiction of its continuing and expressed desire, any and all actions or commitments of any of its officers and/or representatives approving or agreeing to a reduction in the site area in said pending legislation." After Burnham's resolution, "all hell broke loose," according to one newspaper account. A special board meeting of the society was called on May 25, 1948, and within two hours the resolution was rescinded by pressure from Ray Bachman, and he denied there had ever been a secret meeting at the mayor's office with Representative Mack.57 The Columbian, in response, described Burnham's action as an "ill-advised effort on the part of one or two of [the society's] members to create disharmony in the ranks of those supporting the creation of a Fort Vancouver National Monument." The Burnham-supported resolution asking for 125 acres was "based on misinformation and lack of information."58

Whatever the controversy was over the initial acreage of the proposed monument, nearly everyone agreed on the need to establish a monument. An editorial in The Oregon Journal stated that "Fort Vancouver is one of the truly great historic shrines of the West."59 The authorization bill, reiterating an oft-used phrase, reminded all that Fort Vancouver had been "the cradle of civilization of the Northwest country."

On June 19, Congressman Mack's bill passed the Senate and was sent immediately to the President. Harry S Truman signed H.R. 5957 authorizing Fort Vancouver National Monument the same day. The act allowed the War Assets Administration to transfer up to 90 acres of surplus property in Vancouver Barracks to the secretary of the Interior without exchange of funds. The monument could not be formally established, however, until specific properties were transferred and notice of the transfer published in the Federal Register.60 And though the City had agreed to loosen its grip on the fort site, the Army still claimed portions of the fort site that were also essential to the monument. There were six more years of land claim debates before the Park Service could officially declare Fort Vancouver a monument.
The Long Debate Over Land, 1948-1954

The enabling legislation of 1948 authorized the establishment of Fort Vancouver National Monument, which would "include the site of the old Hudson's Bay Company stockade."[61] The War Assets Administration and the secretary of the Army received authority to transfer land to the Department of the Interior without exchange of funds. But, it had yet to be determined exactly what property would ultimately be part of the new monument. The Park Service and the City of Vancouver had reached an agreement on the boundary between their respective properties, but the Army had to agree where its own boundaries lay before the monument could be established.

Although no specific funds were appropriated to create a park administration in 1948, the Park Service found some money to keep the project at Fort Vancouver National Monument vital. Louis Caywood received $8,500 for the following fiscal year to continue the archaeological excavations at the fort site.[62] By the fall of 1948, Russell Mack became one of the biggest advocates of reconstruction at Fort Vancouver and in October met with Alfred Loeb and Howard Burnham to ask "how much more land we needed" to accommodate this reconstruction. As Caywood uncovered building after building of the original fort site, he estimated that 125 acres would probably be a more practical size for the monument grounds. Though Representative Mack had been quick to reduce the Monument to 90 acres in the enabling legislation, during a visit to the fort site with Louis Caywood and Alfred Loeb, he "wanted to know why we did not include the houses constituting Officers' Row" in the original site.[63] Mack suggested that the Park Service request $300,000 to $500,000 in its budget to restore the old fort and to build a museum on the site. He predicted that Vancouver would become a mecca for hundreds of thousands of tourists.[64] To put this change of heart into perspective, we have to remember that Russell Mack was on a campaign trip through his home district.

But, of more immediate concern, the Army threatened to take back two parcels of land which had been part of the Park Service's surplus property request from Vancouver Barracks. A portion of the fort site adjacent to Pearson airfield had been released by the City of Vancouver, but the Department of the Army wanted to withdraw the
northern portion of the fort site, which it called Parcel 2, for use by the National Guard and Organized Reserve Corps. The parade ground, called Parcel 3, also contained several Army buildings that the Park Service wanted to use as a staff residence, a museum, and storage, but which the Army now wanted to keep. The Park Service, however, had been assured by the secretary of the Army that the land was going to be declared surplus and that it would have priority rights to it.

In December 1948, Herbert Maier, associate director of Region Four, assured the Army that the land transfer was moving forward and "what is needed from our standpoint is the President's proclamation describing the boundaries." The Park Service, however, wanted the War Assets Administration to go ahead and demolish some of the surplus buildings before the final land transfer so that the park could justify its request for funds to develop this site. Public opinion supported the Park Service's acquisition of the entire fort site and parade ground. "STOP THE ARMY GRAB," a Columbian headline demanded. But the Park Service was caught in a bind. Herbert Maier wrote to Regional Director O.A. Tomlinson on January 11, 1949, that "since boundaries recommended are minimum requirements, Service should not compromise further but rather delay establishing monument until circumstances adjust themselves to permit securing most appropriate area." The Park Service was in the untenable position of having to show some tangible progress toward creating a monument in order to request appropriation of the necessary funds to create that monument. Yet, until the boundary question was solved, it could not develop the site.

Perhaps because of the Army's reluctance to release some property for Fort Vancouver National Monument, the City of Vancouver renewed its own claims to the old fort site. On January 13, 1949, the Park Service, the city, the Army, and the War Assets Administration met to review their land boundaries. Even though the Park Service had agreed several years earlier to some restrictions on the fort site, it had to again reassure the city that it "would place no buildings on the area, using only flat markers, and would not encourage our visitors to walk over the area." Raymond Hoyt, Park Service regional chief of land and recreational planning, noted that the mayor finally agreed that the City
of Vancouver would release its interest in the fort site. By a letter of January 25, 1949, the City of Vancouver Aeronautics Board released the fort site from its airport application but added that the transfer would be subject to an easement for aircraft.

In March 1949, Kenneth C. Royall, the secretary of the Army, informed the secretary of the Interior that the strip of buildings on the southwest side of the parade ground at Fort Vancouver National Monument was still "being considered for withdrawal from surplus for the use of the Organized Reserve Corps," though the Army had not formally requested it. The Secretary of the Interior replied that the historic parade ground is one of the principal features of the national monument project and ready access to it is important if the visiting public is to understand and appreciate the factors that led to the selection and development of the site by the Hudson's Bay Company as its capital in controlling the economic and political life of the Northwest.

The local community sent their complaints to Congress. Some of the Vancouver historical groups continued to blame the Army, and inadvertently the city, for the delay. Portland businessman and early supporter Alfred A. Loeb, in a letter to Representative Russell Mack pointedly suggested that the Congressman "look into this to learn why this transfer [to the Park Service] has not been made, as in the meantime the City of Vancouver has received title to the airport grounds, likewise to school property, all within the original Vancouver Barracks boundaries."

Though the southern portion of the fort site and the entire parade ground were legally transferred to the National Park Service on May 19, 1949, the Army continued to pressure Fort Vancouver about the parade ground property. In early June 1949, Secretary of the Army Gordon Gray requested a non-revocable permit to use five buildings on the south side of the parade ground. The Park Service agreed in principle to allow the Army to use four of the buildings "together with a portion of the old parade ground for the training of the Organized Reserve Corps, provided the military activities will not alter the appearance of the site, or interfere with the program for the development and public use of the Monument grounds." But the Army disliked the uncertainty of using buildings only on a year-to-year basis when the cost of maintaining them was high. Gordon Gray wanted to know that all buildings at the southwest corner
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of the parade ground would be available, and threatened to keep the northern portion of the fort site unless the Park Service exchanged it for the parade ground buildings.\(^{76}\)

On March 19, 1950, the local community reenacted the founding of the Hudson's Bay Company's Fort Vancouver for its 125th anniversary.\(^{77}\) This event reinforced the community's commitment to the establishment of the national monument. Indeed, local businessmen supported both appropriation of more land to the site and reconstruction of the fort. Alfred A. Loeb and Burt Brown Barker urged the Park Service and Congressman Russell Mack to secure the old Kanaka Village land west of the fort site which retained much of its archaeological significance.\(^{78}\)

A group of proponents from the Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society finally met with Louis Caywood and Army personnel to hash out a workable solution to a prolonged stalemate between the Park Service and the Army. The citizens' group, which included Alfred Loeb, Burt Brown Barker, Howard Burnham, Ray Bachman, Carl Landerholm, and Donald Stewart, proposed that the Park Service should be given the entire fort site while the Army retained the strip of buildings on the southwest corner of the parade ground. Fort Vancouver National Monument would keep the parade ground itself, but make it available for the Army's use. Then at some future date, the Army should also make the Kanaka Village property available to the Park Service.\(^{79}\)

As the director of the Park Service in Washington was trying to negotiate with the secretary of the Army, the general staff, and the Corps of Engineers, the Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society worked independently with General Robert A. McClure at Vancouver Barracks and the Department of the Army. Everyone in the Park Service and the Army seemed to agree with their sensible solution. The historical society, the Department of the Army, and the Park Service arrived at a "complete agreement" on June 20, 1950.\(^{80}\)

By August 23, 1950, the secretary of the Army, Frank Pace, Jr. completed the agreement with the secretary of the Interior and worked out the land transfer. And just as the Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society had suggested, the Park
obtain by transfer from the Department of the Army the lands [at the fort site] that are needed to establish the National Monument. In return, certain lands and improvements in [the southwest portion of the parade ground] will be transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Department of the Army for the use of the Organized Reserve Corps. [Parts of the parade ground] will be made available for military activities under restrictive permit.

In January 1951, Frank Hjort came on board as the first superintendent of Fort Vancouver National Monument. He immediately became embroiled in the negotiations over the parcels of Barracks land which were to be transferred to Fort Vancouver. B.F. Manby, Park Service regional chief of lands, informed the Region Four director that "All the lands deemed to be sufficient have not yet been transferred to the secretary of the Interior. Therefore, notice has not yet been published in the Federal Register and the monument has not yet been established and in consequence is still a 'project.'"

Because of the uncertain status of the monument, the Park Service thought it best to wait until the General Services Administration (GSA) approved the land transfers before negotiating a revocable agreement with the Army for the use of the buildings on the parade ground. The Army also insisted that the proposal go through military channels. Colonel Rodman, the commanding officer of Vancouver Barracks, worked with Frank Hjort to route any land documents to the Sixth Army Washington office for review.

The Army Corps of Engineers and the Park Service reached a tentative agreement in July 1952 that reaffirmed the Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society proposal. Instead of revising the respective land applications, however, the GSA would simply amend the original letter of land transfer to the National Park Service. However, after several years of negotiating, the Army found yet one more "Catch-22." According to Title VI, Public Law 155, 82nd Congress, approved September 28, 1951, any transfer of property whose value exceeded $25,000 required review and approval by the Senate Armed Services Committee. Unfortunately, the Armed Services Committee would not meet again until Congress convened January 3, 1953.

The transfer of property between the Army and the Park Service was completed
April 5, 1954. GSA Administrator E.F. Mansure amended the May 19, 1949 letter of transfer to recognize the basic exchange of the Fort Vancouver stockade site for a strip of property and buildings on the southwest side of the parade ground. In general, there was a feeling of relief. But, Superintendent Frank Hjort remained concerned that the monument had not yet been officially established. Herbert Maier, acting regional director, argued that Army officials and their decisions were "so frequently reversed, changed, or modified, orally and otherwise," he seemed reluctant to act too quickly.

But nearly 60 acres of land were now officially part of Fort Vancouver. And on June 30, 1954, the secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay, established Fort Vancouver National Monument by departmental order which was published on July 9, 1954, in the Federal Register. The lands within the monument boundary were finally preserved; no one could "appropriate, injure, destroy, or remove any feature of this national monument [nor] locate or settle upon any of the lands thereof." Secretary McKay traveled to Fort Vancouver in August 1955 to dedicate the monument as the climax of the Lewis and Clark Sesquicentennial celebration. The Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society presented McKay with a gavel to commemorate the occasion. Even though Secretary McKay's own ancestors had lived and worked with the Hudson's Bay Company at Fort Vancouver, he was cautious about the future of the monument. McKay wanted to restore the roads and trails of the old fort but

the reconstruction of the stockade and buildings is not favored. We would like to replant the orchard, fence in the fields and re-establish old wagon roads now forgotten [but] the National Park Service does not favor reconstruction of historic structures, particularly when most or all evidence of the original building has disappeared.

It would take a different decade, a different Park Service director, and a different congressional representative to turn this policy around.
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The Legislative History
of Fort Vancouver

Fort Vancouver National Historic Site is within the Third Congressional District of Washington State. This political designation has worked to its advantage since the representatives elected from the Third District have been strong advocates of the fort since its creation, for subsequent appropriations of funds, and throughout the process of expanding its boundaries in 1961. From Russell Mack to Julia Butler Hansen, who became one of the most powerful women in Congress as chairman of the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, from Don Bonker to Jolene Unsoeld, representatives from Washington have supported the reconstruction and development of the site. Though this chapter will not detail all the legislative battles fought for Fort Vancouver, it will highlight some of the issues and personalities which have brought Fort Vancouver national attention.

Some might say the early legislative history of Fort Vancouver was filled with abortive attempts at establishing a monument or memorial. Between 1915 and 1948, no fewer than eight bills were introduced in Congress to reconstruct the stockade, some of the bills only a few years apart. At least three were signed into law, but never amounted to anything since they received no funding. Other bills simply died, but each attempt brought the site closer to development.¹

It was not until 1947 that these efforts bore fruit. The Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society, the Washington Historical Society, and Portland Chamber of Commerce joined forces to persuade Senator Guy Cordon from Oregon and Representative Russell Mack, from the Third District in Washington, to prepare initial legislation to authorize a monument at Fort Vancouver.
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The States of Oregon and Washington also pressed for legislation. In February 1947, the Oregon State Senate passed a bill (House Joint Memorial 11) "memorializing congress to set aside tracts at Vancouver Barracks as a national monument under the direction of the national park service." The bill called for approximately 75 acres to be set aside and maintained by the National Park Service, including the old fort site and the old apple tree.² At about the same time, the Washington State Legislature passed House Joint Memorial No. 9 "urging Congress to appropriate adequate funds for the immediate acquisition, research, and construction of buildings constituting old Fort Vancouver."³

With pressure from both state legislatures as well as local historical societies and businessmen, Congressman Russell Mack introduced a bill on March 23, 1948, "To provide for the establishment of the Fort Vancouver National Monument, in the State of Washington, to include the site of the old Hudson’s Bay Company stockade, and for other purposes."⁴ The Committee on Public Lands and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs supported the bill to set aside no more than 90 acres. The secretary of the Interior also promoted the bill, estimating that "the probable cost for administration, protection, and maintenance of the national monument will be approximately $35,000" for the following fiscal year.⁵

President Harry Truman signed H.R. 5957 on June 19, 1948, thus approving the official act of Congress which authorized Fort Vancouver National Monument. The act allowed the War Assets Administration to transfer surplus property in Vancouver Barracks to the secretary of the Interior without exchanging funds. But, because of complicated negotiations between the Park Service and the Army, the land transfer was not completed until 1954.⁶

On June 30, 1954, Fort Vancouver National Monument was officially established. The secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay, whose ancestors had settled in or near Fort Vancouver, signed the departmental order (Dept. Order 19 FR 4204) which was published in the Federal Register July 8, 1954, passing administrative jurisdiction over 59.913 acres in Vancouver Barracks to the National Park Service.⁷
Ironically, even before the monument was established in 1954, the Park Service had reconsidered its position on the desired size of the site. A few interested parties, such as Burt Brown Barker, a prominent member of the Oregon Historical Society, insisted that the monument should include the site of the Hudson’s Bay Company employee town, Kanaka Village, to the west of the fort. Based on local interest and Louis Caywood’s archaeological findings, the Park Service regional office prepared a boundary study which prioritized parcels of land within the original Vancouver Barracks that were necessary to preserve and interpret Fort Vancouver. In October 1954, Secretary McKay formally requested that Senator Guy Cordon of Oregon introduce legislation to extend the boundaries of the monument by 136 acres. On January 16, 1955, Secretary McKay approved the proposal to extend the boundaries of the monument beyond the 90 acres "as a general planning objective."\(^8\)

Subsequent legislation supported the policy of expansion. Fort Vancouver National Monument was enlarged by nearly 15 acres by departmental order published in the Federal Register on January 23, 1958. The General Services Administration, then in charge of the surplus property at the Vancouver Barracks, transferred 6.5 acres of river tract and 8.3 acres of railroad right-of-way that extended across the southern portion of the site to prevent future adverse effects to the scenic view of the Columbia River from the monument.\(^9\)

The boundary study of 1955 also set parameters for legislation first introduced by Washington Representative Russell V. Mack in July 1958 to revise the boundaries and increase the acreage limitation for the national monument by 130 acres.\(^10\) The bill was to expand Fort Vancouver National Monument to a maximum of 220 acres and allow for the Park Service to change the name of the monument to Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. After a year delay, Mack reintroduced the same bill on January 7, 1959. Though $500,000 had been allocated for the development of a museum and portions of the site, the money was withdrawn for development of campgrounds and facilities in other national parks.\(^11\) Representative Mack's untimely death in 1960 left the Fort Vancouver bill on shaky ground, and all funding was withdrawn.
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Julia Butler Hansen and Fort Vancouver’s Ascendancy

Julia Butler Hansen had reached her early 50s, and had served for 20 years in the Washington State legislature, when she was elected to fill Russell Mack’s seat in Congress. Elected from the Third District in 1960, at the beginning of John F. Kennedy’s administration, she had significant support from both U.S. Senators Henry Jackson and Warren G. Magnuson, and established a close working relationship with National Park Service Director George Hartzog soon after he was appointed in 1964. She was also a powerful woman in her own right. Julia Butler Hansen’s description of the new President’s inauguration set the tone for her own tenure in Congress: “There was wind and snow and bitter cold, but President Kennedy’s voice, firm, strong and clear, pledging his support to the search for peace, as well as giving his pledge to the defense of America, was unforgettable.” In her turn, Hansen pledged uncompromising support for Fort Vancouver.

Julia Butler Hansen quickly took up where Russell Mack left off and, with the support of the Department of the Interior, re-drafted the bill to extend Fort Vancouver’s size. Citing the mid-1950 boundary study done by the National Park Service, George Abbott, the assistant secretary of the Interior, concluded that “certain of the adjoining tracts are essential to the fulfillment of the development and interpretive needs of the area, and that the existing acreage limitation is inadequate to meet those requirements.” In March 1961 the new secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, concurred with Abbott’s recommendations.

Julia Butler Hansen introduced the Fort Vancouver bill in the House on January 25, 1961, the first bill of her long career. Senator Henry Jackson introduced an identical bill in the Senate on March 2, 1961. Without any substantial opposition, the bill passed the House on May 1, 1961, and was referred to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. The Senate passed the bill June 22, 1961.

Hansen’s supporting statement cited both the historical significance of Fort Vancouver and the desire to stimulate “tourist development within our very beautiful state.” But rather than a purely political maneuver, her interest in Fort Vancouver
seemed to come from highly personal reasons. Not only had she grown up in Cathlamet, a town founded by a former Hudson's Bay Company employee, but she also honored local history:

During the 30's I visited rebuilt Fort Nisqually and I began at that moment to work wherever I could—in the speeches I used to make relative to Northwest history and my book—to awaken public interest in rebuilding Fort Vancouver as a historical monument, particularly for young people who have no knowledge of the Northwest as it once was when it was actually the outpost and bastion of trade and civilization.16

As her son David Hansen recalls, when Representative Hansen was a young child, she also knew people who had once lived and worked at Fort Vancouver for the Hudson's Bay Company.17

The significance of the pending change of status also heightened the growing importance of Fort Vancouver to the local community. Though a "monument" was not much different than an "historic site" according to Park Service terms and policies, in the public's eye the latter was far more descriptive. In the 1940s and 1950s, Fort Vancouver was considered primarily an archaeological site, and thus to be commemorated as a monument to its past use as a fur trade post. The Historic Sites Act of 1935, however, encouraged the Park Service to interpret and develop entire cultural areas, which included not just historic buildings and objects of national significance, but also representative historic periods and cultural events. By redesignating Fort Vancouver a national historic site, it seemed to become more significant than a static landmark; its new status would make people in the community take notice and perhaps persuade Congress to fund the fort reconstruction and encourage future planning of the larger site.18

Both the House and Senate had approved the Fort Vancouver legislation and the bill (75 Stat. 196) went to President Kennedy, who signed it June 30, 1961. The act revised the Fort Vancouver boundaries, redesignated its status to national historic site, and increased the acreage limitation by 130 acres to a total of 220. The act also allowed the secretary of the Interior to "acquire in such a manner as he may consider to be in the public interest the non-Federal lands and interests in lands within the revised
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boundaries." With several reasons to celebrate, Fort Vancouver hosted a dedication of the new legislation and the recently completed museum and Visitor Center on March 18, 1962.

Madame Chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee

By 1963, Congresswoman Julia Butler Hansen obtained a seat on the House Appropriations Committee. When she was appointed to the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee (chaired by Senator Alan Bible of Nevada), she was able to steer the course of development at Fort Vancouver as well as other Park Service projects. In July 1965, Julia Butler Hansen had arranged for Congress to appropriate $83,000 for the reconstruction of a portion of the fort stockade. She envisioned a two year schedule for reconstruction including historical research, contracting, and construction.

Besides her influence on the Park Service budget, Julia Butler Hansen maintained a close relationship with George Hartzog, director of the National Park Service from January 1964. "She and I always sat down together," Hartzog recalled in his recent book about the Park Service, "before she began to make changes in marking up the National Park Service portion of the appropriations bill, to discuss any items that may have surfaced during the hearing that were of further concern to her or members of the subcommittee." If Hansen taught Hartzog anything, it was that "there are really two Congresses--the House Appropriations Committee and the balance of Congress."

George Hartzog and Julia Butler Hansen had many similar ideas about park policy and development. Hartzog, for instance, was interested in living history demonstrations as central to site interpretation. With Congresswoman Hansen's and Senator Bible's help, Hartzog was able to withhold "a small reserve from the management appropriation...to be used for program innovations, such as living history." His interest in living history perhaps influenced the new direction that interpretation at Fort Vancouver took in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

Julia Butler Hansen had an informal, can-do attitude with everyone at Fort Vancouver. Superintendent Eliot Davis recalls that she would visit the site every year and ask, "What do you need?" Davis would give her a minimum dollar amount because
he was afraid that ad hoc appropriations would upset the Park Service budget. One year he decided to reply "Julia, we need a Master Plan." "What, you don't have a Master Plan?" she growled, "I'll go back and chew out the Director." "No, don't do that," Eliot Davis diplomatically suggested, "just ask them to see a copy of the Master Plan, and that should prod them to start the process." Within three weeks, Davis had architects, landscape architects, archaeologists and a budget. Once a Master Plan was in place in 1969, Representative Hansen could use that as a blueprint for appropriations instead of asking for funding piecemeal.24

She was especially supportive of the continued archaeological excavations at the fort site. In the summer of 1969, during a visit to Fort Vancouver, Julia Butler Hansen asked Dr. Robert Greengo of the University of Washington, and Paul Schumacher, Park Service chief of archaeological research, "how much additional archaeological research work was needed at Fort Vancouver." Schumacher estimated that the site needed about $500,000 for five years of intensive excavation to complete the research. Julia Butler Hansen simply added this amount to the National Park Service appropriation bill.25 At a time when many park projects were being cut back and austerity was the by-word, Fort Vancouver benefited from the favor of the Appropriation Committee's "Madame Chairman."

The 5-year archaeological program in the 1970s laid the ground work for significant reconstruction of the fort site and Julia Butler Hansen set aside $2,400,000 for a five-year reconstruction project.26 In order to start the reconstruction of Fort Vancouver, she executed another major coup in 1971 and 1972, by clearing the way in the Senate to fund the purchase of the Pearson Airpark property.27

But the congressional cornucopia was not necessarily bottomless. It was easy enough for Superintendent Donald Gillespie to assume in January 1974 that "$100,000 for final archaeological field work will be included in the 1975 National Park Service budget request."28 But, Julia Butler Hansen was fast approaching her retirement from a long distinguished career of public service. In one last gesture of support, she left Fort Vancouver with a nest egg of $500,000 for the 1975 fiscal year to continue the
reconstruction of the fort. She showed her support for Fort Vancouver one last time on April 19, 1974, when she was honored at the dedication of the completed stockade wall and bastion.

**The 1970s and 1980s: New Political Problems**

Though Representative Hansen remained in Congress until 1974, in 1970 legislative redistricting put Vancouver, Washington, into a new 4th District. Mike McCormack was elected to fill the new congressional seat. After Julia Butler Hansen’s retirement from Congress, Representative McCormack urged Sidney R. Yates, the new Chairman of the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, to support a bill for further funding of the Fort Vancouver Phase II reconstruction program. "Although this is a tight budget year coming up," McCormack told Yates in 1976, "I believe there is room and ample justification for this comparatively modest expenditure for a project that will forever touch the hearts and minds of generations to come." The "modest expenditure" amounted to $500,000 for 1977 to continue with reconstruction. McCormack justified the expenditure by reminding Yates that "in our Bicentennial year there is ample reason to continue the efforts at Fort Vancouver in a timely manner to establish it as a permanent and authentic national monument of our Nation's heritage." By 1980, Congressman McCormack, with some behind-the-scenes assistance from Julia Butler Hansen, was able to secure $590,000 for reconstruction of the blacksmith shop, the Indian Trade Shop, and the well.

In 1974, Donald Bonker was elected to serve the Third Congressional District of Washington State after Julia Butler Hansen retired. When redistricting in 1980 once again placed Vancouver in the Third District, Bonker was faced with new issues. He was very concerned about how the City of Vancouver’s Central Park Plan, which incorporated all the land within the old Vancouver Barracks, would affect Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. On March 16, 1984, he called an informal meeting to discuss public opinion on land use issues, including the Central Park Plan, Pearson Airpark, the Waterfront section of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, and the
disposal of Officers’ Row by the General Services Administration. Especially difficult was the question of Pearson Airpark’s future. Bonker emphatically indicated that he would not sponsor legislation extending the city’s use of the Airpark property beyond the year 2002. He also opposed the City of Vancouver’s attempts to trade 5th Street for more time at Pearson. Bonker’s tough stance on the Airpark was coupled with his belief that Fort Vancouver “has a tremendous potential for historical interpretation and that its attraction of visitors would be a large economic factor for the City and southwest Washington.” Congressman Bonker saw Fort Vancouver as a “Williamsburg of the West.”
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Jolene Unsoeld and the Historical Reserve Concept

In 1988, the uncompromising attitude of Julia Butler Hansen and Donald Bonker changed when Jolene Unsoeld stepped into the Third District congressional seat. Unsoeld was instrumental in obtaining $1,689,000 for the design and initial reconstruction of the Fort Vancouver fur store. However, she has been best known for her introduction of legislation to create a Historical Reserve in Vancouver. Early in 1989 Jolene Unsoeld met with NPS Reg. Director Charles Odegaard and Vancouver Mayor Bruce Hagensen to discuss draft legislation to develop a new master plan for the Vancouver area to "protect and enhance" Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, Officers’ Row, and Pearson Airpark. Reversing Don Bonker’s tough stance, Unsoeld proposed legislation which included the continuation of general aviation at Pearson beyond the year 2002, the integration of the three historical themes in the area, and the creation of a military museum at the Vancouver Barracks.
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By June, Unsoeld had solicited support from fellow congressional members Norm Dicks, Al Swift, Sid Morrison, Rod Chandler, John Miller, and Jim McDermott to request Sidney R. Yates’s support for a "Master Plan" study of the proposed Reserve site. More specifically, Unsoeld stated that the "master plan should take into account the need for continued general aviation use of the airport and should identify the other financial factors that might be used to help develop and sustain the historic potential of
the area." The catch-all plan would call for coordinated development and interpretation of three distinct historical themes: the 19th century fur trade, the U.S. Army occupation, and aviation history at Pearson field. In addition, legislation anticipated a military museum at Vancouver Barracks and additional land acquisition to buffer the entire Reserve from "incompatible development." Perhaps due to a budgetary crunch, Yates, chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee put the legislation on hold together with funding for all National Park Service studies.

In June 1990, a year after its original inception, Jolene Unsoeld again introduced legislation to establish a Vancouver National Historical Reserve. The legislation sought to establish a cooperative agreement and a Coordinating Commission to manage the Reserve which would include Vancouver Barracks and Military Cemetery, Officers' Row National Register Historic District, Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, Pearson Airpark, and the Columbia River waterfront. Within this Reserve, general aviation would continue at Pearson Airpark beyond the year 2002. The National Park Service opposed the legislation. Denis Galvin, National Park Service associate director for planning and development, in a hearing before the subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, warned that "administration of the reserve by a committee whose members represent diverse interests beyond historic preservation could threaten the integrity of Fort Vancouver, for which purposes have already been established by Congress."

The City of Vancouver, however, and certainly the supporters of Pearson Airpark, promoted the Historical Reserve concept and on November 5, 1990, President George Bush signed into law H.R. 5144 which created the Vancouver Historical Study Commission pursuant to Public Law 101-5. The Commission, with representatives from the City of Vancouver, the National Park Service, the Army, the State of Washington Historic Preservation Office, and an individual representing the general public, was established to study the historic, cultural, natural, and recreational significance of resources in the Vancouver area and to determine the feasibility of an Historical Reserve. They also had to prepare a final report including an inventory of the above resources, preservation and interpretation goals, propose management alternatives, and
make recommendations concerning the operation of Pearson Airpark and its compatibility with Fort Vancouver, all on an estimated budget of $300,000 and a time schedule that envisioned a final report on the feasibility of the Reserve within 18 months.  

To date, the Commission has met once a month to discuss the various management alternatives for and feasibility of the Historical Reserve. Though a final decision has not been made, the Commission's preferred alternative includes extending the use of Pearson Airpark for aviation beyond the original expiration date, 2002, as well as interpreting both 19th and 20th century historical eras at Vancouver Barracks, including military aviation. The Commission's final recommendations to the Secretaries of the Interior and Army were submitted on April 12, 1993.
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Site Planning and Development at Fort Vancouver

INTRODUCTION

Legislation made possible the creation and eventual expansion of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. But, once established, a site needs guidance to fulfill its potential; site planning and development bring a park concept to fruition and set goals for future management and interpretative programs. The general direction of planning for Fort Vancouver has changed dramatically over the past 45 years. From preserving the archaeological record to commemorating the fur trade and its cultural importance, to reconstructing the physical structures to present the public with a tangible piece of the "past," the Park Service has compromised some of their more restrictive policies towards reconstruction in order to develop the Fort Vancouver site.

LAND ACQUISITION AND ITS EFFECTS ON FORT VANCOUVER

A major component of the planning at Fort Vancouver revolved around land acquisition. After the initial 60-acre acquisition which established Fort Vancouver National Monument, the Park Service and local Vancouver supporters quickly realized that more land was needed to preserve the historic record. In the summer and fall of 1954, the commanding officer at Vancouver Barracks advised Superintendent Frank Hjort that the Army might declare 5.8 acres west of the fort site, which contained part of the historic Kanaka Village, surplus property. This property held one of the more important archaeological sites. John Hussey, Park Service regional historian, urged the Park Service to keep its options open to buy the property, but the Army was not yet ready to part with it.¹
Two other parcels, however, were transferred to the Park Service within the first decade of Fort Vancouver's existence. The General Services Administration released 6.5 acres of river tract lying between the City of Vancouver's Kaiser access road (Columbia Way) and the Columbia River to the National Park Service. The City of Vancouver had also been interested in this tract of land for development as a park, but did not have the funds to purchase it and could not assure the Park Service that the land would remain undeveloped under its ownership. Also in January 1958, the GSA asked the Park Service to administer a 100-foot-wide railroad right-of-way just north of the Kaiser access road. Together, these two parcels totaled 14.8 acres and were added to Fort Vancouver National Monument by a departmental order "enlarging" Fort Vancouver, which was published in the Federal Register January 23, 1958.\(^2\) These tracts of land assured that the scenic view from the monument to the historic riverfront would be preserved.

Two years later, the Army again prepared to release land at the Kanaka Village site to the National Park Service, but only if the Civil Air Patrol had adequate hangar space for planes at an alternate site.\(^3\) The Fort Vancouver Historical Society (originally the Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society) donated $50 toward the move to make room for monument expansion. The society also offered to donate the proceeds from a salmon bake for the purpose.\(^4\)

MISSION 66 planning also anticipated acquisition of more Army property including several historic roads, the Hudson's Bay Company cemetery, and all of the city-owned Pearson airfield.\(^5\) But Fort Vancouver National Monument was limited to 90 acres as set by Congress, and only after the legislation of 1961 expanded the ultimate boundary and changed the designation from monument to national historic site did the acquisition of the Kanaka Village and other related property become possible.

Indeed, by November 1962, the Army declared part of the Kanaka Village property surplus and the Park Service acquired 14.5 acres the following spring. The property included nearly half of the village site and old orchard "where the Hawaiian, Indian, and Canadian engagees of the Company lived," wrote Superintendent Frank Hjort. "Second to the fort site, this is the most important area associated with the
The land, however, was subject to an Army Aircraft Taxiway easement, which gave the Army unobstructed access from Vancouver Barracks to Pearson Airpark. The National Park Service received the property from the secretary of the Army, which brought the total area of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site to 89.123 acres in June 1963.7

In the late 1960s, the Park Service entered an era of wheeling and dealing for land at Fort Vancouver. Commercial development, freeway expansion, and the continued encroachment of Pearson Airpark put pressure on the site to actively pursue control over surrounding land uses. The proposed highway interchange was especially ominous. John Rutter, the regional director, feared that it would permanently obscure the western portion of Kanaka Village, leaving "no opportunity to carry out existing plans to interpret the village within the present boundaries by reconstruction of fences, marking house sites, erection of exhibits, etc."8

The regional director proposed that the Army give the Park Service a large parcel of land between Kanaka Village and the freeway where the interchange was going to be built. The Park Service would then trade a portion of the tract to the State Highway Commission for a strip of state-owned right-of-way at the southern end of Pearson field. In addition, the Army would give the Park Service a large tract of land southwest of the parade ground which encompassed the Hudson's Bay Company cemetery in exchange for the continued use of the western portion of the parade ground.

Needless to say, these land exchanges never occurred. However, since the Army land nearest the proposed interchange was part of the park's ultimate boundaries, the Highway Department negotiated with the Park Service to provide "improved access to the Historic Site together with adequate directional signs" in exchange for putting the interchange over the westernmost portion of Kanaka Village.9 The Washington State Highway Commission was even able to mitigate extensive damage to the site. Its study, S.R. 14 Interchange on Interstate Highway No. 5 and Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, required only 0.7 acres of land from the historical site. By May 1969, the Army, the Highway Department, and the Park Service agreed on "Alternate Plan No. 1," which
moved the ramp out of the middle of the Kanaka Village area and provided a screen of trees, shrubbery, or fencing to be "placed to preserve and compliment the environment of the Historic Site. The interchange and freeway would become a green park-like transition zone between the historic setting of the year 1845, and the modern urban business district of today." After the National Park Service purchased Pearson Airpark in 1972, the Park Service was able to trade 1.63 acres to the Washington State Department of Highways in exchange for 2.5 acres south of Pearson Airpark. The state was then able to construct the new SR 14 interchange on Interstate 5.

Another important land acquisition considered by the Park Service was a 30-acre tract of Veterans Administration property to the north of Fort Vancouver. In April 1969 the Park Service requested the 30 acres in hopes of negotiating a future trade with the city for Pearson Airpark and the 5th Street right-of-way. But both Clark College and the city had an interest in the site: the city for a golf course and the College for expanding its facilities. With the city uninterested in a swap for the Pearson property, the Park Service eventually withdrew its request for the 30 acres of Veterans Administration land.

Despite the importance of the exchange of highway property or the negotiating value of the Veterans Administration property, the 70 acres of Pearson Airpark property remained the highest priority for acquisition at Fort Vancouver. After years of negotiations with the City of Vancouver (which are detailed in Chapter Six of this report), the National Park Service purchased 72.57 acres of land that the Airpark occupied for $544,500. The city was limited to 30 more years of airport use by provisions in the Statutory Warranty Deed which would allow the Park Service to incorporate the land into its plans for Fort Vancouver development. The new land also expanded the size of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site to about 161 acres.

In February 1973 the Park Service petitioned the City of Vancouver to vacate 40 feet of East Reserve Street between Evergreen Boulevard and East 5th Street in order to expand existing utility and maintenance facilities. On March 21, 1973, Alan Harvey, the city manager, recommended that the City Council approve the street vacation, and City Ordinance No. M-1399 of April 13, 1973, granted the vacation, except an easement
for "the construction, repair and maintenance of public utilities and services." On May 6, 1973, the vacation of .46 acres of city right-of-way on East Reserve Street to the National Park Service was official. Owning the vacated portion of the street allowed Fort Vancouver to "construct an addition to our maintenance facility and build a covered picnic shelter adjacent to our present visitor center." 

Besides Pearson Airpark, the waterfront property had great significance to the development of Fort Vancouver. The Park Service had acquired a long strip of waterfront property in 1958, but in the spring of 1974 the Park Service requested 2.1 acres of old Coast Guard property which had once contained the historic boat landing and Hudson's Bay Company salmon house. The following spring Edward J. Kurtz, the acting regional director, resubmitted the request for the transfer of the Coast Guard Depot property, with "a proposed five-year program for restoration of the historic scene at the waterfront." In July 1975, the abandoned Coast Guard Station was finally transferred to Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. The station and pier were torn down and the National Park Service prepared a special use agreement with the city, and planning for the property was incorporated into the city's Waterfront Park development.

In April 1980, Superintendent James M. Thomson helped prepare the "Fort Vancouver National Historic Site Land Acquisition Plan," which in conjunction with the 1978 Master Plan identified priorities for future land acquisitions. The plan targeted the 14-acre parcel of Army land west of the historic Kanaka Village which John Rutter had wanted in 1969 and three to four acres of City right-of-way on 5th Street. The western land would allow the park to explore and excavate Kanaka Village further and the street right-of-way would allow the restoration of historic roadways and historic scene, integrating the fort site with the Visitor Center and parade ground.

Though Fort Vancouver National Historic Site has not acquired any new property since 1975, it continues to plan for the future development within its ultimate boundaries. It is unknown how the proposal for an Historic Reserve in Vancouver will specifically affect the land acquisition program at Fort Vancouver.
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MASTER PLANS AND BOUNDARY STUDIES

Early Development of the Monument

After Fort Vancouver National Monument was authorized in June 1948, O.A. Tomlinson, Park Service Region IV director, assigned Regional Historian Aubrey Neasham the task of putting together a preliminary development program. With the encouragement and help of the Oregon Historical Society, Neasham and Louis Caywood worked with locals to raise funds for the monument, while John A. Hussey, who worked under Neasham, prepared a preliminary outline for development at the monument.

Though Representative Russell Mack and local supporters had envisioned complete reconstruction of the old fort, Park Service personnel did not agree on the best direction for development at the site. In particular, the regional director opposed reconstruction of the fort. In November 1948, he wrote a local member of the Knights of Columbus that, "It is not the plan of this Service to 're-establish a replica of the site of Old Fort Vancouver.' No doubt most of the existing buildings will be removed and the area returned to its natural condition."ften

Other local interests, such as the mayor of Vancouver and City Council, were more interested in combining the development at Fort Vancouver with the needs of the city. In October 1948, Mayor Verne Anderson wrote Regional Director Tomlinson, to ascertain what lands the Park Service considered part of the monument and whether the city could coordinate planning. Park Planner Harold G. Fowler and Louis Caywood met with Mayor Anderson, Donald Stewart, a local architect, and other consultants and city planners only to discover that the city planned "to sound out the possibility of designing [a] civic center, in conjunction with Fort Vancouver National Monument, allowing the civic center to be all or partly within the proposed boundary of the monument." The city's plan set the tone for its continued relationship with Fort Vancouver. The Park Service felt pressure to fully use its property and provide visible signs of site development or risk the criticism and possible encroachment of the city.

Dr. John Hussey finished the first "Preliminary tentative outline" for Fort Vancouver National Monument in December 1948. Though Louis Caywood had located
the fort site, the Park Service had not yet determined how to interpret the landscape and cultural artifacts found during excavation. Hussey's tentative plan for development of the National Monument called for a main museum building located at a commanding position, with an "orientation parapet" that overlooked the original fort site. The fort would be "simply marked" on the four corners; the original building sites would be similarly treated. The museum room would house exhibit cases, dioramas, and murals depicting the life and economy of Fort Vancouver during the mid-19th century. The approximate cost would be $43,900 for the exhibits and museum interior. Hussey thought that a planting of Douglas fir around the perimeter could help isolate the monument from "unrelated modern buildings" already crowding the surrounding landscape."

Though the Park Service plans precluded recreating the original fort, Burt Brown Barker of the Oregon Historical Society and the Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society still favored reconstruction and requested that Congressman Russell Mack study the matter. Though Mack had openly supported the idea, by early 1949 he was unable to find any precedent for reconstruction of lost historic structures by the federal government. "Unless I can find such a precedent and thereby be able to say you did it before why not do the same thing again at Vancouver," Mack informed Donald Stewart, "I'm going to have difficulty in selling the restoration of Fort Vancouver idea to Congress." He suggested that the Historical Society instead look to the State Parks Department for funding since the "Park Service is cool to the idea of restoration of the old fort, preferring instead to build a cyclorama building and a museum."25

Indeed, lack of funding was one of the major deterrents to development at Fort Vancouver. During 1949, Fort Vancouver only had a $3,635 budget, barely enough to maintain Caywood's administration of the site.26 In July 1949, Acting Director Hillory A. Tolson solicited Senator Warren Magnuson to support the appropriation of $25,000 for the 1950 fiscal year to operate Fort Vancouver. Yet, Hussey's development plan for Fort Vancouver estimated a cost ten times that amount to construct roads and improve the grounds of the monument.27 And there was disagreement over how the funding
would be spent. Some local supporters of the monument still did not want to limit the site simply to archaeological excavation and a museum. Burt Brown Barker complained to congressional members that the Park Service frowns on reconstructing the fort and yet ask for $250,000 for buildings. What could that be if not for reconstruction. They talk of a museum. Heavens, the reconstructed fort would be the museum and they should have the museum in the fort. We can see no sense to building a museum at great expense and not reconstructing the fort. Visitors want to see reproductions--not museum buildings.28

Barker was not opposed to completing the archaeological work, but his words seem prophetic in predicting public tastes.

Not only did the public clamor for particular plans for the site, but restrictions and political pressures on the use of the site strongly influenced development plans at Fort Vancouver. For instance, an aircraft easement over the fort site limited interpretation possibilities. In 1950, the Park Service planned to simply mark the corners of the stockade with flat cement markers since visitors could not walk onto the site. The City of Vancouver had always asked that the fort be developed as a "Real Tourist Attraction," as one editorial headline demanded. The city was encouraged that the monument would make Vancouver "the archaeological center of the park service’s activities in the northwest, and possibly on the Pacific coast."29

The new estimate for the construction of a museum at Fort Vancouver was $150,000 in 1950. Another $50,000 was needed for the superintendent and employee residences and utility buildings. Despite local enthusiasm and support from Representative Russell Mack, Congress only appropriated a small amount to clean and grade the monument grounds, paint buildings, and repair and maintain existing buildings. Indeed, an old Army building at the south end of the parade ground had been slated as a temporary museum and administration building. The Army had just rehabilitated offices, class rooms, and a storage area, which Louis Caywood used as a center for his excavation work.30

When the first superintendent, Frank Hjort, came on board in early 1951, local supporters increased pressure to restore Fort Vancouver. But the regional office
remained reticent. In November, the regional historian, Aubrey Neasham, visited the site and advised Frank Hjort since no funds had been programmed for a reconstruction project and their research was not even complete, that the Park Service would favor an interpretative type of museum at the Monument rather than a full reconstruction of the stockade area. Before encouraging reconstruction projects, although they may have a real educational value, this Service should be sure as to what we wish to advocate. We are somewhat of a model in the State of Washington and what we do may be closely followed by State and local organizations.\textsuperscript{31}

**Developing the Landscape**

Though the early debate on reconstruction at Fort Vancouver reached an impasse with the Park Service tenuously upholding their preservation policy, the overall site still needed to be developed; the Park Service needed to show a good faith-effort to the community to keep the momentum going.

The first Master Plan Development Outline for Fort Vancouver National Monument, written under Frank Hjort in 1952, conceived a buffer zone around the fort site to protect its historic integrity.\textsuperscript{32} Land acquisition and landscaping were important parts of creating the proposed buffer zone. In the summer of 1951, Superintendent Hjort informed the regional director that the Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society had "very generously offered through several garden clubs located in this vicinity to furnish the shrubbery and plants necessary for landscaping some of our area in the event we can go ahead with the planning."\textsuperscript{33} The regional office skeptically replied that "It would seem undesirable for you to accept plant materials indiscriminately for landscaping the grounds; however, there is no objection to your accepting plant materials such as may be specified on planting plans prepared by this office."\textsuperscript{34}

But, no plan was forthcoming. The regional landscape architect estimated that landscape development would cost Fort Vancouver about $10,000. The estimate included landscaping the planned museum, monument grounds, residences, and utility area, as well as marking the location of buildings and other features at the fort site.\textsuperscript{35} Again, lack of funding put landscaping plans of the early 1950s on hold. Instead, Hjort
was content to make an inventory of the existing landscape features, showing the size, species, and location of vegetation, which might facilitate future landscaping plans prepared by the regional office.\textsuperscript{36}

\textbf{The First Boundary Study of 1954-55}

Some of the individuals who helped secure the initial legislation to establish the park were disappointed by the boundaries of the original monument. Burt Brown Barker, of the Oregon Historical Society, wrote Region IV Director O.A. Tomlinson that he was "keenly interested" in the Kanaka Village site west of the Fort Vancouver stockade. Indeed, he insisted that the "village, historically, and I suspect archaeologically, is as important as the fort. The fort represented one part of the life only, that of the gentlemen. The village represented the servants and other workmen's quarters."\textsuperscript{37}

Dr. Barker's persistence paid off. By the fall of 1953 he had lit a fire under Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon, who contacted National Park Service Director Conrad L. Wirth to emphasize the importance of the Kanaka Village area. Barker prompted the director's office to suggest that the regional office prepare "a study of the boundaries of Fort Vancouver to determine the ultimate ideal boundaries and to assemble historical data which could be used by the Service as justification for the acquisition of needed lands as they become available."\textsuperscript{38} And so the Park Service authorized the first boundary study of Fort Vancouver National Monument.

The irony was soon apparent. The 90-acre limitation legislated by Congress in 1948 had quickly become obsolete. In February 1954, Lawrence C. Merriam, the new Region IV director, asked the superintendent what his priorities were for Fort Vancouver land acquisition and ultimate boundaries. Frank Hjort ranked the surrounding parcels as follows: Priority "A", 70.92 acres which covered some Pearson Airpark land, but also land to the west of the fort site; "B", a 9.31 acre triangular piece which included part of Kanaka Village and spur railroad track east of the fort site; "C", a 12.68 acre strip east of the fort site, which encompassed two Hudson's Bay Company road paths; "D", 19.09 acres southwest of the parade ground which included most of the
cemetery and several other minor structures; "E", 22.17 acres divided between two
deparis on the extreme west and extreme east of the ultimate boundary; and lastly "F",
14.14 acres that included Officers' Row. These parcel configurations were very different
than later master plan acquisition maps because they were not based on single owner
parcels, but on proximity to the stockade site and importance to the cultural landscape.
The total acreage within the proposed ultimate boundary encompassed about 209.74
acres, so Regional Director Merriam suggested that legislation to increase the size of the
present monument place a 220-acre limitation on the site.39

John Hussey drafted a report to support the proposed ultimate boundary. In the
May 1954 report, Hussey insisted that the 90-acre limitation for the monument was
entirely inadequate for the proper preservation and interpretation of the area's
historical values. This situation is not critical at the present moment, because the
present use of the adjacent land as a military reservation and airport tends to
preserve the character of the landscape, which, in essence, has changed
remarkably little since Hudson's Bay days.

Yet, the Park Service feared that the surrounding property might soon be used for
commercial purposes which would destroy the historic scene and obscure the relationship
of the fort to the river "even from the elevated situation of the Monument headquarters
and interpretive center."40

Conrad Wirth, the National Park Service director, generally agreed with Hussey's
assessment. Further, he realized that Fort Vancouver, in light of its location on prime
real estate, had to be prepared to show the community how it would use the additional
land at the monument.41 However, the Park Service's initial request for secretarial
approval of the ultimate boundary report met a brick wall of opposition. The secretary
of the Interior quickly returned an October 4, 1954 memo from the National Park
Service director marked "not approved, orig. destroyed." Secretary Douglas McKay
wondered what circumstances brought about the 90-acre limit in the first place and why
the Park Service would want to change its mind at this time. Even after investigation,
the Park Service could "find nothing in the legislative history of the act to indicate why
Congress reduced the limitation from 125 to 90 acres, but the committee report on the
bill states that it was with the consent of this Service."42
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1961 Legislation - Fort Vancouver National Historic Site

On January 16, 1955, Secretary McKay finally approved the proposed boundary study for Fort Vancouver as a general planning objective. He then asked Senator Guy Cordon to seek legislation which would extend the site boundaries to the ideal limit. An additional 136 acres would be added to provide a clear view of the Columbia River and to include important areas adjacent to the fort such as Kanaka Village and the Hudson's Bay Company cemetery. Yet, it was Representative Russell Mack of Washington's Third District who on July 1, 1958, first introduced a bill requesting that the acreage limitation at Fort Vancouver National Monument be increased by 130 acres. The proposed legislation also meant to redesignate the monument as Fort Vancouver National Historic Site.43

The Fort Vancouver bill floundered for several years and Mack's untimely death in 1960 might have been the end of it, but Representative Julia Butler Hansen, elected to fill Mack's seat, made it her priority to get the legislation passed. On June 30, 1961, the bill passed, increasing the maximum size of Fort Vancouver to 220 acres, allowing acquisition of nonfederal lands within the revised boundaries based on the 1955 boundary study, and designating Fort Vancouver a national historic site. The new designation gave Fort Vancouver higher visibility—perhaps even more clout—in local political struggles and opened the way for a change of direction in development and planning.

MISSION 66 Planning

The 1955 boundary study not only served as a basis for new legislation, but it also inspired much of the planning behind the MISSION 66 program for Fort Vancouver. MISSION 66 was a 10-year program to develop the park system to its fullest potential by 1966, in time for the 50th anniversary of the National Park Service. The Park Service estimated some 80 million visitors traveled to the parks annually by that time and wanted to provide adequate and modern facilities at all the units of the system.

At Fort Vancouver, the MISSION 66 Master Plan, prepared by the
superintendent and other staff members, contemplated new visitor facilities and resurrected the debate on reconstruction. The debate in the early 1950s focused on whether or not to reconstruct. The National Park Service felt it was not in the business of running theme parks, but, since Fort Vancouver had no visible remains left from the historic period, it felt the site needed to provide some sense of the historic scene. Indeed, by 1959 the public complained that the Park Service had been dragging its feet on the basic construction of a museum and visitor’s center for Fort Vancouver. The Vancouver Columbian complained that the city was "very disappointed in the lack of progress being exhibited in developing the Monument. The National Park Service is giving Fort Vancouver the 'runaround,' if you ask us."

Between 1952 and 1964 Fort Vancouver staff wrote a Master Plan for the Preservation and Use of Fort Vancouver National Monument, Mission 66 Edition. The plan identified the site itself and the "great wealth of material objects [which] have been recovered through archaeological investigations" as the most significant resource of the monument. The plan envisioned a monument whose focus was on research, an interpretive theme which encompassed the fur trade and settlement of the Northwest, and an interpretive method which would principally be "self-guiding, employing the visitor center for initial orientation and to prepare the visitor for interpretive excursions over the historic grounds." Land acquisition as suggested in the 1955 boundary study, rather than reconstruction, was the most important step in site interpretation. In fact, the Master Plan only cautiously speculated that if reconstruction occurred, the structures "shall be clearly distinguished as only replicas of the original Fort Vancouver structures." The MISSION 66 Plan, however, encouraged historical research which might contribute to authentic restoration and reconstruction.

It was the 1961 legislation supported by Representative Hansen which finally opened the door to change. Not only did it allow for the MISSION 66 building program to continue, including a Visitor Center, housing for employees, and maintenance buildings, but the expanded boundary and more serious designation as national historic site broadened the opportunity for funding at Ft. Vancouver. Yet, despite new plans for
The legislation which created Fort Vancouver National Historic Site in 1961 also provided funding for the MISSION 66 building program, including the Visitor Center, which was dedicated March 18, 1962. (National Park Service.)
visitor facilities, the fort site remained full of asphalt pads. As Frank Hjort, the superintendent, remarked to the regional director, "The existing flat markers are not impressive as they leave quite a bit to the imagination." He hinted that "two hundred feet of stockade wall east of the bastion [would] make an excellent backdrop for the newly planted orchard."\(^{47}\)

But the Park Service was still hesitant to plan for reconstruction of the fort. Even after the City modified the avigation easement over the fort site in February 1962, freeing some of the restrictions on its use, Regional Director Lawrence C. Merriam told Hjort that he was reluctant to schedule the stockade reconstruction right away. He took a wait-and-see attitude, hoping that the new museum would take care of interpretive and educational needs.\(^{48}\)

**Revising the Boundary Status Report**

Due to the growing public demand for the reconstruction of the original stockade, Lawrence Merriam, who had initially rejected the idea, agreed in July 1962 to "a partial reconstruction of the Fort Vancouver stockade, including the northwest bastion."\(^{49}\) Since the city had already modified the avigation easement over the fort site which had precluded even basic reconstruction, the Park Service was now receptive to reconstruction. But it was still not forthcoming with funding and interested local organizations started looking for private sources of funding.

By September 1963, the Vancouver Chamber of Commerce told Hjort's replacement, Superintendent Harold Edwards, that it wanted "to restore our fort site according to NPS plans and specifications by providing required materials and labor at no cost to the government."\(^{50}\) Private funds would be solicited from the public and local civic groups. Park Service Architect Charles Pope recommended rebuilding portions of the stockade to which the regional director had agreed. But reconstruction was no cheap proposition. Park Service Director George Hartzog, in a letter to Representative Julia Butler Hansen in February 1965, assured her that "we fully intend to carry out this reconstruction if funds for the purpose are provided in the 1966
appropriations." And costly it was. In 1965 dollars, the estimate for total reconstruction of the stockade and the buildings within was $1 to $2 million.\footnote{51}

There were some members of the public who had mixed feelings about the reconstruction of Fort Vancouver. At City Hall, for instance, the mayor and City Council anticipated increased controversy and problems if the Park Service reconstructed the fort, since the avigation easement had not been removed from the site.\footnote{52} Indeed, newly appointed Regional Director Edward A. Hummel raised "grave questions of practicability and feasibility" of the reconstruction project in September 1965, in light of the continued existence of an avigation easement (albeit modified) over the fort site. The Western Regional Office finally decided on a compromise: it was "desirable to have the bastion project approved so that reconstruction can go ahead should avigation easement limits permit construction on the original bastion site and should it be considered desirable to reconstruct the blockhouse in lieu of part of the palisade."\footnote{53}

During the mid-1960s a new boundary study was conducted for Fort Vancouver. It is unclear exactly why the Park Service ordered the study since the 1955 boundary study had identified those surrounding properties most important to restoring Fort Vancouver's cultural landscape. Perhaps it emerged from the pressure to reconstruct the fort and the city's uneasiness with the various plans being discussed. Indeed, no overall master plan existed for the site and "no Master Plan study of Fort Vancouver is scheduled for the near future," wrote the regional director in June 1966. "Because of the uncertain status of the Army, Veterans Administration, and airport lands adjoining the existing boundaries, we believe it important that we be able to take prompt action should additional lands become available, and for such action an approved future boundary is a prerequisite."\footnote{54}

Superintendent Eliot Davis, Harold Edwards' replacement, had submitted his recommended ultimate boundaries to the regional office the previous February and urged quick approval by the national director. Yet, once again, the Vancouver community had mixed reactions to the study. Regional Director Edward Hummel lamented that
a large portion of the land within our proposed ultimate boundaries has already been zoned by the City of Vancouver as 'light industrial,' and should this land become surplus (as could happen at any moment) there would be strong local pressure exerted to have this property turned over to the city for commercial use instead of going to the National Park Service.\textsuperscript{55}

After many months of study and land surveys, the Western Regional Office approved the Boundary Status Report on October 21, 1966, which recommended the acquisition of 122.43 additional acres in 7 separate tracts for expansion of the site. At that time, Fort Vancouver National Historic Site covered 89.10 acres. Unlike the 1955 boundary study, the new recommendations did not include Officers' Row, but did include additional land along the Columbia River, some of which had been acquired by Fort Vancouver in 1958. The status report justified the addition of 122 acres to the site in order to preserve those areas important to the historic Fort Vancouver complex, but outside the immediate environs of the stockade, especially "the essential relationship between the fort and the Columbia River."\textsuperscript{56}

Ironically, the Washington Office never approved the new Boundary Status Report, even though it seemed to simply reiterate the well-established purpose and priorities of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. The reasons for the delay appeared technical rather than substantive. For instance, in April 1967, the Division of New Area Studies and Master Planning chief, Russell E. Dickenson, told the regional director that several of the tracts had wrong legal descriptions.\textsuperscript{57} For Fort Vancouver, the approval of the Boundary Status Report became even more important because of the city's continually changing plans for the use of its own land. The Park Service feared that the city would abandon the airport and use the property for industrial development despite the restrictions placed on the property by its original deed. And the city might further develop the Airpark property. Eliot Davis learned in 1968 that the City Airport Committee had made an official request to the Army for the property southwest of the parade ground, which encompassed the Hudson's Bay Company cemetery, if it ever became surplus. The city wanted to build a motel, gas station, swimming pool, and restaurant for Airpark passengers and pilots. If the freeway interchange was built, the Airport Committee would instead move the concessions "to the south side of the main
runway at a point approximately south of [Fort Vancouver's] Visitor Center."\(^{58}\)

As late as March 25, 1968, Eliot Davis complained that "Our ultimate boundary proposal is still in the Washington Office unapproved."\(^{59}\) But by this time, a comprehensive master plan was in the works, and the urgency to clarify Fort Vancouver's ultimate boundaries had diminished.

**The 1969 Master Plan**

The first glimmer of master planning after the MISSION 66 construction came in 1964, under the brief administration of Harold Edwards. In 1964, Superintendent Edwards helped prepare the "Draft Master Plan of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site." Edwards planned to rebuild the stockade and buildings, as well as graze oxen and herds of cattle in restored pastures to help the visitor visualize the conditions of 1845.\(^{60}\) To accommodate his plan, however, Edwards recommended purchasing the eastern half of Pearson Airpark, owned by the Spokane, Portland, & Seattle Railroad, and giving it to the City of Vancouver in exchange for a release of the avigation restrictions over the fort site.\(^{61}\)

As new Superintendent Eliot Davis dealt with the ramifications of the "Edwards Plan" in 1965, and the City of Vancouver's increased expectations, he recognized the need for a more permanent planning document. Indeed, without an approved boundary study, it became imperative that a master plan be prepared to clarify the goals for land acquisition within Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. With some assistance from Congresswoman Julia Butler Hansen, Fort Vancouver completed a preliminary draft of the master plan in March 1968. The plan brought together a comprehensive evaluation of park goals, cultural resources, land use and facilities, as well as the feasibility of future development at the national historic site. It created a firm basis for the reconstruction of the stockade buildings and the next phase of archaeological excavations.

The plan reiterated the prime directive of the park: "to preserve as a national monument the site of the original Hudson's Bay stockade [of Fort Vancouver] and sufficient surrounding land to preserve the historical features of the area" for the benefit
of the public. For the first time, the Master Plan saw the clear interpretation of fur trade "HISTORY" as Fort Vancouver's primary goal, and archaeology as secondary, though "an integral part of the historical resource."

The plan even called for recreation of "the original surrounding forest environment which has virtually been eliminated since historic times." Not only would Fort Vancouver restore the cultivated fields around the stockade area, but the plan called for restoring native Douglas fir and open meadows to recreate the original natural environment. If the Park Service purchased the Pearson Airpark property, which had become the top priority, an access to the reconstructed fort would be a long loop road from the Visitor Center to the south gate, and East 5th Street and McLoughlin Road would be restored to their original wagon trail dustiness.

For the first time, Fort Vancouver's planning document also outlined the concept of "living history." Not only would the stockade be reconstructed and surrounding farmland be restored, but "certain manufacturing activities such as blacksmithing, baking, and cask making [would] be revived as live demonstrations of the daily activities of the period, with the products made available for purchase."

The immediate needs of the park, however, remained visitor facilities. A sheltered lunch area for school groups was planned near the Visitor Center and "a program of clean-up, grading, and planting is needed along the river front." As well, the local community could use the site for special purposes related to the fort's history, but only if they were "compatible with the primary purpose of preservation and maintenance of the historic scene."

**Master Plan of 1978**

National Park Service Acting Director Harthon L. Bill approved the final Master Plan for Fort Vancouver National Historic Site on January 7, 1969, but by the early 1970s, the 1969 Master Plan again needed revision. The archaeological excavations, fort reconstruction, and interpretive program which emerged from the 1969 document helped generate interest and increased visitation at Fort Vancouver. City growth and regional
planning as well as new environmental concerns presented new problems to the staff at Fort Vancouver. As early as March 1974, Fort Vancouver attempted to outline changes needed to the 1969 Master Plan. A Fort Vancouver Planning Directive ordered the park to systematically:

A. Develop alternatives for future development and interpretation based on increased input by local and regional planning agencies; historical societies, local elected officials, and interested citizens.
B. Consider alternative plans for circulation and automobile parking, public use pattern, and waterfront beautification.
C. Review factors necessary for an environmental assessment. 

By November 1975, a master plan preview committee recommended that the Columbia River waterfront be made into a greenbelt with only a few improvements such as parking, a pedestrian walkway, some interpretive markers, and the reconstruction of the historic Salmon House and Wharf. Since the Pearson Airpark property was purchased by the Park Service in 1972, the new planning document had to reflect the phase-out of general aviation and the new interpretive program for the property. Finally, the committee agreed to a phase-out of a children’s playground erected in 1970.

Published in February 1978, the new Master Plan included the primary goal of mitigating the impacts of Pearson Airpark. Though the Park Service owned the land and the airport was to be phased out within 30 years, Fort Vancouver still urged the City of Vancouver to remove hangars and other obstructions because in "their current location, these aircraft and hangars represent a major infringement on Fort Vancouver’s historic setting. Relocation of these obstructions would make a major contribution to the visitors’ appreciation and understanding of the historic setting."

Reconstruction continued to be a priority. By 1978 the stockade, bastion, Chief Factor’s House, kitchen, and washhouse had been completed. The master plan anticipated completion of the Indian Trade Shop, blacksmith shop, fur warehouses, and the Bachelors Quarters as the last parts of a 5-phase reconstruction program. The Park Service stressed authenticity of architectural structures based on archaeological and historical research and evidence.

One mystery about the 1978 Master Plan remains unsolved. For some reason the
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Park Service dropped the parcel of land that lay southwest of the parade ground, which includes the Hudson’s Bay Company cemetery from its ultimate boundary. Perhaps the Park Service felt that the Army would be too reluctant to give up the use of its facilities since many newer buildings had been constructed on that portion of Vancouver Barracks.

Planning for the Future and the Vancouver National Historic Reserve

A revised general management plan, as master plans were redesignated in 1979, for Fort Vancouver is overdue. Rapid change seems built into the basic agenda at the site, and since 1978, new circumstances have presented themselves. For instance, it is no longer certain that the entire Pearson Airpark property will revert to Park Service use after the year 2002 when the city’s use of the property expires. By the mid-1980s a vocal community group which had city support, had formed for the purpose of forcing the Park Service to reverse the terms of the property sale made in 1972 and extend general aviation at Pearson indefinitely. In the face of the mounting pressures, the Pacific Northwest Regional Office created a task force to study possible use of the Pearson property after 2002. Headed by Deputy Regional Director William Briggle, the task force members, including Richard Winters, Stephanie Toothman, Wendy Brand, and Harlan Hobbs, visited Fort Vancouver in June 1987 to review the Pearson issue. They concluded that "the park strongly supports proceeding with the concept outlined in the Master Plan of restoring a sense of the historic scene by planting the Pearson Airpark property in various field crops after the City’s rights expire in 2002." Richard Winters, associate regional director of recreation resources and professional services, suggested that the Park Service develop a strong offense and begin planning for the property to demonstrate "our commitment to using this property in the manner for which it was intended—to enhance the visitor’s understanding of this nationally and regionally significant historic site—and to avoid any further compromises that would cause us to deviate from that Congressional mandate." In response to this suggestion, the Regional Office’s Cultural Resource Division is conducting a Cultural Landscape Study which, based on archaeological, historical, and cultural landscape analyses, will update
the Master Plan and help shape development and interpretation of Fort Vancouver.

Congressional Representative Jolene Unsoeld eventually joined the Pearson Airpark supporters to counter the Park Service's plan for utilization of the airport property and she introduced legislation to create a Vancouver National Historic Reserve. The Reserve Commission's recommendations regarding the suitability and feasibility of a larger, integrated, historical complex encompassing Vancouver Barracks will be forwarded to the secretaries of Interior and Defense in 1993. A series of cultural resource inventories prepared by consultants to the Commission evaluates the significant prehistoric and historic resources within the Reserve Study Area, including Vancouver Barracks, Pearson Airpark, Providence Academy and the Kaiser Shipyards. In addition, revised National Register documentation for the site, which indicates and evaluates the full range of historic resources within the site's boundaries, is being prepared for submission in 1993.

CONSTRUCTION, RECONSTRUCTION, AND DECONSTRUCTION

MISSION 66 Construction

Site Planning and Master Planning only laid the groundwork for the development of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. The details of actual construction and the sequence of reconstruction can give us a more accurate picture of the changing cultural landscape.

Before 1961, Fort Vancouver National Monument included an open parade ground, an old Army fire station converted to a temporary office and museum, and a fort site which was denoted "by killing vegetation with a commercial plant killer" along the footprint of the stockade walls and old buildings. The first significant construction began in August 1960, when ground-breaking for the MISSION 66 facilities took place on the parade ground for the utility corridors, roads, and parking areas of the proposed Visitor Center. When these basic facilities were completed in November (including sidewalks), blacktop pavement was poured over the old foundations of the buildings
The Fort Vancouver stockade well was the only visible surviving structure at ground level. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, it was lined with stone and managed as an interpretive site. (National Park Service.)
within the stockade. The fort’s well, the only visible surviving structure from the
Hudson’s Bay Company period, was then lined with field stones to ground level in order
to accommodate visitors, and safety screens were installed.\textsuperscript{74} Grass, which was kept
watered and mowed, covered the rest of the fort site.

Construction of the Visitor Center, the utility buildings, and the two staff
residences began in January 1961. Completed by early August 1961, the two residential
buildings were single story with a living room, dining area, three bedrooms, hardwood
floors, kitchen, utility room, one and a half baths, and attached garage.\textsuperscript{75}
Superintendent Frank Hjort hoped that the new Visitor Center would provide enough
space for interpretation of the site, an office for the small staff, and "a fire-proof vault
for storage of artifacts."\textsuperscript{76}

Unfortunately, a few defects remained. In September 1961, the Western Office of
Design and Construction informed Superintendent Hjort that if "this contractor does not
finish soon or at least make an effort we shall be compelled to hire a contractor to finish
the job at his expense."\textsuperscript{77} The contractor’s work apparently created numerous "cracks in
the concrete basement walls in the Visitor Center in the workshop, the restroom and the
artifact storage room," which leaked badly.\textsuperscript{78} It took several years of repair work to
correct these problems.

\textbf{Replanting the Orchard}

Besides the visitor facilities, MISSION 66 provided for other improvements at
Fort Vancouver. In 1962, an orchard was planted to represent the historic Hudson’s Bay
Company orchard. Though much of the orchard plan was created by guessing at its
historic content, Fort Vancouver used a variety of historic and non-historic fruit trees,
including: "Red Macintosh Dwarf Apple, Yellow Delicious Dwarf Apple, Stayman
Winesap Apple, Bing Cherry, Black Tatarian Cherry, Montmorency Cherry, Elberta
Peach, J.W. Hale Peach, Satsuma Plum, Peach Plum, Bartlett Pear, Jonathan Apple, and
Boston Nectarine." The Park Service also planted various species on the grounds to
control soil erosion including Myrtle, Oregon Grape, St. John’s Wart, Salal,
Rhododendron, Yew, Juniper, Kinnikinnik, Spruce, and Douglas fir. The planting of the orchard as well as general landscaping and decorative shrubs was completed in February 1962.\textsuperscript{79}

Other landscaping and site beautification projects combined the efforts of Park Service planners and volunteers groups. Fort Vancouver maintained most of the parade ground and site north of 5th Street as meadow or lawn, with clumps of coniferous and deciduous trees, shrubs and flowering plants. In the spring of 1964, the Fort Vancouver Rose Society donated 52 'Tropicana' rose bushes for the Visitor Center as part of an effort to "beautify the public parks and buildings of Vancouver."\textsuperscript{80}

**Reconstructing the Stockade**

The MISSION 66 building program did not necessarily anticipate reconstruction of the fort site. However, the modern facilities brought more visitors to the site and both members of the local community and Park Service staff at Fort Vancouver believed that the interpretive program could be further enhanced with more tangible reminders of the past. In March 1965, Representative Julia Butler Hansen supplied the means for building those reminders; she secured a budget of $100,000 to begin the reconstruction of the north wall and part of the east wall of the old stockade. Unfortunately, those funds were whittled down to $83,000 for the reconstruction project and the Moll Construction Company of Vancouver won the job with a bid of $73,800.\textsuperscript{81}

The design for the stockade was another challenge. The consulting architect in charge of the project, Lewis Koue, had to rely on many general or contradictory descriptions of Hudson's Bay Company forts and building construction. He also examined other reconstructed posts such as Fort Nisqually in Tacoma, Washington, and Fort Langley in British Columbia. By piecing together the historic sources and archaeological evidence, Koue was able to design the stockade and gate, but the plans for the 44-foot-high bastion were delayed.\textsuperscript{82} Leland P. Hughey of the FAA Seattle Area office informed John W. Stratton, the acting regional director, that the bastion would exceed the height restrictions established by the Pearson avigation easement "by
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Rebuilt in 1966, the north stockade wall copied the original design of peeled logs set deep into the ground and pegged. Unlike the original, however, these logs were treated to prevent decay. (National Park Service.)
13 feet and further aeronautical study is necessary to determine whether it would be a hazard to air navigation.\textsuperscript{83}

Despite the bastion’s delay, construction of the stockade began in July 1966, when “Jackhammers were brought in to break up the old Spruce Mill footings.”\textsuperscript{84} By November 29, a portion of the north wall log palisade had been completed. The work was done meticulously. To appear as accurate as possible, the palisade was constructed with peeled, treated logs pointed on the top, set four (4) feet below ground level in concrete retaining walls, backfilled with fine gravel and sixteen (16) feet above ground level. There are King posts every twenty (20) feet into which are notched and pegged two six (6) by eight (8) inch walers on the inside. Each log is pegged through each waler top and bottom. All pegging is wood.\textsuperscript{85}

At final cost of $85,608, the reconstructed fort palisade helped visitors to visualize the context of Fort Vancouver and spurred additional local interest in the site.

Though the bastion plan had been put on hold because of the Federal Aviation Administration’s intervention, there was hope that the stockade would help convince the city to remove the avigation easement of Pearson Airpark’s north runway, which by the mid-1960s was only used sporadically.\textsuperscript{86} However, the avigation easement would not be completely lifted until 1972, when the Park Service bought the airport property from the city.

\textbf{The Children’s Playground}

National Park Service planning at Fort Vancouver affected the development of the site in a myriad of ways. For instance, in the late 1960s George Hartzog introduced a "Summer in the Parks" program for the National Capital Region, which provided programs to open the national parks up to urban children for recreation.\textsuperscript{87} The Fort Vancouver National Historic Site 1969 Master Plan also encouraged "Related Visitor Services" which included "facilities for recreation purposes." The park wanted to provide facilities for groups, especially those with children, who visited "the park at mid-day to enjoy a continuous stay without the necessity of leaving the area for lunch; and to provide for children’s play activities as a part of the park visit."\textsuperscript{88}
Whether Fort Vancouver would have built a children's playground to fulfill the Master Plan objective on its own is unknown. But apocryphal stories concerning the playground's origins abound. The most plausible comes from Superintendent Eliot Davis. Sometime in 1969, according to Davis, "George Hartzog was on the grounds and agreed to [a permanent lunch shelter just south of Fifth Street.] At the same time he said 'And let's have a playground and ball field, too.' The idea was that kids would have a place to play while they were at their lunch time." Historian John Hussey recalls a rumor that George Hartzog "put his finger on the map--right out in the historic village site and orchard area--and said 'put it here.'" Of course, that location was out of the question.

Congresswoman Julia Butler Hansen also wanted the playfield; many believed that she had been walking through Fort Vancouver with George Hartzog and asked him where children would be able to play and he, in response, said "here." By November 1969, playground construction began, but on a site south of the Visitor Center adjacent to Fifth Street instead of near the stockade as originally planned. Eliot Davis was put on the spot to explain the playground to the regional office. In a memo to Urban & Environmental Specialist Steve E. Butterworth, he said it was "a long story." Davis had originally been against the idea,

but you don't buck George and Julia so this park went all out to do a good job. What do I think of a playground in a National Historic Site? I think it's great at this site but there are many where it would certainly not be acceptable. First there must be a need for it, second it must not be built to interfere with archaeology or historical interpretation and thirdly there must be room for parking and safe approach for children.

Though he felt pressured into it, Davis concluded that Fort Vancouver had such a great number of children visiting that the playground was necessary. Parents were happy about the additional park in town which was "away from town and freeway where there are no hippies, sailors or bums as in the park near the city center." Western Service Center designer Jim LaRock helped Davis configure the site and the playground was completed in June 1970. It embodied a "typical" western theme, including a frontier outpost, prairie schooner, and corral stockade. In addition, regular
Controversial, but well-used, the Children's Playground, built in 1970, was moved to a more appropriate spot in 1990. (National Park Service.)
playground equipment such as a merry-go-round, slide, and swingset were installed, though the completion report recommended that the Park Service consider the safety and use of certain equipment if used in the future. For instance, the coil-spring toys were found to be relatively dangerous to children and the "western" equipment—the corral stockade and prairie schooner—were not even popular with the children. Finally, Superintendent Davis estimated that "every cat in Vancouver used the sandbox as a litterbox until it was removed." 92

The playground issue, however, had not been resolved. Even though nearly 16,000 children used the area the first year it was installed, superintendents have been unhappy with its location, the decay and unsafeness of the equipment, and the inappropriate nature of a city playground at a national historic site. Playground equipment was removed sporadically over the years as it wore out, but in the spring of 1990, Superintendent Dave Herrera removed the remaining equipment south of the Visitor Center. There followed an immediate and intense reaction by the community. Mayor Bruce E. Hagensen "received several calls at City Hall objecting not only to the removal but also to the precipitous manner in which it was accomplished." 93 Regional Director Charles Odegaard's response was curt and to the point:

It is difficult to understand why anyone would consider the action precipitous when at least one piece of equipment per year has been removed for the past several years. Those pieces, like the present ones, were unsafe. At the same time, I am informed that there is playground equipment to the West at Esther Short Park, to the East at Marion Elementary School, and to the North at Waterworks. Should this equipment not be sufficient, might I suggest that the City consider placing equipment at the high school grounds which are within a quarter of a mile or so. 94

But, apparently, other members of the Washington congressional delegation, Congresswoman Jolene Unsoeld and Senator Slade Gorton, received enough pressure from their constituents to demand that the Park Service bring back the playground. By April 1990, a more appropriate site was selected close to the picnic shelter which minimized impact on "the integrity of the historic site. The City of Vancouver has offered their assistance to acquire the equipment, install it, maintain it, and absolve the National Park Service of all liability." 95 Again, Fort Vancouver was forced to
compromise on an issue about which it felt strongly.

Reconstruction in the 1970s

The reconstruction of Fort Vancouver’s north wall in 1966 had only been Phase I of a multi-phased reconstruction project. Robert Utley, Park Service chief historian, lamented that "without the other walls it looks rather forlorn and not altogether meaningful." There was no doubt that the historic scene of the Hudson’s Bay Company post was "all but gone as a result of the intrusion of the municipal airport on the fort site and a highway and railroad that destroy its historic relationship with the Columbia River." Indeed, further reconstruction was impossible as long as the airport existed. But the Park Service acquired the Pearson property in 1972 and the reconstruction plans moved forward. The bastion and the remaining portions of the stockade, completed in January 1974 at a total cost of $247,842, wrapped up Phase I of the reconstruction and Fort Vancouver moved quickly to start further site development.

In 1974, the Park Service hired Lewis Koue (whom Merrill J. Mattes, the manager of the Historic Preservation Team at the Denver Service Center, called "the only qualified architect available") as project architect for Phase II construction. Congressman Julia Butler Hansen, chairman of the House Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, found funds to both finish the archaeological excavations and begin construction of the structures within the stockade. Superintendent Donald Gillespie submitted two alternative proposals for funding the furnishing of reconstructed buildings as well as further planning and construction and exhibit production.

The bakehouse was the next major structure to be reconstructed at Fort Vancouver. Russell Jones, the restoration architect, inspected the building in September 1974, and "found the brick piers for the bakery completed and the ovens laid up to a level just above the floor line." But, he thought that the masons may have been doing too good a job; the bakehouse looked too new which was "somewhat disturbing. The bricks are soft and I hope they will weather quickly. If they don’t, before the end of the job they can be treated with a manure solution to give them an aged look."
The details of reconstruction, such as the appearance of the brick, were important to both the project architects and the Fort Vancouver staff. Superintendent Donald Gillespie especially had an eye for detail and closely supervised the reconstruction of the fort. At one point he spent months tracking down hand hewn beams for the fort buildings.101 There was still some doubt that hand hewn beams had been used in the original structures; certain construction questions could not always be answered from the archaeological excavations. In the end, primarily sawn beams were used instead, since the technology had certainly been available to the Hudson's Bay Company in the early 19th century, and for mid-20th century builders, they were easier to supply.

By June 1976, the Chief Factor's House, kitchen, and washhouse were completed in time for the National Park Service' American Revolution Bicentennial celebrations. The Chief Factor's House and kitchen were to be staffed by interpreters in period dress and the washhouse adapted as a comfort station and janitor's storage.102

David Hansen, a Park Service furnishings specialist from the Division of Reference Services at Harper's Ferry and Julia Butler Hansen's son, joined the Fort Vancouver staff as curator in October 1974. One of his first tasks was to prepare a furnishings plan for the Phase II building interiors which were completed by the summer of 1976.103 Despite the expertise available, occasional problems remained. For instance, the bakehouse ovens experienced "expansion and contraction, resulting in cracks," because they were only occasionally heated then allowed to cool. Historical Architect George Thorson concluded that the cracks were not critical, but even today, oven restoration work is once more necessary to prepare them for baking demonstrations.104

In 1976, the regional office and Denver Service Center (the successor to the Western Service Center) began planning Phase III of the Fort Vancouver reconstruction program. The most ambitious of the reconstruction projects, Phase III included the Indian Trade Shop, the blacksmith shop, iron store, and other trade shops. Estimated at a cost of $4 million, the regional office looked for ways to economize. In the fall of 1977, it considered cutting the Indian Trade Shop and blacksmith shop from the
The Chief Factor's House was the centerpiece of Phase II reconstruction. Completed in June 1976, the structure is still one of the most important interpretive sites at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. (Oregon Historical Society, 1976.)
reconstruction package. "The new estimate should take into consideration new reconstruction techniques that can reduce costs," Acting Regional Director Edward J. Kurtz wrote:

An historic facade, rather than detailed reconstruction in kind, is what we have in mind. In the event that the current estimate of $2,431,000 construction net (including furnishings) for the structure cannot be reduced, I think it unlikely the proposed reconstruction will ever occur.\textsuperscript{105}

The Fort Vancouver staff, led by Chief of Interpretation and Resource Management Sam Vaughn, urged that the Park Service keep the blacksmith shop and Indian Trade Shop as part of the project. A canvas tent had been used as a temporary trade store in the early 1970s and the staff did not want to return to this since the public would respond better to a more authentic structure.\textsuperscript{106}

Reconstruction of the Phase III buildings did not begin until December 1980, with Lewis Koue and Murray Slama as the consulting architects.\textsuperscript{107} Though the regional office had wanted to cut back on the number of reconstructed buildings, the blacksmith shop was completed by September 1981, and living history demonstrations began in 1982 with some 30 volunteer blacksmiths working an average of 5 days a week. A portion of the Indian Trade Shop, completed in 1981, was used in the late 1980s for the curatorial staff and the archaeological collection, the park’s library, and offices for interpretive staff; the front contains furnished space that interprets all historic functions of the building. It took another 10 years to complete Phase III reconstruction which includes the recently completed fur store.

\textbf{The Bandstand - 1980}

The children’s playground was not the only construction unrelated to the historical theme of Fort Vancouver which ended up on Park Service property. In early 1980, \textit{Sunset} magazine asked the Vancouver Chamber of Commerce what it might do to commemorate the 175th anniversary of Lewis and Clark’s arrival in the northwest. The Chamber of Commerce and the Fort Vancouver Historical Society were interested in holding a music festival "to attract attention and to raise money for the restoration of a
bandstand on the old parade ground located south of Evergreen and between Fort Vancouver and East Reserve. The managers of the City’s Central Park Plan proposed the idea of reconstructing the historic bandstand that was once on the parade ground of Vancouver Barracks, in conjunction with the Lewis and Clark celebration.

The regional director, Russell E. Dickenson, thought that the bandstand went against fundamental Park Service policy that reconstructions "intended primarily to serve as stages for demonstration or other activities, are not permitted." According to Dickenson, "The reason for the policy, is grounded in the Service’s philosophy of maintaining integrity of both historic and natural resources. Single exceptions do little harm of themselves, but the effects, especially in a historic area, are cumulative." This had been the case with the children’s playground ten years earlier, now the regional office feared another structure would add to the problem. However, the Vancouver Central Park coordinator, Patricia Stryker, and the local bandstand committee found sufficient evidence of the location and original design of the historic bandstand to comply with Park Service policy.

Local citizens donated money to the project and the bandstand was completed by the end of 1980. In April 1981, the city and National Park Service signed a "Memorandum of Understanding" which clarified "the procedures and responsibilities related to use of the bandstand by the City and the National Park Service." Though donations covered the cost of construction, the Park Service agreed to maintain the grounds while the city was responsible for organizing and policing events that were held there. The original military bandstand had been a focal point for social gatherings of the civilian community and the U.S. Army activity in Vancouver from about 1871 to 1946. The modern replica would do the same and provide a place where local people could enjoy musical events. The historical criteria for its use included a ban on amplified instruments: "Appropriate events will feature music written or performed between 1853 and 1946. A performance may include music written after 1946 so long as it is compatible in style with that of the earlier period."
**Chapter Four**

**The Fur Store**

In 1981, Fort Vancouver completed the construction documents for the fur store, the second part of Phase III construction. But it was not until the mid-1980s that the plans got underway. In March 1985, Superintendent James M. Thomson notified the regional director that both the City of Vancouver and the Port of Vancouver were interested in entering a cooperative agreement with the Park Service to help build the fur store in order to use it as a repository for their artifacts as well. The regional office was "concerned that we do not obligate the Service to perpetual care of collections that are not ours, without being assured of the annual funds necessary for their care and preservation," and so did not enter an agreement with the city.

The price tag for the reconstruction was quite high, an estimated $1.5 to $2 million. Don Bonker, congressman for the Third District, suggested that the Park Service justify the price tag to the taxpayers. "To my mind," wrote Bonker in April 1987, "this is the most critical remaining construction aspect of the Fort's development. I would appreciate it if you could provide a more detailed break down of how the funds would be used as well as a description of your plans for the building's use." The fur store was designed to function as a curatorial workspace and artifact storage facility, as well as archaeological study center. The interpretive portion of the building would depict the receiving, processing and preparation of furs for shipment from Fort Vancouver during the 1840s.

By the late 1980s, the cost of the reconstruction had sky-rocketed to $2.75 million. "Completion of fur store is not a high regional, Servicewide or Departmental budget priority, but would be beneficial," declared a briefing statement for Manuel Lujan, secretary of the Interior. Representative Jolene Unsoeld supported the project after she was elected to Julia Butler Hansen's old House seat in 1988. But her support seemed contingent on the Park Service's acceptance of the Vancouver National Historic Reserve idea. Unsoeld was able, however, to obtain $1.7 million for the 1991 fiscal year to continue the planning and design for the fur store.

The new fort building came with a different sort of price tag. As the thick file
entitled "Fur Store Complaints" attests, not all members of the public shared Fort Vancouver's enthusiasm for commemorating the achievements of a fur trading culture. Several citizens protested the "symbolic tribute... to man's disregard for animal welfare." By glorifying the fur trade, they argued, the Park Service showed the same cruelty that trappers did in mutilating "innocent animals for fashion." They feared that the fur store would "teach our children that killing animals for nothing more than their skin is not only OK, but is an honorable thing to do." Others called the fur trade a "dark spot in our country's history."  

Fort Vancouver, however, stressed the need to accurately interpret history. "We believe that it is better that our history be understood than suppressed and will continue to interpret it in an accurate and sensitive manner," wrote Regional Director Charles Odegaard to one concerned woman. Superintendent Dave Herrera assured the public that the reconstructed fur store would help the park "make the public aware of the needless slaughter of fur bearing animals for economic purposes and how this practice brought these animals to the brink of extinction." Herrera hoped that most people would "understand the fur trade within the historical perspective and not as an endorsement of the practice."  

Despite the public's concern, the reconstruction of the fur store moved forward. By early 1991, the original archaeological reports completed by Jake J. Hoffman and Lester H. Ross in the early 1970s had been reviewed by James Thomson, the regional archaeologist, and in June 1991, Bryn Thomas, of Eastern Washington University's Archaeological and Historical Services, began new excavations on the site of the building. The contract for reconstruction was awarded to the Lorentz Bruun Company of Portland and work began by the end of 1991. The massive timbers for the building, donated from the Gifford Pinchot National Forest, "will require a year to cure before they can be used for construction," Dave Herrera told the regional director:

Archaeological investigations and the installation of a utility corridor will be completed this summer. Additional funding will be needed next year to complete the interior of the building that will be used for archaeological storage and workspace and the interpretive area of the building.
But, even as late as the summer of 1991, there was concern that the budget would not include the needed $1.7 million to complete the reconstruction project. The Park Service solicited assistance from Senator Slade Gorton to include completion funds for this project in the National Park Service budget. The Park Service and Congress decided that it would be most cost effective to finish the fur store; "To leave the building shell vacant and unused rather than pursuing its completion would result in additional maintenance expenses and deterioration with minimal return."123

As the fur store nears completion questions are raised about the future of continued reconstruction at Fort Vancouver. The amount of work completed belies any notion of removing the stockade, which was actually an alternative presented in 1981 by Lewis Koue and Murray Slama in Report Project A-1 Alternate Construction Systems and Alternatives to Total Reconstruction of Structures at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. But, in economic hard times, funding will not necessarily be forthcoming for future reconstruction projects. Current superintendent Dave Herrera understands this constraint, yet maintains a vision of the full reconstruction of Fort Vancouver. Perhaps not today or even in 5 years, but maybe some day down the road.
Chapter Five

Fort Vancouver and Public Relations

PUBLIC RELATIONS

Introduction

Public relations presented a constant challenge to Fort Vancouver. As an historic site, Fort Vancouver struggled to maintain a balance between its national significance and the role it had in the local community. The power of compromise, helped Fort Vancouver maintain good relations with its neighbors: the Army, the City of Vancouver, the county, and the state. But compromise also helped erode the site's unique identity. On one hand, Fort Vancouver National Historic Site made the City of Vancouver more visible and attractive to visitors. On the other hand, Fort Vancouver lost some of its identity and autonomy as a national site since it was also perceived by some as a city park. The proximity of Pearson Airpark, and its eventual incorporation into the site, the special use agreements between the Park Service and the City concerning the riverfront property, and the creation of the Central Park Plan by the city, all contributed to this confusion.

Dedications and Publications

The Park Service's early efforts at public relations included displaying visible signs of the commemoration of the original fort, such as dedications marking significant anniversaries of Hudson's Bay Company activities and publication of historical reports to educate the public about Fort Vancouver's significance. In 1950, for instance, a group of local dignitaries reenacted the dedication of Fort Vancouver 125 years earlier on March 19. The dedication took place on the parade ground with a peeled 45-foot Douglas fir pole erected for the flagstaff. Hudson's Bay Company Governor George Simpson, played by Barent Burhans, "shattered a bottle of rum on the flagstaff", while Dr. [John] McLoughlin, a thinly disguised W.E. Farr, received a "gold headed cane of office...by
Frank Hjort, the first superintendent, tried hard to publicize the new monument. Yet, like today, Hjort struggled with making sure the site was used for appropriate purposes. In the spring of 1951, for instance, a large group of church congregations wanted to use the parade ground for a Gospel crusade. Both the superintendent and Herbert Maier, assistant regional director, thought it "highly undesirable to have the precedent established that the Fort Vancouver National Monument be regarded as a place for holding tent meetings, conventions, and other public gatherings of a similar nature." In the spring of 1954, after the site was officially designated as a monument, Hjort requested that The Columbian carry an article with a map of the monument lands. "A great deal of this kind of publicity will be necessary," he wrote, "before the citizens of Vancouver can fully understand where the National Monument is." Unfortunately, very few signs directed visitors from the main roads to Fort Vancouver in those early years. Hjort faithfully contacted radio and television stations to give the park a higher profile. In 1955, as the dedication for the establishment of Fort Vancouver National Monument drew near, the superintendent even "appeared on several Portland television stations explaining the history of Fort Vancouver and the purpose of the national monument." The success of Hjort's continued effort at public relations could be seen by an increase in visitation by the late 1950s.

In the late 1950s, John Hussey published The History of Fort Vancouver and its Physical Structure through the Washington State Historical Society, which drew together a decade of historical research on Fort Vancouver. Together with Louis Caywood's archaeological findings, Hussey's book generated both popular and scholarly interest in the site and its history. Their work also gave weight to Congresswoman Julia Butler Hansen's efforts to pass legislation to expand the site.

In 1962, when Fort Vancouver National Historic Site opened its newly constructed Visitor Center, the Park Service's image improved even further in the eyes of the local public. As Frank Hjort succinctly put it:
We have felt for years that our bargaining power with other agencies, especially the city of Vancouver, as well as our public relations would improve as soon as we had adequate facilities. The completion of our MISSION 66 projects has brought this into sharp focus already. Every member of the city council has visited us and has expressed a willingness to cooperate whenever they can. Many other agency heads have visited us and all seem to better understand our position in the community.\(^7\)

The dedication ceremony for the new Visitor Center on March 18, 1962, epitomized that local cooperation. The event was planned as a flag-waving, saluting, military-marching, good old all-American celebration led by various dignitaries from the Department of the Interior, the Park Service, and state and local governments. Besides dedicating the new park building, the event targeted the public's image of Fort Vancouver. "Living as we do in a city which is quite indifferent to the history and significance of Fort Vancouver," wrote the Fort Vancouver staff, "we wish to make the most of this dedication in selling the Historic Site to the local public and especially in emphasizing the fact that this is a National Park Service area." Important to conveying this image was the presence of a large contingency of uniformed personnel. Rangers came to Vancouver from Olympic National Park to help with security and arrangements.\(^8\)

With nearly 1,000 people attending, including R.H. Chesshire, a representative from the Hudson’s Bay Company, Regional Director Lawrence C. Merriam gave the keynote address. Merriam cited the benefits of the historic site for the community, including "tourist dollars, increased values of surrounding properties, and employee payrolls." Yet, he also stressed the Park Service’s determination "to promote a quiet pride in our past and a confidence in our future, the essence of that true patriotism without which no nation or people can long endure."\(^9\)

More than 10 years later, Fort Vancouver once again celebrated a landmark event. On April 19, 1974, the Park Service dedicated the completion of the reconstructed stockade wall and bastion on the 150th anniversary of the founding of Fort Vancouver. Despite the cold weather, the presence of Congresswoman Julia Butler Hansen and Oregon Governor Tom McCall drew large crowds and the press. The
Congresswoman Julia Butler Hansen played a key role in the development of Fort Vancouver. Here she is accepting an appropriate symbol of her work at the dedication of the newly reconstructed stockade wall and bastion on April 19, 1974. (Alfred A. Monner, The Journal.)
reconstructed fort forged another iron link between the Park Service and community.\textsuperscript{10}

**SPECIAL EVENTS**

Besides dedications and publications, Fort Vancouver hosted many special events that attracted visitors to the site. From Easter egg hunts to military drills on the parade ground, these special events have been important to build relations between the Park Service and the local community.

**The Fourth of July Celebration**

Probably one of the best known but also the most controversial special events is the Fourth of July celebration. The City of Vancouver first sponsored the event using Park Service and city land in 1963 when William R. Sampson was acting superintendent after Frank Hjort transferred. That first year, around 17,500 people enjoyed helicopter demonstrations, sky diving exhibitions, water fights between the fire departments, a presentation of highlights from the MUSIC MAN, tours of the fort site, and a spectacular fireworks display on the airport. For the first time in many years, groups were allowed free use of the fort site, and eight members of the Fort Vancouver Historical Society were stationed at key locations within the stockade walls to interpret the site and pass out information sheets prepared by us and printed by the City’s committee in charge of arrangements.\textsuperscript{11}

The site received five times more visitors than they had during the previous July, forcing them to use the parade ground as a parking lot.

By the late 1960s, the Fourth of July celebrations were drawing 10,000 to 15,000 people each year. Special guest speakers attracted these crowds every year. In 1966, Representative Julia Butler Hansen gave a keynote address. Senator Henry Jackson was principal speaker in 1968. Indeed, as the years passed, the event grew in importance to and attendance by the local community. In 1968, Superintendent Eliot Davis complained that crowd control and protection was far too much for "two uniformed NPS employees. This year we hope to deputize local police and sheriff's officers. The events are drawing more and more young people who are looking for action and one of these days we could have some."\textsuperscript{12} Davis also complained about firecrackers and fires on park property, but
noted that the local paper carried an article stating that the state fire marshals are proposing legislation to forbid the sale of all fireworks within the state. This would not only get rid of the fireworks, but also the whole celebration. We are wishing the fire marshals the best of luck.\textsuperscript{13}

Indeed, Davis was not too thrilled as the celebration became the "annual" Fourth of July celebration. "You can well imagine the breathless excitement with which we anticipate this traditional, patriotic event," the superintendent told the regional director in 1969, "In order not to be selfish about this momentous occasion, you are all invited. Please wear your uniform."\textsuperscript{14}

When Donald Gillespie was appointed superintendent in 1972, he felt that the celebration on July Fourth was "strictly a P.R. exercise and my initial impression is that it generates more awareness of the park than we seem to get during the remainder of the year."\textsuperscript{15} He recognized that the celebration and continuing good relations with the city was necessary to the health of the park.

However, like his predecessor Eliot Davis, Donald Gillespie also felt that the Fourth of July celebration had no place on a national historic site because of safety hazards and crowd control problems. On July 4, 1976, an estimated 65,000 to 70,000 visitors packed the fort site to view fireworks. (The traffic jam did not clear until 3 o'clock in the morning.) New federal safety regulations had been imposed on the state that restricted firing rockets near highways--they had to be at least 300 feet away and the firing site required sufficient barriers to keep people from wandering into the firing area. Though Fort Vancouver received help from both the city and Vancouver Barracks to control the crowd, both the City Council's Fourth of July Committee and the Fort Vancouver superintendent made a serious effort to find a new location for the following year.\textsuperscript{16} Gillespie noted in his bicentennial annual report that he had announced that 1976 would be the last year the city could use the current firing site on Park Service property because it would "not meet the requirements of the recent safety rules established for discharge of pyrotechnic displays."\textsuperscript{17}

In 1977, Gillespie stood by the joint decision made by the park and the Fourth of
July Committee the previous year. The celebration and daytime activities could continue, but the park would not be used to launch fireworks. The Fourth of July Committee, however, reversed its decision and insisted that the historic site was the only possible place for the fireworks.\textsuperscript{18} In another classic compromise, by June, Donald Gillespie reached an agreement with the city that seemed satisfactory to everyone. The city agreed to put more money into police coverage, a fence was to be installed around the firing site, publicity would be reduced in hopes of reducing the crowd, and beer drinking would be discouraged. Public pressure played an important role in reviving the celebration for 1977.\textsuperscript{19}

However, the following year the Fourth of July celebration nearly fizzled once more. This time it was clearly the decision of the Fourth of July Committee. Jim Larson, the co-chairman of the committee, said the obstacles had become too great including "increasing expense of the event, what he termed a lack of cooperation from historic site Superintendent Don Gillespie and 'biased coverage' of the event by the Columbian." Apparently, the committee's exclusive sales of fireworks which had financed the event in the past no longer existed and the sales competition from other vendors left the committee with little funding. Yet, two days after their announcement, the problems had supposedly been resolved and the celebration was back on track.\textsuperscript{20}

The Fourth of July celebration remains one of the busiest events of the year at Fort Vancouver. The superintendent still struggles to maintain the safety standards and cooperation of the city to make the event successful and safe. There are also still questions about the effects of the event on the archaeological resources of the site, especially that portion of the site used for launching fireworks. Most recently, Superintendent Dave Herrera has had to insist that the State Patrol keep cars from parking or stopping along SR 14 on the south side of the historic site during the fireworks display.
The Brigade Encampment

Another special event more apropos to the setting of Fort Vancouver is the annual Fur Brigade Encampment. Held for the first time in the summer of 1980, the encampment is a reenactment of the return of Hudson's Bay Company fur trapping brigades from the field in the early 19th century. During that first year, about 20 participants were invited by the park from among the various local mountain-men groups. The participants set up lodgings and various craft displays and took part in contests such as tomahawk throwing, jews harp playing, and frying pan throwing (for women).21

Fort Vancouver sponsors the two-to-three-day event. There has been a concerted attempt to keep modern conveniences out of the camps as much as possible and to maintain historical activities, period clothing, and events. In 1991, a record 4,700 visitors arrived to see the Brigade Encampment instead of the usual 2,500 to 3,500.22

THE CITY OF VANCOUVER

Though special events brought the visitors into Fort Vancouver and helped maintain good public relations, there are other aspects of the relationship between Fort Vancouver and the City of Vancouver which deserve mention. The problems of Pearson Airpark and the Waterfront Park warrant separate examination; the history of their development as park-owned but city-operated properties present unique problems that justify detailed discussion. But several other issues of city planning and land use sorely tested the Park Service's ability to compromise.

For instance, in the fall of 1948, just after Fort Vancouver National Monument was authorized, the City of Vancouver approached the Park Service to explore the possibility of building a civic center in conjunction with the monument, which would have allowed "the civic center to be all or partly within the proposed boundary of the monument." Harold Fowler, a park planner who met with the city during discussions on the Civic Center, admitted that the design could possibly work but that the development had to avoid "complex boundaries" since dual jurisdiction over the site of a civic center would be impractical.23 It took the regional office a mere 3 days to formulate an
answer for the Mayor of Vancouver: "the combined development would create a very
crowded condition and would definitely introduce other elements into the picture that
would automatically reduce the effectiveness of our presentation of the Fort Vancouver
Story." This was only the beginning of the Park Service's involvement in the City of
Vancouver's planning and development schemes - and indicative of the nature of these
future plans.

**The John McLoughlin/George C. Marshall Park**

The congressional act which established Fort Vancouver in 1948 also gave the
director of the National Park Service authority to make final determinations on the
transfer of any surplus property within Vancouver Barracks if that property were
requested for purposes of public park and recreation areas or as an historic monument.
Therefore, when the city decided to apply for surplus property north of Fort Vancouver
National Monument in the spring of 1949, the Park Service assisted in preparing the
application. The city wanted the site to develop as a "Monument," which would have
allowed the city to acquire the property at a 50% discount.

Though the Park Service believed that a city monument would create a buffer
zone and keep land from intensive commercial development, Neal Butterfield and John
Hussey studied the historic significance of the site and determined that the two pieces of
property north of Fort Vancouver National Monument--now the George C. Marshall
Park and John McLoughlin Memorial Library--did not have enough historical
significance to warrant being part of an historical monument. There were no
significant historic remains and the Fort Vancouver National Monument had already
been established to encompass the historical significance of Vancouver Barracks lands.
By December 1949, the city revised its application to transfer surplus property for public
park and recreational purposes instead. The city obtained the property on March 16,
1950, and began making plans to develop a city park.

However, in the early 1950s, development of the park was delayed because the
state wanted to construct a clover leaf and expand Interstate 5, both of which were to be
completed sometime in 1954. The city continued to file biennial progress reports with the General Services Administration concerning development of the surplus property. In 1960, George L. Collins, Park Service regional chief of recreation resource planning, prodded the city about the status of its site plans:

We realize that funds have been limited, that numerous attempts to obtain approval for a bond issue for development have been unsuccessful, and that there have been other elements which have interfered with development of the site. We feel, however, that the City authorities should give serious thought to developing this area for the purposes for which it was conveyed.

Two years later, development had not begun; the city had not provided restrooms or even picnic tables for the site.

Various rumors circulated about the city’s public park property. First, the city was going to build a children’s playground and swimming pool, then it was heard that the city wanted to use the property for a new city hall. Vancouver continued to speak vaguely about the property; it supposedly was available for use though no facilities were provided, and the city never reported any actual use.

The federal Bureau of Outdoor Recreation monitored the development of the site. By 1963, the bureau informed the City of Vancouver that unless it developed the 13 acres as a park the city would have to give the land back. The city was required to submit plans for the property as a park within 120 days or give notice that the title was reconveyed to the United States. The city quickly proposed to construct a new "recreation building" on the site, to replace another that had been torn down elsewhere. Some saw this maneuver as a deceptive means of putting city administrative buildings on land meant for parks and recreation. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation field representative R.W. Allin complained to the Park Service director that the city had not shown good faith in developing the surplus land. He thought that the "government’s interests" would be better served if a federal agency, such as the Park Service, administered the property.

Pressured into action, the city developed plans for General George C. Marshall Park, which included a recreational building and playground. By the end of 1963, the city had installed playground equipment, softball fields, picnic facilities and a rose
garden. The voters also passed a bond issue to finance the recreation building which was constructed between 1964 and 1966.31

City Zoning, Land Use, and Jurisdiction at Fort Vancouver

Fort Vancouver had always been concerned about land use on property adjacent to the site. The Park Service feared losing buffer zone property such as Officers' Row or the eastern portion of Pearson Airpark to commercial development. In the 1950s, the regional office recommended that Superintendent Frank Hjort "endeavor to prevent non-conforming or nuisance use of peripheral monument land. Proper zoning is the answer to this and you should keep in touch with such activities so you can influence the regulations to have them conform with what you desire to accomplish or prevent."32 And so Fort Vancouver became an active party in community planning.

In July 1952, the City of Vancouver installed a manager-type government. Zoning issues became one of the top priorities for the new government.33 By the 1960s, the city contemplated zoning surplus Army land in Vancouver Barracks which had never before been zoned.34 Though many on the City Council preferred that the Barracks ultimately be used for commercial development, the Park Service worked to protect the Fort Vancouver site. As a way of protecting the land, the Park Service prepared a boundary study in the mid-1960s which laid claim to pieces of property within the Barracks that might otherwise have been zoned for commercial development such as Pearson Airpark. Superintendent Eliot Davis was concerned that the city would attempt to sell or develop portions of Pearson for purposes other than an airport, thus going against the restrictions in the quit claim deeds with the federal government.

The city's discussion of zoning Vancouver Barracks paralleled its attempts to annex the property. As early as 1968, the City of Vancouver explored the possibility of annexing federal lands in Vancouver Barracks. The advantage for the city included increased tax revenue. Fort Vancouver would also gain the advantage of better coordinated police and fire protection. Though the fort had "fire protection now under an informal agreement," the Park Service wanted to change its status from proprietary
and exclusive jurisdiction to concurrent jurisdiction, which would allow the Park Service to apply both state and federal regulations to any criminal or legal situation at the historic site.\textsuperscript{35}

With the pending sale of Pearson Airpark to the National Park Service in 1972, this issue became even more important. Who would be responsible for law enforcement in an area which was owned by the federal government but leased to the City of Vancouver? The Park Service petitioned to convert Fort Vancouver’s status to concurrent jurisdiction to keep all services consistent. Their changed status would help address some of the problems of crowd control, the use of hazardous fireworks, and the proliferation of teen gangs during the large Fourth of July celebration.\textsuperscript{36}

The city requested that Congressman Mike McCormack assist in initiating legislation "for a Retrocession of Jurisdiction of the Federal enclaves within the City of Vancouver," to allow uniform jurisdiction in all portions of Park Service land.\textsuperscript{37} The change would permit either city or county emergency vehicles to answer calls at Fort Vancouver without putting the call on lowest priority.\textsuperscript{38}

On February 27, 1974, the city officially annexed the property in the Vancouver Barracks and Fort Vancouver National Historic Site.\textsuperscript{39} But it was not until 1981 that the National Park Service relinquished partial legislative jurisdiction over Fort Vancouver National Historic Site to the State of Washington. In a letter to Senator James McClure, chairman of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Park Service Director Russell E. Dickenson contended that the proposal was "a means to provide increased protection to park visitors and park resources. It will result in a partnership between the United States and the State of Washington in the protection of persons and property within the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site." The concurrent jurisdiction left the management of natural and historical resources to the United States, but removed "the barriers to full civil rights that exist in areas of exclusive jurisdiction."\textsuperscript{40}

Concurrent jurisdiction did not mean that security problems went away. As Fort Vancouver National Historic Site acquired more small pieces of land outside the main
stockade and parade ground area, policing the entire site became increasingly difficult. In the spring of 1988, the elevated berm of the railroad right-of-way became a popular gathering spot for large numbers of young people in cars where "it appeared there was considerable consumption of alcohol, possibly drug distribution and use, and a general inclination to get rowdy, fighting breaking out with resulting injuries, perhaps the potential for homicide." Fort Vancouver decided to put up a barrier of posts and cable to discourage the young people.41

Central Park Planning

Once Fort Vancouver National Historic Site was annexed to the City of Vancouver in the spring of 1974, it opened the way for the City Council to introduce the Central Park Planning concept. The 600-acre Central Park Planning area included all the publicly-owned property that once incorporated Vancouver Barracks, including Clark College and city property north of Evergreen Boulevard. A Central Park Plan helped alleviate the Park Service's fears of commercial development encroaching on Fort Vancouver.

In 1975, the city organized a Regional Urban Design Assistance (RUDA) team, a group of planning and design professionals to coordinate efforts. Donald Gillespie, as superintendent of Fort Vancouver, sat on the Planning Commission steering committee which monitored potential impacts on national park plans, goals, and objectives.42 Though, according to The Columbian, the city was at first uncertain whether Pearson Airpark fit into the Central Park concept, by the fall of 1975, Pearson became one of its main focuses as the center for an aviation museum.43 Two years later the Vancouver Central Park Steering Committee of the Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce was still "working on a plan to preserve the cultural, historical and recreational assets of an area referred to as 'Vancouver Central Park.'" The participating federal, state, county, city, and private property owners were still developing a master plan and land use guidelines.44 Though Fort Vancouver had always supported the idea of coordinating development and growth in the old Barracks area, some of the
private developers seemed less than enthusiastic.\textsuperscript{45}

By August 1979, the master plan and the RUDA recommendations had been approved and the Central Park Advisory Committee was in place. Fort Vancouver Superintendent James M. Thomson was asked to join the Central Park Community Support Group, a separate body. Thomson realized that the Executive Advisory Committee made all the decisions to implement the plan while the major property owners were put into the Support Group. Consequently, it was difficult for Fort Vancouver to respond quickly to any development proposals.\textsuperscript{46}

Two major actions under the Central Park Plan that specifically affected Fort Vancouver were the reconstruction of an historic bandstand on the parade ground in 1980 and the disposition of Officers' Row. In 1982, the city received by trade two buildings on Officers' Row which it operated as the Marshall House Restaurant and Grant Museum. The General Services Administration, now proprietors of surplus Barracks property, wanted the city to buy the rest of the buildings on Officers' Row, but the city balked at the price tag of $1.3 million. The Park Service soon learned that Congressman Donald Bonker wanted to introduce legislation that would transfer Officers' Row to the Park Service in conjunction with congressional appropriation. The Park Service would, in turn, lease Officers' Row to the city under the Historic Preservation Act provisions.\textsuperscript{47} Indeed, the city welcomed the idea of acquiring Officers' Row at little or no cost through a Park Service lease. The National Park Service, however, refused to support the Bonker legislation. Yet by 1986, the city was able to acquire the remainder of Officers' Row at no cost from the General Services Administration through a surplus property provision. The City was obligated to maintain and preserve the buildings since they were listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

THE ARMY AND VANCOUVER BARRACKS

The United States Army always had close ties with Fort Vancouver, whether under Hudson's Bay Company or National Park Service jurisdiction. Since 1860, when
the Army took over the decaying and empty stockade and surrounding property, it strongly influenced the land's use and disposition. For instance, during World War I the Army's Spruce Mill Division covered most of the old stockade site and much of Pearson airfield. By the 1920s, the Army had created a small airfield for its Army Air Service. On May 25, 1933, "Vancouver Barracks was designated as a training camp for men enlisting under the new Roosevelt reforestation program," the Civilian Conservation Corps. Finally, in 1946, surplus Army property was transferred to the War Assets Administration, which oversaw the disposition of these lands to other governmental agencies or entities such as the National Park Service and the City of Vancouver.

**General Army Cooperation**

After legislation authorized Fort Vancouver National Monument, the National Park Service continued to rely on Army cooperation. Louis Caywood and Neal Butterfield relied on the good graces of the Army to use its buildings for work space near the excavation site. They had to maintain the two buildings and pay for utilities, but the Park Service could use them rent-free. Caywood also appreciated the Army guard patrol performed three or four times a night to provide security around the excavation site. Indeed, the archaeologists relied on the good will of the Army to allow the early excavation of the stockade site, since the final transfer of the north half of the fort site was not completed until 1954. The Park Service also had to negotiate with the Army over responsibility for maintaining and protecting buildings in the monument and Barracks area, since the issue of land had not been settled.

**Land Transactions between 1948 and 1954**

Between 1948 and 1954, when Fort Vancouver National Monument was formally established, the Park Service vied with the Army over several parcels of land which were extremely important to the integrity of the site. During the fall of 1948 and winter 1949, the Army at Vancouver Barracks did not want to give up the buildings at the southwest corner of the parade ground and threatened to keep the north half of the old stockade
unless the Park Service allowed it to keep the other buildings. After years of negotiations, the Park Service agreed to exchange the row of Army buildings and land on the southwest portion of the Parade Ground for the parcel containing the fort site, and thus completed its initial land acquisition that became Fort Vancouver National Monument in 1954.

**Army Aircraft Taxiway**

Just as the most controversial issue between the Park Service and the City of Vancouver has revolved around the airfield, a long standing issue between Fort Vancouver and the Army was an aircraft taxiway easement. The original easement was established May 14, 1963, when the Army transferred the land encompassing part of historic Kanaka Village to the National Park Service.

In May 1972, the Army requested a modification of the easement to allow the military aircraft to park on the right-of-way. The original permit, however, became invalid after the Park Service purchased Pearson Airpark, requiring a permit revision. The Park Service modified the easement in March 1973, allowing the Army to widen the taxiway to accommodate newer, larger aircraft. But Superintendent Donald Gillespie complained that the Army mowed a larger swath, about 100 feet wide, all the way to the Pearson Air Park runway and back around to the West of the existing hedge row. There is also evidence that a rather large tree (about 12 inches in diameter) was taken out and the area is now dotted with well over 50 old tires painted yellow as runway guides.

Consequently, Fort Vancouver National Historic Site drew up a Memorandum of Agreement with the U.S. Army at Vancouver Barracks to better specify the extent of the easement. However, by December Gillespie was "afraid that those damn tires are sprouting roots."

As late as November 1974, the Memorandum of Agreement had not been officially signed since certain issues were pending such as the configuration of the easement and whether visiting aircraft could park on the easement. The Army wanted to park aircraft, but the Park Service wanted aircraft to stay at Pearson Airpark or the
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Barracks. Major James H. Lyles told Gillespie that he "would prefer to settle the aircraft easement question by merely amending the description and drawing of the easement contained in the original Documentation of Transfer" of 1963.55

In 1977 C. Richard Neely, assistant regional solicitor, expressed a legal opinion that an agency of the Executive Branch, such as the Army, could not hold an easement on property owned by the United States. Since the Army's taxiway was held by agreement between the secretary of the Army and the secretary of the Interior, the latter could extinguish the agreement at any time.56 So, instead the Park Service prepared a special use permit for the Army taxiway, which was periodically updated or modified.57 By 1990, however, the Army had let the special use permit for the taxiway lapse, since it was no longer needed.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES AND COOPERATING ASSOCIATIONS

Throughout its existence, Fort Vancouver has had support and assistance from outside groups such as historical societies and cooperating associations. These groups not only assisted in creating legislation for the original Monument at Fort Vancouver in 1948, but continue to help the Park find volunteer support and funding for some special programs.

The Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society

The Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society was first established on March 9, 1940. This group succeeded several other attempts to create local historical societies whose focus was to establish a monument commemorating the history of the Hudson's Bay Company post at Fort Vancouver. According to early board member Donald Stewart, the society first made an agreement with the Army to lease an acre of land near the state's oldest apple tree where Interstate 5 now runs through the Barracks for the reconstruction of a small scale model of the stockade. Stewart, a local architect, drew up plans for the model.58

The nation's entry into World War II interrupted these plans and the group
became inactive. In January 1947, after the war, the society was reactivated when the Army declared portions of Vancouver Barracks surplus property. The first board of trustees for the revitalized historical society included W.K. Peery, Howard Burnham, Don Stewart, John Camp, Eva Santee, Ray Bachman, and Ken Billington. Together with the Washington State Historical Society, the Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society sponsored the legislation for Fort Vancouver National Monument.  

Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society supported the monument movement in a variety of ways. The society solicited the backing of congressional members. It also objected to the Army's attempt to take back portions of the Barracks which had been scheduled for the monument. In 1949, the Army planned to retain the northern portion of the fort site for the Army Reserve Corps as well as parts of the parade ground. In response, Donald Stewart, president of the Historical Society, sent "a resolution protesting the army action to members of Congress and to local organizations." Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society finally worked independently with Vancouver Barracks and the Department of the Army to reach a compromise. The Park Service agreed to exchange a portion of the parade ground for the fort site in 1950 and in 1954, Fort Vancouver National Monument was officially established.

By 1950, the purpose of the Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society had expanded. Its goals were to develop a museum for housing the various books, manuscripts, and material resources they had received, to promote regional historic research, to establish school programs, and to stimulate interest in Fort Vancouver. In order to create interest in the monument the society insisted that Fort Vancouver needed to reconstruct the original stockade. The Park Service disagreed. There were no immediate plans for funding the reconstruction of the fort. Indeed, Park Service policy ran contrary to reconstruction of historic buildings or sites. Frank Hjort, when he became superintendent at Fort Vancouver in 1951, had been cautioned against restoration. Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society, however, had a clause in its articles of incorporation
that called for the reconstruction of Old Fort Vancouver. The regional director warned
the Fort Vancouver staff to avoid serving as a board member to the society as long as
this goal remained in the organization's statement of goals. Frank Hjort succeeded in
changing the Historical Society's by-laws.\(^{63}\)

By the early 1950s, the Historical Society had moved into other areas of local
historic promotion. "It is true that originally it also had in mind the reconstruction and
restoration of Fort Vancouver," wrote Aubrey Neasham, regional historian, "however,
since acquisition of the site by the National Park Service, Mr. Hjort states that Society
has dropped these plans and 'is now devoted to the gathering of historical objects and in
developing, marking and bringing to public attention other historic spots in this vicinity.'"
Neasham suggested that both Frank Hjort and Louis Caywood participate in the local
Society's programs and planning to prevent any actions by them adverse to park policies
of "protection, administration, and interpretation of the area."\(^{64}\) The Park Service still
insisted that neither Caywood nor Hjort discuss Park Service matters with members of
the historical society.

Yet, the Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society continued to dream
of recreating the Hudson's Bay Company post. Donald Stewart recalls going to
Washington, D.C. in 1956, to meet with the director of the Park Service to discuss the
issue of restoration of Fort Vancouver. The Park Service remained reluctant to agree to
that action. But this did not deter the group. In October 1956, the Historical Society
had three historical signs erected, one at the site of the first Fort Vancouver, one at the
first sawmill, and one at the Covington House.\(^{65}\) By the late 1950s, the society along
with other interested groups, met with local service clubs, City Council members, and
County Commissioners to urge Congressman Russell Mack to expedite passage of H.R.
194, which was the first attempt to increase the boundaries of Fort Vancouver to 220
acres.\(^{66}\)

After some gentle prodding by Frank Hjort, the Fort Vancouver Restoration and
Historical Society finally dropped "Restoration" from its name in January 1960.\(^{67}\) But
the society continued to promote the development of Fort Vancouver. Throughout the
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1970s and 1980s, the Fort Vancouver Historical Society was involved in a wide range of activities. President John Brougher, Gus Norwood, and Victoria Ransom have provided support and exhibition preparation for the Clark County Historical Museum, published a bulletin, and organized an annual picnic.

The Northwest Historical Association, Inc.

Another important source of support for national parks are their cooperating associations. In 1951, the superintendent at Mount Rainier first suggested creating an association at Fort Vancouver National Monument. Preston P. Macy sent a copy of their association’s by-laws to Frank Hjort and offered the use of Mount Rainier Association as a cooperative venture. One major purpose of an association was "to make available to visitors various publications." But Fort Vancouver decided to establish its own association and in November 1952, Frank Hjort drew up papers for the Northwest Historical Association. He chose the name "because there are at present at least three organizations in Vancouver including this monument which start with the words 'Fort Vancouver' and which causes a great deal of confusion at the post office." Assistant Regional Director Herbert Maier suggested some ground rules for the new association: no Park Service employee could be the treasurer; the association had to confine its interest to the Fort Vancouver story; and it should drop "Northwest" from the name since "that term as ordinarily used includes a lot of territory."

Despite the suggestion on the name, the Northwest Historical Association was incorporated on January 9, 1953, by Louis Caywood, Frank Hjort, John F. Camp, Jr., Carl Landerholm, and Patricia Dell. The articles and by-laws were recorded by the State of Washington January 28, 1953, and, as suggested by Assistant Director Ronald F. Lee, the by-laws contained provisions to enable the association to buy or hold property on behalf of the Park Service.

In order to begin operation, the Northwest Historical Association borrowed money from the Eastern National Park & Monument Association in 1953. During those early years the Northwest Historical Association managed both Fort Vancouver
and Fort Clatsop sales operations. This double duty ended in October 1963 when the association focused on Fort Vancouver operations alone, though Fort Clatsop activities had averaged about 75% of the total sales for the group.\textsuperscript{74}

In October 1974, the Northwest Historical Association was dissolved and a combined effort called the Pacific Northwest National Parks and Forests Association was created by the regional office.\textsuperscript{75} Under this new association, Fort Vancouver sales increased tremendously. Yet, the amount of assistance provided to Fort Vancouver's interpretive programs from those sales was only about 10% of the sales proceeds. The regional cooperating group currently operates under the name of Northwest Interpretive Association.

**Friends of Fort Vancouver**

Bob Appling, the former chief of interpretation and resource management, recalled that he and Glenn Baker wanted to organize a "Friends of Fort Vancouver" beginning sometime in 1987. They hoped to establish an organization that could work as an intermediary between the park and the public on such issues as Pearson Airpark. They also hoped to establish a cooperative association to replace the Pacific Northwest National Parks and Forests Association that might return more profit from sales directly to the park. The high administrative costs for the existing cooperating association left little of the profits to the park for interpretation.\textsuperscript{76}

The Friends of Fort Vancouver worked well as an advocacy group, but was unable to function as a cooperating association. A memorandum of agreement between the Park Service and the Friends of Fort Vancouver was prepared in March 1991, which outlined the purpose of the society. The organization included thirteen park volunteers whose main goal was to aid the visitor service programs and objectives of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. The agreement intended "to authorize private fundraising for the reconstruction of additional historic structures and support of other programs at Fort Vancouver NHS," because no funding for reconstruction had been authorized since 1981. The Friends' role included raising money as well as collecting
interpretive items for the fort. The agreement extended 5 years from the date which Susan Hudson, as president, signed on behalf of the group. The park allowed the Friends to use office space within the historic site grounds as well as other support.\textsuperscript{77}

The Friends of Fort Vancouver have faithfully supported the Park Service in its attempt to uphold the provisions of the deed of purchase for Pearson Airpark, which restricts use of the airfield beyond 2002. Members of the Friends of Fort Vancouver have attended most meetings of the Historical Reserve Study Commission and have supported maintaining the integrity of the site. Though Susan Hudson resigned as president in 1992, the Park Service is in the process of creating a strong advisory board of influential community members to once more build up a base of support for Fort Vancouver.

Historical associations and societies, the Army, and the City of Vancouver have all contributed to or affected the development of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site in a variety of ways. Given its location, Fort Vancouver needs to continue to solicit the good will of these special interest groups, especially as the debate over the Vancouver Historical Reserve escalates. Compromise has been and will continue to be the site's best public relations tool.
CHAPTER SIX
Pearson Airpark encompasses two distinct parcels with rather different histories. The eastern half of the site, east of East Reserve Street, was owned by a succession of railroad companies from 1930, when the City of Vancouver first leased it for the development of a municipal airfield, until 1972, when the city purchased it. The western half of the site, now part of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, has a more tangled history of ownership. The Hudson's Bay Company, which left Fort Vancouver in 1860, surrendered its fur post to the United States Army as part of a court settlement in 1869. By the mid-1920s, the site was developed as Pearson Field for the Army Air Corps. In 1949, the City of Vancouver obtained the western half of the present Airpark when parts of Vancouver Barracks were declared surplus. Pressure from Burlington Northern to buy the eastern half of the site and the National Park Service's interest in obtaining the property for Fort Vancouver National Historic Site led to the sale of the western parcel to the Park Service in 1972. This sequence of ownership is easy enough to trace. More difficult, however, is to document and evaluate the relationship between these owners, their intentions for the Pearson Airpark property, and the historical significance of the land's use over the past century and a half.

Silas Christofferson's June 11, 1912 flight between Portland and Vancouver Barracks is the first documented landing of an aircraft in the immediate vicinity of the present field.\(^1\) Observers of Christofferson's flight recalled that he used the polo field at Vancouver Barracks for his landing, which was just west of what soon became the Army Air Corps airfield.\(^2\) While no permanent runway was established prior to the 1920s at this site, which continued to be used as a polo field by the officers at Vancouver Barracks, a number of Army and local aviators used the open field for their experimental
flying until the First World War.

The polo playing and the aviation experiments were discontinued during World War I when the United States built a spruce mill on fifty acres of the site to provide lumber for American aircraft factories. Between November 1917 and the end of the war, the 30,000 officers and enlisted men of the U.S. Army Corps' Third Spruce Production Division produced about nine million board feet of spruce lumber monthly. Though the spruce mill was in operation for a little under two years, the buildings remained on the site for several years after the war's end.³

Due to the lack of funding for Air Service activities after the war, the Army did not resume the use of the Barracks' airfield until 1921 when the Forest Patrol, a cooperative effort between the Air Service and the U.S. Forest Service, was stationed there. Keeping the landing strip open, however, proved to be an on-going problem because of its location in the flood plain of the Columbia River. Periodically covered with water which prevented its use, local news accounts indicate that the field's condition was a factor in the Army's decision to relocate the airplane Forest Patrol unit to another field by 1925. The privately contracted airmail service that originally operated out of the field in 1926 also moved, relocating to Portland in 1928 because of the limitations of the airstrip.⁴

On September 16, 1925, the airfield was officially dedicated as Pearson Field, in memory of Lt. Alexander Pearson, a noted military aviator killed in an airplane accident the previous September. The field was restricted to military use, primarily the Reserve Army Air Corps, except in emergencies, by a 1925 ruling which restricted civilian use of military fields.⁵ Thus excluded from Pearson, a few pilots established a civilian airfield, east of East Reserve Street, on land owned by the Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railroad. This civilian strip evolved into the Vancouver municipal airport, which formally opened on the railroad property May 25, 1930. The city leased the seventy-acre airfield from the Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railroad on a year-to-year basis with no long-term agreement.⁶

In 1941, Pearson Airpark ceased to be an active Army Air Corps base. Both
United States Army planning drawings and aerial photographs show that the Army intended to develop Pearson Field for non-aviation purposes during 1944 and 1945—perhaps for military housing during World War II. By 1945, a grid of streets had been laid out, named, and graded onto what had been the airfield. The U.S. Army most likely put these expansion plans on hold at the end of the war and, in December 1946, announced that much of Vancouver Barracks, including Pearson Field, would become surplus property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944. The War Assets Administration (WAA) was appointed as trustee to distribute the surplus property.\(^7\)

In July 1946, even before the Barracks property was officially declared surplus, the City of Vancouver unofficially consolidated the old municipal airport with Pearson Field, linked the two runways with grading, and renamed the entire site "Pearson Airpark."\(^8\) During this postwar period, the main turf runway ran parallel to the Columbia River, in the vicinity of the current strip. Most of the runway was on the Spokane, Portland & Seattle property. By the 1940s, the city formally leased this property on a long-term basis from the railroad for $500 a year and annual tax payments.\(^9\) A northern runway crossed the old Hudson’s Bay Company fort site, but by the mid-1940s it was probably not used except during high waters, when the southern runway was inaccessible. Neither runway was paved until 1966 when the lower runway was filled to stop flooding and asphalt was laid.

The National Park Service also had an interest in surplus property at Vancouver Barracks. In March 1947, O.A. Tomlinson, the Region Four director, met with the Fort Vancouver Restoration & Historical Society and the Vancouver Chamber of Commerce about acquiring lands once occupied by the Hudson’s Bay Company’s Fort Vancouver for a national monument. Because the fort site was on land for which the City of Vancouver had also applied, the Park Service, the city, and the War Assets Administration had to negotiate the best disposition of land. The Park Service originally wanted most of the land surrounding the fort site. But O.A. Tomlinson "decided to apply only for lands which were not essential for the operation of Pearson Air Field." The WAA, however, suggested that the Park Service apply for the fort site land before the option expired and
then work out any conflicts directly with the city. So, on March 13, 1947, the National Park Service made formal application for the fort site within Vancouver Barracks.\(^\text{10}\)

The following month the regional director, still faced with resistance from the city, lamented that:

\[\text{because we signified our desire not to accept the whole of Pearson Field and then give the City of Vancouver a special use permit for that part to be used as an airport, the War Assets Administration felt they could accomplish the same result by deeding to the City of Vancouver the entire field with the understanding that they would in turn grant the Park Service a permit to use the Hudson Bay Stockade area.}\(^\text{11}\)

To help resolve the overlapping land claims of the city and Park Service, Park Service historian Dr. Aubrey Neasham and planner B.F. Manby visited the site on April 23, 1947. Manby assured the city that if the fort site was included within the proposed monument boundaries, the National Park Service would "adjust the east and south boundaries,...place only flat markers at the fort site, and...restrict visitors from walking out onto the fort site."\(^\text{12}\)

With these assurances, the City of Vancouver agreed to revise its surplus land application in the spring of 1948 to allow the parade ground and the fort site to go to the Park Service for the purposes of a monument. Once more, the WAA delayed a formal land transfer to either the City or the National Park Service pending the outcome of proposed legislation to establish Fort Vancouver National Monument.\(^\text{13}\) Legislation to authorize the monument was signed by President Truman on June 19, 1948.

Once the conflicting claims between Vancouver and the Park Service were settled in April 1949, the WAA transferred the title to the western half of the Pearson Airpark property to the city, formalizing the unification of the military and municipal airfields made 3 years earlier. A clause in the deed restricted use of the property to airport purposes only and provided for reversion to the federal government if the property ceased to be used as an airport. In addition, the government had the right to take control of the property during a national emergency and required the sale, lease, or disposal of any of the property be approved by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, later the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).\(^\text{14}\)
The Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railroad continued to own the eastern portion of Pearson. During May 1949, the WAA transferred the fort site to the Department of the Interior, to be included in Fort Vancouver National Monument. The letter of transfer contained the four conditions that would affect future negotiations over the Fort Vancouver site and reconstruction of fort structures:

1. no structures could be built on the area now within Pearson Field;
2. only flat markers could be placed at the corners of the old structures, and the entire area must be kept free from obstructions;
3. visitors had to stay off the fort site; and
4. the property was to be subject to an easement and right-of-way, for the benefit of Pearson Field, for the free and unobstructed passage of aircraft in the air space over the granted lands.\(^{15}\)

Though this was ultimately an unsatisfactory solution for the Park Service, it allowed it to obtain the original Fort Vancouver site for a national monument and preserved remaining cultural resources for future archaeological study. But, in order to maintain aviation at Pearson on the existing runways, the National Park Service was effectively restrained from developing the site for interpretive purposes.

**Pearson in the 1950s**

The 1950s were not very successful years for the young municipal airport. Besides the practical problems of having the main runway located on a flood plain and the threat of commercial development to the east, the fiscal health of Pearson Airpark was at times in doubt.\(^{16}\)

In the mid-1950s the Vancouver City Council "expressed their private and unsolicited opinion" to Fort Vancouver Superintendent Frank Hjort that the city might be willing to close the Airpark "if the National Park Service will receive the land now used for airport purposes."\(^{17}\) Again in 1958, the City Council investigated closing the airport and purchasing land outside the city limits for airport purposes, which "would release the Spokane, Portland and Seattle Railway property immediately east of the city-owned airport property for industrial purposes."\(^{18}\) The city then decided it would continue to operate Pearson field but with no further investment in the property.\(^{19}\)
In fact, in February 1959, the City Council disbanded the Vancouver Board of Aeronautics and appointed a new Aviation Committee in an attempt to plan for discontinuation of Pearson. The committee's role was to "advise the Council on aviation problems and to study possibilities of relocating the airpark should a move become necessary."  

Principal tenants of Pearson sensed an insecure future at the airport. In June 1961, Art Whitaker, "the principal occupant of the city of Vancouver's airpark, closed his distributorship for Piper products for the Pacific Northwest. It has been reported that the move was made at the Piper Company's request because of the inadequate facilities at this airfield."  

At various times during the 1950s, Pearson Airpark operated in the red. But there were several other reasons that the City Council did not want to invest in any further development at the airport. Primarily the city could not get a longer lease on the railroad property east of East Reserve Street which incorporated most of Pearson Airpark's operations. State law also prohibited the city from issuing additional revenue bonds for airport improvements. Finally, the city realized that it might have to give up its avigation easements if federal funds were appropriated for reconstruction of Fort Vancouver.

**Pearson Development in the 1960s**

Despite the uncertainty of Pearson's future in the early 1960s, the City of Vancouver began to plan for the Airpark's development. The city sold a 4.22 acre parcel of the western property to the Washington State Highway Department on March 22, 1961, for road construction purposes. In return, the city received $25,600 which it slated for new airplane hanger construction. However, the quit-claim deed did not reference the original 1947 War Assets Administration deed for Pearson which required that the city use the property only for airport purposes. In a later memo to the director of the Park Service, Superintendent Eliot Davis wrote that lawyers for Vancouver's Airport Committee determined that "the sale of land by the city to the State of Washington was
probably illegal although no one protested it at the time of the sale.\textsuperscript{24}

On August 23, 1963, the city acquired 4.7 additional surplus acres of Vancouver Barracks to extend the lower runway at Pearson. The deed for this transfer applied the same use restrictions as the 1947 Deed.\textsuperscript{25} By the fall of 1964, the city informed the FAA of its intention to extend the 3,400-foot lower runway to 4,200 feet at the west end of the airport. Even though the FAA "withheld action' on the city's notice of intention," the City of Vancouver proceeded to mow the grass, making an 800-foot sod overrun at the end of the southern runway.\textsuperscript{26}

Although it had assisted the city in obtaining the surplus property in 1947 and had created restrictions for the avigation easement over the Fort Vancouver site, the FAA was hesitant to support any further development at Pearson. Indeed, in July 1964, the FAA began to pressure the city to relocate Pearson. Joseph Tippets, Los Angeles FAA regional director, recommended relocating the airpark "not only because of air traffic problems which are developing, but also because [the] city is growing and will ultimately need a larger airport."\textsuperscript{27} New FAA regulations had recently been developed for small airports and Tippets could foresee the potential problem of conflicting air space with Portland International Airport across the Columbia River, as well as conflicts with the Interstate expansion. Tippets told Vancouver that the sale of Pearson property could finance new runway construction and federal assistance could help relocate the airport. But Allan McCoy, the airport manager, said that they had no intention of moving the airport.\textsuperscript{28}

While the FAA remained adamant about the serious safety hazards posed by Pearson, it also supported further Pearson development plans. In a May 1965 meeting with Manuel Morris, the acting regional chief of the Division of Land and Water Rights in the Park Service's Western Region, the FAA admitted that it had limited itself when it supported the city's application for surplus Vancouver Barracks property in 1947. Though it supported the airport's relocation, the FAA could not "reverse itself without embarrassment."\textsuperscript{29} Thus the FAA initiated seemingly contradictory policies on Pearson Airpark. On one hand, it strongly suggested relocation of the airport, yet it also funded
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an airport development study in the fall of 1966, by Leigh Fisher Associates, Inc., professional planners from San Francisco, which recommended expanding the facility. The first sign of new development appeared in October 1966 when Pearson Airpark paved its south runway. Until 1961, the main runway had been turf, then gravel topped. In 1966, three thousand feet of the runway was paved at a cost of $35,000, which the city hoped would improve the Airpark’s business.³⁰

Leigh Fisher Associates’ final airport development report, available in March 1967, recommended as a priority the purchase of the Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railroad property which was still under lease to the city. The report also recommended removing restrictions of the original 1947 quit-claim deed in order to develop the entire property, estimating the total project would cost about $1 million. Others in the city thought the report did not go far enough. Harold Kern, Chairman of the Airport Advisory Committee, wanted to keep the north runway, which went through the fort site, remove the original quit-claim deed restrictions, and turn the south end of the field into "revenue producing property for the Airport."³¹

The city’s consideration of more intense development of the Pearson property concerned the staff at Fort Vancouver. "If the City has unrestricted use of the land," Fort Vancouver Superintendent Eliot Davis wrote the regional director in April 1967, "it can be sold for private industrial use as it is already zoned for light industry. As Fort Vancouver adjoins the Airpark this could ruin the setting of Fort Vancouver."³²

Nonetheless, two new hangars were to be constructed adjacent to the fort site. In April 1967, the Park Service objected to this proposal "as it will cut off the view of the east wall of the Fort from the Visitor Center." The city manager promised that the hangars would be removed if the Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railroad lands and other private lands were ever owned by the city. The City of Vancouver then suggested that the National Park Service help them purchase the railroad lands, the avigation easement over the fort site, and the western portion of Pearson, so that they could remove the hangars.³³ However, at this point, the Park Service was primarily concerned with the development of Fort Vancouver itself.

110
Development of Fort Vancouver in Relation to Pearson

Although the Park Service had conceded to certain restrictions on the use of the fort site when the War Assets Administration transferred the Pearson property to the City of Vancouver in 1949, early planning goals for the monument included eliminating the runway and avigation easement which ran through the fort site. In the early 1950s, Superintendent Frank Hjort met with the Vancouver Aeronautics Board to discuss the runway and they agreed in principle that if the lower runway "could be filled enough on the east to place it above the high-water stages of the Columbia," then the upper runway could be eliminated, since it was needed only during flood stage.34

In 1960, the National Park Service again broached the question of moving the existing avigation easement which restricted use of the fort site. The Park Service could not plan reconstruction or further the interpretation of Fort Vancouver as long as the northern runway remained. The Park Service thought the northern runway was not essential to the continued operation of the airfield, but the City Council and Pearson Airpark wanted to keep the runway because of flooding problems and, according to City Manager Robert Clute, air turbulence on the south runway.35

On the other hand, the City of Vancouver was interested in "acquiring a small portion of the southerly part [of Vancouver Barracks property] in order to extend a runway." This same property was within the ultimate boundaries of Fort Vancouver National Monument and part of desired legislation that would authorize this expansion. Robert D. Clute, city manager, wrote Julia Butler Hansen, newly elected congressional representative for Washington State's Third District, that they did "not wish to obstruct the wishes of the National Park Service, but we do not feel that this portion would hamper their overall development." Clute mistakenly implied that the city "originally gave the land, that they now occupy, to the National Parks [sic] Service and for this reason we feel somewhat justified in this small request."36

It was not until 1961, when Representative Julia Butler Hansen introduced legislation to expand the maximum acreage for Fort Vancouver to 220 acres and change its designation to national historic site, that the means to reconcile the conflict
materialized. The legislation, signed into law by President Kennedy on June 30, 1961, anticipated reconstruction of the fort site and additional land acquisition, including the western portion of Pearson Airpark. George Hartzog, the director of the National Park Service, later wrote Congresswoman Julia Butler Hansen that it was the Park Service's understanding "that certain lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Defense and lands owned by the City of Vancouver and utilized as the Pearson Airpark would eventually be added to the Site."37 The city, having been reassured that it could extend its lower runway if it acquired a piece of land not important to Fort Vancouver's development, withdrew its objections to the legislation.38

Though the acquisition of the Pearson property was not accomplished for another ten years, the City of Vancouver, the secretary of the Interior, and the FAA agreed to modify the avigation easement on February 27, 1962, to allow reconstruction of the north wall of the fort, which was built in 1966.39 However, the bastion construction was delayed because it exceeded the FAA height limitation by 13 feet, coming into conflict with the airspace requirements for the modified easement.40

As early as October 6, 1964, the first plan for acquisition of property at Pearson was proposed by Superintendent Hal Edwards. His proposal for Pearson Airpark "relocation" was not only endorsed by the mayor, but had been originally suggested to Edwards by Harold Kern, chairman of the city's Airport Advisory Committee. The "Edwards Plan" suggested that the National Park Service purchase "land east of the old Military Reservation owned by SP&S Railroad and private parties" thus preventing "heavy industry" from locating on the property. In exchange, the north runway would be moved south to reconfigure Pearson so that the fort site and stockade could be rebuilt. However, Edwards' proposal would have required that the Park Service deed the Spokane, Portland, & Seattle land back to the City of Vancouver, transferring ownership of the entire Airpark to the city.41

Hal Edwards' untimely death in November 1964 left many questions about his proposal unanswered. His successor, Eliot Davis, struggled with the repercussions of the "Edwards Plan" since some people in the Vancouver community thought that the Park
Service had approved the plan. In July 1965, Eliot Davis wrote to the regional director that he told a member of the Chamber of Commerce "that this was not a valid plan and had never been one. It was an idea advanced by Mr. Edwards, the former Superintendent, but never approved by higher authority." 42 By January of the next year, Davis had "repudiated any verbal commitments that may have been made [under Edwards, which] still continue to plague us." 43 Indeed, the City of Vancouver continued to use Edwards' report to pressure Senators Henry Jackson and Warren G. Magnuson and Representative Julia Butler Hansen to pass legislation to appropriate Park Service funds to pay for the expansion of Pearson Airpark. 44

Throughout 1966, several prominent men in Vancouver promoted both the reconstruction of Fort Vancouver and the upkeep of Pearson Airpark. Gus Norwood, executive secretary for the Northwest Public Power Association, told Representative Julia Butler Hansen that he felt that "the Fort and Airpark can live together in harmony and on a complimentary basis." In order to do this, however, the Park Service had to purchase the Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railroad property for the city. Norwood also wanted the Park Service to "reimburse the City of Vancouver for the costs of removal and relocation of the upper runway and airport buildings." 45 J.E.N. Jensen, assistant director of the National Park Service, wrote Representative Hansen that though the Service was interested in the development of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, "we entertain serious doubts that the expenditures involved in Mr. Norwood's plan could be justified." 46

 Pearson Commercial Development

At the same time that the modified avigation easement opened up limited possibilities for development at Fort Vancouver, the City of Vancouver explored the possibilities of the commercial development of the adjacent Pearson property as recommended by Leigh Fisher Associates. In July 1966, the city attempted to obtain a release from the 1947 quit-claim deed restrictions to allow development of non-airport uses. Edward Hummel, the Park Service regional director, advised the director that
release of the terms would adversely affect the future of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site.\textsuperscript{47}

By the following year, the Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railroad encouraged the city to buy from it the eastern half of Pearson Airpark, which was valued at about $600,000. The city explored the possibility of an exchange of city-owned waterfront lands for the parcel, but the railroad would not accept an exchange.\textsuperscript{48} Next the city asked the Park Service to buy the avigation easement over the fort site for $600,000 to allow them to purchase the Spokane, Portland & Seattle land.\textsuperscript{49} The Park Service rejected this proposal.

At the end of the summer of 1967, the City of Vancouver again asked the FAA to release it from the 1947 deed restrictions.\textsuperscript{50} After meeting with Park Service representatives in October 1967 to discuss the city's request, the FAA recommended denying its request "until such time as arrangements can be made for the selection and construction of a replacement airport and the airport property released for sale and acquired for the planned development of the historic site."\textsuperscript{51}

Based on these meetings, the FAA again strongly suggested that the city look for another airport site, because it would not support further development at Pearson. Three suggested alternate airport sites included Evergreen Airport, Orchard, and the Vancouver Lake Complex. Portland International Airport's plans to expand in early 1968 also added urgency to the issue of relocation, since the proposed flight paths would encroach on Pearson air traffic.\textsuperscript{52} Indeed, the FAA proposed that all Pearson traffic fly to the north to avoid potential conflict.\textsuperscript{53}

The Fort Vancouver 1969 Master Plan and Pearson Airpark

Since the Fort Vancouver National Monument Boundary Status Report of 1955, the proposed ultimate boundaries for Fort Vancouver included the western portion of Pearson Airpark, which had previously been part of the Hudson's Bay Company's Fort Vancouver complex. When the National Park Service formed the Fort Vancouver Master Planning Committee in 1967 to plan a direction for the site's future development,
the acquisition of the Pearson property became a priority. In August, R.B. Moore, acting regional director, Western Region, suggested that if appropriations could be obtained to purchase land which the Federal Government has so recently donated, we would prefer to see the Service purchase or otherwise obtain from the City all of the airport lands within our proposed ultimate boundaries; these lands could then be leased back to the City for airport runway purposes.

The planning committee's primary concern was that the fort site be freed for reconstruction. In addition, the surrounding historic scene could be restored to provide more accurate interpretation of the site. The 1969 Master Plan for Fort Vancouver reiterated the priority of acquiring Pearson to make these goals possible.

The Park Service explored several options for acquiring the Pearson property. In April 1969, it asked the Army for custody of thirty acres of former Veterans Administration property to exchange with the city for the Pearson Airpark land. By the end of the year, Superintendent Eliot Davis hoped that Ken Puttkamer, airport manager, "would cooperate in a land exchange if they locate another airport site near, or on, Government lands. We understand that an area near Brush Prairie is under consideration which includes a small area of Federal land."

The land exchange never worked out, but the new city manager, Alan Harvey, continued to pursue alternative solutions to the land use conflict. "During the next phase of expansion at Fort Vancouver," Harvey wrote to Representative Julia Butler Hansen in December 1969, "we believe that land at the airport could be sold or transferred to the National Park Service or the avigation easement over the Fort might be altered to allow for expansion of the Fort, and at the same time flying from other portions of the airport could continue on a reduced scale."

The Park Service eventually hoped to move the airport to incorporate the property into the historic context of Fort Vancouver. In January 1970, Eliot Davis again suggested that the Park Service purchase the Pearson property but with a limited special use permit to the city "with enough time to phase out the airport and move it to another site." Alan Harvey agreed that the Park Service should consider purchasing 73 acres of city-owned airport property which he valued at $730,000. He also suggested that the
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city and the Park Service enter into a long-term lease agreement to allow continued operation of the airport for a definite number of years, with a modified or discontinued avigation easement which would allow for the reconstruction of the fort stockade. The city would then purchase the eastern 62 acres of Pearson from Burlington Northern Railroad, who now owned the Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railroad property. Harvey also admitted to Superintendent Eliot Davis that "pressure from the public and from the City Council is calling for reconstruction of Fort Vancouver."

Negotiations for the Purchase of Pearson

While the Park Service contemplated the idea of purchasing the city's property to incorporate it into Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, City Manager Alan Harvey contacted Burlington Northern to ask that the company consider donating the 61.8 acres of leased airport land, or a portion of it, to Vancouver. Harvey cited the tax advantages and the potential public relations coup that such an action would create. Burlington Northern did not take to the suggestion.

In the spring of 1971, serious negotiations began between the National Park Service and Vancouver for the purchase of the city-owned Pearson property. Representative Julia Butler Hansen was kept informed of the negotiations because congressional approval was needed to appropriate funds for the purchase. The negotiations centered around three basic conditions:

1) providing enough money from the acquisition for the City of Vancouver to purchase the Burlington Northern property;
2) eliminating restrictions for development of the Fort Vancouver site by removing the upper runway; and
3) allowing the city to continue to use the property as Pearson Airpark for a limited period of time.

George Hartzog, the director of the National Park Service, suggested to Ed Hummel, deputy regional director, that the Park Service negotiate a separate option with Burlington Northern which it could then assign to the city if all desired conditions for the sale were met, including reversion of the property back to park use after a limited time. Superintendent Eliot Davis discouraged the use of this tactic, asserting that the Park
Service "should proceed in the manner that was agreed to by the city where they would contact the railroad and we would then be brought into the negotiation possibly at a later time."\textsuperscript{63} However, Hartzog’s plan prevailed. On April 16, 1971, Burlington Northern and the National Park Service signed an Offer to Sell Real Property for 61.8 acres (the eastern half of Pearson Airpark) in exchange for $463,000.\textsuperscript{64} The Park Service never used its option for the Burlington Northern property. During April and May of 1971 the National Park Service informally agreed to purchase the western half of Pearson from the city if it abandoned the northern grass runway which prevented the reconstruction of Fort Vancouver. As George Hartzog told Congresswoman Hansen in a letter of April 29, 1971, "the city will develop its existing asphalt runway and approaches thereto in such a way as not to further obstruct the full development of Fort Vancouver, in accordance with the approved Master Plan."\textsuperscript{65} The Park Service also agreed to a provision in the deed for a thirty-year right of use and occupancy by the city for operating the Airpark until 2002.

In May 1971, the City of Vancouver and Park Service executed an offer to sell the airport property. The transaction was approved by the City Council with the express understanding that an "agreement to limit any significant expansion of aviation activity at Pearson Airpark is also expected."\textsuperscript{66} The offer even contained a clause that anticipated early expiration of aviation activities; in paragraph 13 the document specified that the "City shall have the right at any time during the thirty-year period right of occupancy to terminate such right and leave Pearson Airpark upon compliance with the other provisions of this instrument."\textsuperscript{67}

Between May and September 1971, while revisions were being negotiated for the final offer, the City Council extensively discussed the provisions for the city's use of Pearson after the sale. During a May meeting several councilmen wondered if the city would be bound to run the airport for thirty years even if it found it unprofitable.\textsuperscript{68} Many raised questions about a possible extension of property use after thirty years. At the September Council meeting the city manager made clear that the Park Service would not extend the use of the property beyond the thirty-year limit. As such, the Vancouver
City Council unanimously accepted the Park Service's offer on Pearson Airpark in May and September Council meetings.69

Although the city seemed to understand and agree to the Park Service's provisions for purchasing the property, the city also had a separate understanding with the FAA about the transaction and future goals for Pearson Airpark. In April 1971, the city manager openly supported the Park Service plans for reconstruction of Fort Vancouver, but he also cautioned the FAA that the city would do everything necessary to keep Pearson Airpark open.70 The FAA, in turn, made it clear that it would "oppose any significant increase of activity at Pearson Airpark."71

The FAA agreed to the sale of the western half of Pearson to the National Park Service provided that the purchase price be used within five years to look for an aviation facility elsewhere. The FAA recognized, as "proponents of Pearson Airpark and planners have long recognized, that Pearson is not the ideal ultimate general aviation airport to serve the ever-growing aviation activity in the Clark County area."72 Indeed, it had been warning the City of Vancouver throughout the 1960s that the city should consider closing Pearson, that it was unsafe and conflicted with flights from Portland International Airport.

Yet, on September 24, 1971, the FAA signed an agreement with the City of Vancouver which insisted that "nothing in this agreement shall indicate that FAA intends to close Pearson Airpark at any time but only that proceeds from this sale shall be used for new airport purposes." The agreement, signed by C. B. Walk, Jr., the northwest regional director for the FAA, incorporated Vancouver City Council Resolution No. M-1521 and obligated the city to expend the proceeds of the sale for the purchase of the Burlington Northern property and development of a new public airport. A deed of release was executed the same day which removed the original restrictions on the City's property to allow for the sale to the National Park Service.73

Despite clear statements of the Park Service's intentions for the use and development of the Pearson property, there continued to be some misunderstandings between the Park Service and the City of Vancouver. In a letter to Chris Walk, Jr. of
the FAA on February 24, 1972, Mayor Lloyd Stromgren contended that "a principal intention of all parties throughout this transaction has been that Pearson Airpark should continue to operate as a local aviation facility and that in addition a larger, regional airpark should be developed." Stromgren further stated that he knew the FAA "fully concurs in the desirability of maintaining Pearson." 74

On March 14, 1972, the National Park Service bought the western portion of Pearson Airpark for $544,500. The statutory warranty deed, signed April 4, 1972, and recorded April 6, 1972 by Don Bonker, Clark County auditor, transferred 72.57 acres to the Park Service and contained a "reservation" clause which allowed the city to use the property for thirty years. This document was not a lease and there was no provision to extend the use of Pearson Airpark in the deed. A subsequent 1983 solicitor's opinion declared that since the initial purchase of the property was instigated by Congress, any amendment to the deed for the Pearson facility would require congressional action. 75

The city paid $1 per year for the use of the western portion of Pearson Airpark with the stipulation that no structures could be built on the property without the consent of the Park Service. In April 1972, the land was officially transferred at a ceremony in Fort Vancouver's Visitor Center, which featured Julia Butler Hansen as keynote speaker. 76 The arrangement was lauded as beneficial for all three participants--the Park Service could now finish reconstruction of the fort and the city could buy the eastern half of Pearson Airpark from Burlington Northern Railroad, who, in turn, would be free of its surplus land.

**Pearson and Fort Vancouver--an Uneasy Coexistence**

Once the land transaction for the western portion of Pearson Airpark was completed, the City of Vancouver and Fort Vancouver National Historic Site settled into an uneasy coexistence. During the next ten years Vancouver sporadically looked for a new airport site while the Park Service tried to minimize the impact of the adjacent airport on Fort Vancouver and plan for the continued reconstruction of fort structures.

In the mid-1970s, Pearson once again wanted to expand its facilities. The Airpark
manager requested that the Park Service allow it to rebuild and enlarge the Bonneville Power Administration's hangars which were situated on park property. Donald Gillespie, superintendent at Fort Vancouver since 1972, denied the request. He feared that "it would be a precedent type of decision" and intended "to stand firm in our resistance to expansion within N.P.S. airpark property in favor of a new facility to the east."  

Alan Harvey, city manager, wanted "to ensure Pearson Airpark's existence as a viable facility beyond 2002," but believed this could only "be done from the standpoint of cooperation and finding a mutually satisfactory solution to all the parties through negotiations." He also thought that a solution could be found that did not use all federal funding. Harvey believed that the city had as much at stake in completing the reconstruction at Fort Vancouver as developing Pearson. Yet, his ultimate goal was to extend the use of Pearson Airpark and he worked under the assumption that the FAA supported the airport's continued existence as well as the development of a new airport.  

Alan Harvey was thus instrumental in working with Clark County to search for another airport site. Several alternative airport sites were considered by the county. In 1979, the Clark County Airport Committee prepared a preliminary study on these sites, though it was agreed that none of the sites were ideal. The FAA funded ninety percent of the study. The most promising site at Pioneer was dropped in the spring of 1981, because local residents, unclear about the size and time schedule of the project, raised a number of objections.

After tabling the Pioneer site, the City of Vancouver asked the FAA for support in negotiations with the National Park Service to extend the use of Pearson Airpark beyond 2002. The FAA, however, did not want the deed restrictions altered due to the continuing airspace conflict between Pearson and Portland International Airport. Not only was there fear of airspace conflict with planes coming out of Portland International, but there were also complaints of noise interference over the fort site itself. As early as July 1974, after the stockade, bastion, and bakery were reconstructed, complaints about low-flying aircraft "buzzing" the fort were received from Park Service
staff and visitors.\textsuperscript{81} Between May and August 1982, Chief Ranger Kent Taylor made a more formal survey of aircraft disturbances at the fort site. During this time period 346 of 625 scheduled tours were disrupted by Pearson air traffic, sometimes making it impossible to hear the interpreter.\textsuperscript{82} Mitigation of noise disturbance was an important component of the 1978 Master Plan at Fort Vancouver, yet accomplishing this goal required cooperation with Pearson Airpark and its supporters.

\textbf{Airpark Use Beyond 2002--Pearson in the 1980s}

From the mid-1970s, the City of Vancouver had requested the extension of the use of Pearson beyond 2002. In the fall of 1981, the city's hopes for Pearson received a temporary boost when current National Park Service Superintendent James Thomson at first appeared receptive to the idea of extension. Indeed, after being approached by Ted Brown, director of Vancouver Parks and Recreation, Thomson seemed to be more willing than his predecessors to consider the immediate needs of the airport, such as extending the paved runway, realigning the taxiway to parallel the paved runway, and replacing hangars in the eastern portion of the airpark. This development meant "quite an investment which would take some years to bring about a satisfactory return on the funds," Thomson wrote to the regional director, "the number of years calculated would be realized only by an extension of the current [use]. From the discussion it seems like there is need for a greater period of time than just a five-year renewal time, perhaps even as much as 20 additional years or probably indefinite."\textsuperscript{83}

Perhaps Thomson had been unfamiliar with park policy and the history of the Pearson negotiations. Charles Odegaard, then deputy regional director, reminded Thomson that the National Park Service "should consistently and accurately inform the City and other interested governmental entities" that it did not plan to extend the use of Pearson beyond 2002.\textsuperscript{84}

On February 22, 1982, the City Council passed Resolution M-2301, which pressed for "re-negotiation" of the terms of the 1972 deed to continue the use of Park Service property for an airport. Mayor Jim Justin advised Regional Director Daniel Tobin that
efforts to locate a new airport had failed because of resident opposition. In addition, many who had financed the development at Pearson thought that their investment was in jeopardy.\textsuperscript{85} Regional Director Tobin's reply reaffirmed that the park had always intended to phase out the use of the airport because of its intrusion on the historic site of Fort Vancouver and that the "city was aware of and agreed with our purpose." Director Tobin added that "No lease arrangement exists and, therefore, we cannot discuss a lease extension."\textsuperscript{86}

The apparent contradictions in FAA actions further complicated the situation. Though the FAA had supported a possible extension of use for the Airpark at the time of the 1972 purchase, in January 1976 it wrote the Park Service to support the 2002 closure date.\textsuperscript{87} Yet, in the spring and summer of 1982 the FAA financed and approved the new Airport Layout Plan [ALP], with reservations. Despite the approval, Mark Beisse, senior planning officer of the FAA regional office, told Clark County officials on May 14, 1982, that, though there were several "historic" buildings at Pearson, the "FAA does not support expansion of activities at Pearson. Closing Pearson would have little or no effect on the civil aviation picture in the Vancouver area."\textsuperscript{88} George L. Buley, FAA chief, Planning and Programming Branch, told Tom Highland, manager of Pearson Airpark, that the agency would "object to the proposed pavement of the runway stopway which is reflected on the ALP," because of the airport closure date in 2002.\textsuperscript{89}

Despite the FAA's hesitation, Paul Grattet, city manager, informed Superintendent Jim Thomson that the city would go ahead with the Pearson Airpark improvement plan "including a new 30 foot wide taxiway running parallel to the runway, a paved engine runup area, center taxiway bypass, and turnout area, paving a runway safety area, and continuation of chain link security fencing along the southern border of the airpark." In August 1982, the city applied for FAA and Park Service approval of this project.\textsuperscript{90}

Just as the FAA had objected earlier, the Park Service's regional office did not approve of the city's proposal to pave the runway safety area. The Park Service further requested that "consideration be given to obliterating the existing taxiway to facilitate
This recent aerial photograph of Fort Vancouver clearly illustrates the close juxtaposition of Pearson Airpark with the Historic site. Officers Row is situated to the north and Interstate 5 to the west, while Pearson's hangars and runway are on the east and south of the stockade. (National Park Service.)
restoration of the area not subject to continued use. We request the opportunity to review your final plans and specifications before construction is begun.\textsuperscript{91}

The following year the Park Service requested a legal opinion from the regional solicitor on the issue of extending the use of Pearson beyond the year 2002. It was determined that an extension would require the United States to reconvey to the city a portion of the ownership that the United States received in 1972. Without special authorization by Congress for such a conveyance, the Secretary of the Interior could not extend the 30-year use period by amendment or agreement with the city.\textsuperscript{92}

In addition, if this reconveyance occurred, the city would be required to pay fair market value for the property.

Congressional support for the city's attempt to extend the use of Pearson was not forthcoming. In 1984 and 1985, Congressman Don Bonker, 3rd Congressional District, held informal hearings and met with Park Service personnel regarding federal land use issues and the relations between the City of Vancouver and Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. The city "indicated that it wanted time [to use Pearson] beyond the year 2002 but not in perpetuity." Don Bonker replied that he would not sponsor legislation to extend airport use beyond the restrictions in the 1972 deed and "reiterated his desire to see the historical integrity of the area maintained."\textsuperscript{93}

While failing to gain support from Bonker, the city began work on another master plan for Pearson Airpark to be "accomplished with federal assistance through the airport improvement program." In early 1985, a study prepared by DEVCO Engineering Airport Planners considered three alternative plans:

1) Maintaining the status quo and allowing the eventual shut down of the airport in 2002;
2) Moving facilities to the eastern portion of the property and leaving the National Park Service property altogether; and
3) "The historically integrated alternative," which "would recognize the historic significance of Pearson Airpark and would be the solution to integrate the Airpark into the Parks [sic] Service long term plans for Fort Vancouver."\textsuperscript{94}

While preparation of the Pearson Airpark master plan proceeded, the City Council held "secret negotiations" in the spring of 1986 to explore using the eastern
portion of Pearson to build an arena for the Portland Trail Blazers. The $40 million project would make Vancouver the center for major sports and cultural events. Though nothing came of these negotiations, the possibility of losing Pearson field to commercial development precipitated the formation of the "Friends of Pearson Air Park." John Wulle, spokesperson for the Airport Advisory Committee, joined with this group to promote the development of an air museum at Pearson and the continuation of the commercial airfield.

In the summer of 1986, City Manager Paul Grattet recommended "that Pearson should operate until 2002 if the airport continued to break even and no better use for the land was suggested." Grattet, as well as others on the City Council, saw the Pearson site as "a prime site for commercial or industrial development." The city manager's major concern was financial since Pearson "will likely finish 1986 in the red." 

**Preservation of Pearson--the Late 1980s**

In September 1986, at a regular City Council meeting, City Manager Paul Grattet recommended that no further efforts be made to support Pearson. Two councilmen, Dick Porkonowski and Bruce Hagensen, who was later elected mayor, disagreed with Grattet and voted to maintain Pearson. The "Friends of Pearson Air Park" regrouped in November 1986 as The Pearson Airpark Historical Society (PAHS). At City Council meetings John Wulle actively promoted "Pearson as the proposed home for a new air museum, and also stressed that the airport should be kept open because it serves as a desirable buffer against air traffic from Portland International Airport."

The following year, City Manager Paul Grattet again recommended abandoning the airport property, even before the right of use expired in 2002, and suggested reconsidering the "Pioneer" site for a county airport. However, on March 9, 1987, the City Council resolved to "keep Pearson operating indefinitely" and, in recognition of the Pearson Airpark Historical Society, establish a museum at the airport. In order to accomplish this it suggested compromising with the National Park Service needs and
relocating "some of the aviation buildings to the east side of the airfield [to] reduce the visual intrusion on Fort Vancouver," while the runway and adjoining taxiway would remain active.\textsuperscript{101} The city realized that congressional approval was needed in order to develop this alternative.

In response to the city's resolution, the Park Service Pacific Northwest Regional Office created a task force to study possible use of the Pearson property after 2002. Headed by Regional Deputy Director William Briggle, the task force members, including Regional Office staff Richard Winters, Stephanie Toothman, Wendy Brand, and Harlan Hobbs, visited Fort Vancouver in June 1987 to review the Pearson issue.\textsuperscript{102} They concluded that "the park strongly supports proceeding with the concept outlined in the Master Plan of restoring a sense of the historic scene by planting the Pearson Airpark property in various field crops after the City's rights expire in 2002." Richard Winters suggested that the National Park Service demonstrate the strength of its commitment to this position--"to enhance the visitor's understanding of this nationally and regionally significant historic site"--and produce a development plan for the property.\textsuperscript{103}

Now mayor, Bruce Hagensen continued to promote the city's commitment to retaining Pearson. At a July 1987 meeting with Congressman Donald Bonker, the mayor stated that the city favored Pearson "remaining as a functional airport with the current level of use and retention of the paved runway."\textsuperscript{104} In January 1988, the City Council passed Resolution M-2595, approving the Pearson Airpark Master Plan.

In an attempt to find some compromise position between the city and the National Park Service, Park Service Regional Director Charles Odegaard developed a Statement of Alternatives which was presented to members of various interest groups on May 5, 1988. Out of five basic alternatives, the Park Service preferred one which was reminiscent of the "historically integrated alternative" of the 1985 Pearson Airpark Master Plan. The Park Service would help the city establish an aviation museum, allowing "limited operations on NPS property, including rehabilitation and use of the historic pilots' lounge and hanger, and exhibition of antique aircraft." Occasional use of a grass strip for landing of aircraft would also be accommodated.\textsuperscript{105} Though the
regional director's proposal addressed the concerns for commemorating aviation history, the city insisted that it could not have the historic airpark museum without the commercial air operation at Pearson. At a meeting with city officials in July 1988, Regional Director Charles Odegaard confirmed that "the agency will help develop an air museum on park property and allow occasional use of grass fields by antique aircraft, but no continued use of Pearson for commercial and general aviation."  

John Wulle, representing the Pearson Airpark Historical Society (PAHS), joined the city in insisting that "this organization can not and will not go forward with the museum without an agreement between the city and NPS which continues Pearson as an airport." In the fall of 1988, PAHS instigated a letter-writing campaign to the Park Service and the Washington State congressional delegation in support of maintaining Pearson as a commercial airport. However, the group continued to decline the Park Service's offer to establish and support an aviation museum and historic airpark.  

In closing this phase of the discussions, Charles Odegaard wrote to both Mayor Bruce E. Hagensen and John P. Wulle in October 1988, asking that the Society reconsider its position of July 26, 1988, which conditions its interest and support for an air museum contingent upon the continued operation of Pearson Airpark....Should the Society choose not to reconsider its position and subsequently meet with us or should the Society reconsider and then decide to withdraw from Pearson, I respectfully request notice at your earliest convenience.  

The regional director further expressed his concerns as to why the city or other interested groups never explored "repurchasing the rights acquired by the federal government in 1972." The only conclusion he could make was that Vancouver expected "a free land grant be made from a national historic site for continuing a small local airport facility."  

Jolene Unsoeld and the Historical Reserve Concept  

Since Representative Don Bonker had not supported extension of Pearson Airpark's use beyond 2002, PAHS did not get very far in its attempt to obtain congressional changes to the 1972 deed. However, in the fall of 1988, a new
representative, Jolene Unsoeld, was elected from the Third District and decided to reexamine the issue.

Early in 1989, Representative Jolene Unsoeld met with Regional Director Charles Odegaard and Vancouver Mayor Bruce Hagensen. Subsequent to this meeting, Unsoeld requested draft legislation to develop a new master plan for the Vancouver area to "protect and enhance" Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, Officers' Row, and Pearson Airpark. The legislation included the continuation of general aviation at Pearson beyond the year 2002, the integration of the three historical themes in the area, and creation of a military museum at the Vancouver Barracks.\textsuperscript{112}

For Pearson Airpark, 1989 brought mixed blessings. On one hand, two major tenants were $20,000 behind in rent. Ted Brown, of Vancouver's Parks and Recreation Department, professed that the Airpark "has a long history of businesses who are behind in rent."\textsuperscript{113} On the other hand, the federal government continued to support development of small airports. In November 1989, George Bush signed a transportation bill which directed the FAA to give priority to Vancouver's request for $95,000 to pay for resurfacing the runway and extending the taxiways and security fence. Since FAA regulations prohibited "use of federal money on any public airport unless it is going to continue to operate for 20 years or more," the act committed Congress "to keeping the airport open beyond the year 2002."\textsuperscript{114}

Perhaps because of the new optimism in finding a congressional solution to the impending closure of Pearson Airpark, the Clark County Commissioners suspended efforts to locate a county airport at the Pioneer/Ridgefield site, despite the FAA's desire to keep that option open. In March 1990, the FAA urged Paul Grattet, the Vancouver city manager, to continue to support the development at Pioneer because the new airport was needed.\textsuperscript{115}

In June 1990, a year after its original inception, Representative Jolene Unsoeld again introduced legislation to establish a Vancouver National Historical Reserve. The legislation sought to establish a cooperative agreement and a Coordinating Commission to manage the Reserve which would include Vancouver Barracks and Military Cemetery,
Chapter Six

Officers' Row National Register Historic District, Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, Pearson Airpark, and the Columbia River waterfront. Within this Reserve, general aviation would continue at Pearson Airpark beyond the year 2002. The National Park Service opposed the legislation because it would prevent Fort Vancouver from restoring the cultural landscape surrounding the reconstructed fort site.

Though an attempt to place Pearson on the National Register of Historic Places failed in October 1990, on November 5, 1990, President Bush signed into law a bill (H.R. 5144) that created the Vancouver Historical Study Commission. The Commission was established to study the historic, cultural, natural, and recreational significance of resources in the Vancouver area and to determine the feasibility of a historical reserve.

The establishment of a historical reserve is still uncertain. To date, the Commission has met monthly and wrestled with both the questions of managing a Reserve as well as recommendations for the fate of Pearson Airpark. The Park Service recently offered a compromise to the city which would allow the extension of general aviation until the year 2022 and the eventual conversion of Pearson to a historic airfield. However, this extension may only delay the ultimate decision which needs to be made: will the Park Service retrieve and develop its property according to its current master plan? Or will the participants arrive at a workable compromise that allows Pearson Airpark and Fort Vancouver National Historic Site to coexist?
Chapter Seven

The Waterfront Property

Historically, the waterfront was an important part of the Hudson’s Bay Company complex. Boatsheds, a salmon house, and a wharf for docking company vessels helped supply Fort Vancouver with fresh food and other items of trade. In 1857, the Army removed the company’s wharf and salmon house to make room for its own activities. Only in the early 1940s did the U.S. Coast Guard acquire several acres for a riverfront station. An additional 14 or 15 acres of adjacent waterfront property between the Coast Guard station on the west and the Buffalo Electro-Chemical plant on the east remained part of the Army’s Vancouver Barracks.

With the post-World War II restructuring of Vancouver Barracks, the parcel of land adjacent to the Coast Guard station became surplus. In the fall of 1954, Fort Vancouver Superintendent Frank Hjort told the General Service Administration that the Park Service decided it would not be feasible to accept the waterfront property as part of Fort Vancouver National Monument. The City of Vancouver, however, expressed interest in the land to develop a public park and the City Council approved a proposal to try to acquire the land. Just as the Park Service had assisted the city in preparing an application for surplus property north of Evergreen Boulevard, in September 1955, Park Service landscape architect James N. Gibson prepared a justification for the transfer of 14 acres of waterfront property to the City of Vancouver. The city’s initial plans consisted of clearing the property, then planting grass and constructing drinking fountains and other picnic facilities.

However, a year later, the city had not completed the transaction though the Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society urged it to acquire the waterfront land. The Park Service also wanted the city to acquire the property to prevent commercial development between the fort site and the Columbia River. But the city turned down
the opportunity to buy the property. Perhaps money was tight. At the same time, the city was under pressure to develop the George C. Marshall Park property north of Evergreen Boulevard. Instead, Frank Hjort "recommended that the National Park Service acquire and administer the [14 acres of waterfront property] to protect the future of the monument."³ In November 1956, the City of Vancouver officially withdrew its application for the waterfront property in favor of letting the Park Service receive it. The city could then lease the property from the National Park Service, "using the property as a moorage."⁴

In 1958, the strip of waterfront property between the Coast Guard station on the west and a boat moorage by the Buffalo Electro-Chemical plant on the eastern boundary was transferred to the National Park Service under the provisions of Fort Vancouver's 1948 enabling legislation. Though the city still hoped to obtain the 15 acres of waterfront property, it could not guarantee to keep the property out of private hands. Instead, the Park Service gave the city permission to use the property as a park. Frank Hjort announced in February 1958, "that the land would be offered to the city for lease as a public park. Just what conditions might be involved is not yet clear, and maybe there are factors which might make a park inadvisable now, but the important point is that the Monument's action keeps the door open."⁵

In 1959, the City of Vancouver requested permission to construct a small boat launching ramp, which was permitted under a special use permit.⁶ Yet, the next spring the city "presented a rather ambitious plan for a municipally-owned marina" to the National Park Service.⁷ The plan included a 468-boat marina, which called for dredging of portions of the waterfront. But financial problems, perhaps an unsuccessful bond sale, caused the city to shelve the plan within three years.⁸

The Park Service continued to issue special use permits to the City of Vancouver "for the purpose of providing a public small boat launching ramp, maintaining the public access, and landscaping the area between the launching area and the Coast Guard station for parking and observation purposes, and to adequately police and maintain the area." But its efforts were not always successful. By 1964, debris, broken concrete,
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curbing, and other paving waste remained on the site, inviting "the public to use the area for disposal of general rubbish including tin cans." Superintendent Hal Edwards lamented that the "area does not present a park-like appearance which in turn may bring discredit to the city and to the National Park Service." 9

The riverfront was also affected by natural disaster. On Christmas Day 1964, the Columbia River flooded, completely covering the Park Service's waterfront property being used by the city. It was the third worst flood on record, cresting at 27.6 feet.

In May 1966, George Lyons, representing the local Sea Scouts, asked the National Park Service about mooring a barge along the waterfront. They wanted to moor a 40-foot by 90-foot barge near the east boundary with a walkway to the road, to be used as a meeting place and storage for equipment. "This plan calls for modification of the Park river front consisting of a 50' wide fill for 600', four moorages and a 150' rock jetty on the east side," wrote Superintendent Eliot Davis, "Approximately twenty to forty small craft will eventually be involved." Davis, however, had reservations about the plan. Because of the permanence of the barge it would "give the Scouts possessory right that will be hard to recover, and will open the door to other groups who might wish to use the water front." 10 The Park Service finally did give permission for a barge to be moored off the shore at the eastern end of the waterfront property near the Buffalo Electro-Chemical plant.

In the mid-1960s, the Park Service's hesitance caused some friction with the City. "They understand natural beauty and our desire for an unobstructed view of the river," Eliot Davis told the regional director, "but to merely retain historical integrity is something they will not try to understand when the area could be of use to the city or the Boy Scouts." During a June 30, 1966, meeting between the superintendent and the Vancouver Parks and Recreation Committee, Jim Fowler, chairman of the Recreation Committee, pushed the Park Service to agree to a permanent breakwater for the Sea Scout barge, but finally asserted that "if we can't have the fill let the Scouts go ahead and moor the barge, then we shall have our foot in the door." Superintendent Eliot Davis cautioned the regional office that
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Their 'foot in the door' attitude speaks for itself. As for the Boy Scouts, their spokesmen made it quite plain that they are embarking on a permanent development when they place their barge or barges on the NPS waterfront, and we can look for further concession requests from them in the future. Their first request will probably be for permission to pipe city water and power to the barge.\(^\text{11}\)

The increased value of the riverfront property played an important role in the city's renewed interest in it. The city also revived plans for a boat marina. The city attorney wrote a letter to the General Services Administration requesting the property for the public benefit, including the construction of nearly 200 feet of dock for temporary boat moorage, rest room facilities, and water and power lines to service boats. The city attorney added that the marina would provide other benefits such as "facilities for obtaining gasoline, oil, and like small boating supplies."\(^\text{12}\)

Fort Vancouver countered with complaints that the city had long abused its privileges under the existing special use permit. Both Superintendents Hal Edwards and Eliot Davis noted unsightly trash and brambles along the stretch of river bank. Davis hoped the new city manager, hired in 1966, would improve conditions.\(^\text{13}\)

Perhaps the city's attitude and the condition of the waterfront did improve, or at least remained status quo, since little documentation about the site can be found between 1966 and 1972. But, when Donald Gillespie became superintendent in 1972, the condition of the waterfront once more came to the forefront. Gillespie developed plans for possible ways of improving the waterfront property. Ideally, his beautification program would include acquiring the Coast Guard property and restoring the historic Kanaka Village boat landing. But the expense precluded total historic restoration.

Instead, Gillespie envisioned

a waterfront facility designed around the historical theme with the accommodation of the water borne visitor as a primary goal. One possibility would be a visitor use docking facility (with a time limit) and a life size replica of a boat or ship of the period with a small marine museum of the 1845 period and a portion of the museum which could be used as a classroom or workshop area for environmental education or study area classes.\(^\text{14}\)

The new mayor of Vancouver, Lloyd Stromgren, seemed very supportive of the idea. Anything would be an improvement over the "pock-marked gravel parking area, a boat
ramp, and a small picnic area" the city called William Broughton Park. Besides, the special use permit between the Park Service and the city, which included the boat ramp and Sea Scout barge moorage was to expire in August 1973.

The Park Service plan for waterfront improvements required the use of the Coast Guard property. According to the local media, the plans included "dredging out a small bay and removing three of five buildings at the base. A fourth existing structure would be converted into a museum, while the remaining structure would become a maintenance facility. The rest of the site would be landscaped." And in early spring 1975, the National Park Service resubmitted its request for transfer of the Coast Guard property from the General Services Administration to be part of the waterfront beautification plan. They also submitted a five-year program for restoration of the historic scene at the waterfront. Acquisition of the Coast Guard Station and removal of the dock would be the first steps in this restoration. On July 1, 1975, 2.1 acres of Coast Guard property was transferred to Fort Vancouver National Historic Site.

In 1975, the Army and city collaborated with the Park Service on a "Bicentennial project" to clean up and landscape the waterfront area. The plan called for "slightly raised plant material islands interconnected with a barricade of pier pilings which are, in turn, connected by 3 inch anchor line." Though the Park Service feared straying from its long-term goal of restoring the historic waterfront complex, a "recent fatality of one of the reserve officers assigned to the project prompted a request for the installation of a bronze plaque. It's an emotional subject and brings mixed feelings." Though they agreed on the plaque, they declined the Army's suggestion for a park name: Timberwolf Annex.

The Army's 104th and 308th Reserve Battalions donated their labor and a city landscape engineer from the Parks and Recreation Department provided his design skills for the beautification project. By the spring of 1975, they promised to "remove [the] launch ramp and redistribute shoreline rip-rap" with general landscaping as their primary objective. But the National Park Service regional office objected to the plan. "Picnicking should be discouraged," wrote Regional Director John Rutter, "and tables
The results of collaboration between the Army, City of Vancouver, and the Park Service at the waterfront included a 1975 parking area with landscaped pier pilings. (Donald Gillespie, National Park Service.)
should not be furnished. We believe it would be inadvisable considering the isolated character of the land parcel and the nearby urban setting.\textsuperscript{20}

But Superintendent Gillespie continued to push for the installation of picnic tables. He emphasized the minimal impact the improvement project would have on the area, with simple landscaping with native plants and an irrigation system. Indeed, Regional Archaeologist Fred Bohannon determined that the improvement project would not affect the historic underlayer, since any penetration of ground would occur in "post-1854 bank fill." He concluded that the "situation does not require mitigation by professional archaeologists. Rather, the persons setting the posts should collect exposed trash, if any, and turn the items over to Fort Vancouver NHS for study."\textsuperscript{21}

The Park Service and the city continued to improve the waterfront property, including "removing concrete spills and an old unused boat ramp at the waterfront and providing general landscaping treatment."\textsuperscript{22} Though the park improvement had been planned, instigated, and supervised by the Park Service, there was still a sense that it was a city project. The park's name, "Columbia Landing," was reminiscent of the old Hudson's Bay Company fort, but by June 1977, the nearby commercial development and the park's isolation from the stockade at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site led to a distinctly separate character about the waterfront.

In 1977, another cooperative shoreline beautification project began. First, the Corps of Engineers removed blackberry bushes and small cottonwoods, cleaned up debris, and repaired the roadway dike with fill material. The City of Vancouver and local service organizations assisted with landscaping, installing park benches, and creating a parking area.\textsuperscript{23} By the end of the year, the Park Service contracted for the demolition of the old Coast Guard buildings and the wharf structure on the Columbia River at a cost of $31,000.\textsuperscript{24}

The 1978 Master Plan for Fort Vancouver National Historic Site included plans to integrate the waterfront with the fort and "strive for a physical access connection with the main fort unit." For the first time, the reconstruction of the Salmon House and historic wharf were not part of the written long-term policy, only the removal of buildings and
improvements to the landscape were identified as goals. The City of Vancouver also reexamined its use of the riverfront park in the Central Park Plan prepared by consultants Management and Planning Services in February 1979. The study proposed expansion of the waterfront area. The city anticipated that the National Park Service would develop a "landscaped greenbelt along the riverfront and the historic salmon house, wharf and boathouses that were an integral part of Fort Vancouver's original operations."  

That same fall, Fort Vancouver Superintendent James M. Thomson renewed Park Service efforts to landscape and improve the waterfront with help from the Youth Conservation Corps. But the various beautification plans did not gel until early 1981, when Patricia Stryker, the Vancouver Central Park Coordinator, consolidated the pieces. The city donated services of its landscape architect, Kelly Punteney. The project, which covered both the old Coast Guard property and "Columbia Landing," would provide connecting walkways between two new restaurants to the west of the Coast Guard property and the Columbia Landing Park. They would also install benches at "view overlook sites" and plant more "deciduous trees, conifers, and shrubs." Patricia Stryker proposed to raise all funds for the project locally and make the money available as soon as possible.

The Park Service sent landscape architects Pat Berg and Geoffrey Swan from the regional office to meet with the city to clarify long-term goals for the waterfront park. Though the Park Service's own goals for Fort Vancouver included reconstruction of the historic waterfront, it was not likely to happen any time soon. Landscape architects Berg and Swan broached the possibility of turning the waterfront site over to the city. "An easement could insure NPS control of the view, while city maintenance and patrol is more compatible with its expected use," Pat Berg concluded in their trip report of March 10, 1981, "it would be appropriate to turn this property over to the City of Vancouver."

Fort Vancouver Superintendent Jim Thomson agreed with this assessment since "it would lighten the maintenance load that is always with us and also save on energy
that is required to go to and from the property." The city also complained that the Park Service's review process was slow whenever it proposed improvements or extensive maintenance of the property. Indeed, a few months earlier Patricia Stryker had been faced with Acting Associate Regional Director for Planning and Resource Preservation Daniel Babbitt's demand for more detailed plans for the development of the park, such as the kinds of planting materials they planned to use, how the site was to be prepared, and where and what the measurements for the pathways would be.²⁹

Though the Fort Vancouver superintendent and the City of Vancouver thought that city ownership would speed up development and maintenance at the waterfront park, the Park Service still wanted to maintain control over the ultimate disposition of the property. By September 1981, the city and the Park Service regional office agreed on plans for the cleanup and improvement of the waterfront park site. The city would sign a 25-year lease, with renewable 5-year increments, "to enable the City to undertake development of the site within the context of Vancouver Central Park and consistent with [Fort Vancouver] Master Plan objectives."³⁰

However, not everyone agreed over the lease. The National Park Service Washington Office thought the lease basically "illegal" and wished to restrict the time frame to 10 years. On the other hand, Ted Brown, the director of Vancouver Parks and Recreation, feared that a 10-year lease would restrict funding options for the city.³¹

So, instead of a lease, the National Park Service and the City of Vancouver signed a memorandum of understanding in March 1982. The Park Service granted the city "the right and privilege of using" the waterfront strip "together with the right to construct, operate, and maintain a public park for a period of 25 years." In return, the city agreed to let the Park Service approve any plans for development and they would not cut trees or disturb archaeological remains or other natural resources without first consulting the Park Service. The Park Service wanted to "protect and preserve said land for the use and enjoyment of the public and for the interpretation of the Fort Vancouver National Historic Site" but once again had to compromise, since it did not have the funds to restore any historic features of the waterfront.³²
But the agreement with the city did not resolve all of their problems. Often, the city would begin maintenance work on the property without informing the Park Service. As recently as July 1990, Chief Ranger Robert Appling notified the superintendent that he "found that the City had graded and leveled the waterfront area from just west of the boat launch ramp east to a point where the embankment meets the shoreline. At least one large tree was removed and all vegetation was removed from the leveled area." After investigating Appling's report, Superintendent Dave Herrera informed the regional director that he found the waterfront "almost completely denuded of vegetation and the beach completely altered by the actions of the City. Further, several City signs were placed on the property without approval." He recommended terminating the memorandum of understanding between the Park Service and city for violation of the terms, which stated that the Park Service had to approve of any modification or improvements on the property. Indeed, Charles Odegaard sent Mayor Bruce Hagensen a letter to that effect in August 1990. Mr. Odegaard warned that "if the City continues to perform work within the Historic Site boundaries without first obtaining approval, the National Park Service will be forced to review the efficacy of the Memorandum of Agreement."

The memorandum of understanding between the Park Service and the city for use of the waterfront park expires in 2007. Currently, Fort Vancouver is studying the use of the park in light of its own goals and development plans, which may affect whether the memorandum of understanding is renewed. The cultural landscape study of Fort Vancouver being prepared by the regional office has recommended a variety of changes to that portion of the site. Under the plan, a stronger connection would be made between the waterfront and the rest of the Fort Vancouver site, including a pedestrian overpass and wayside exhibits to describe parts of Kanaka Village and the waterfront. However, there is insufficient evidence to support the reconstruction of the historic wharf and salmon house. The landscape study will have to be taken into consideration when the Park Service decides on the future of the waterfront park.
CHAPTER EIGHT
Chapter Eight

Cultural Resource Management

INTRODUCTION

The primary management concern at Fort Vancouver has always been its cultural resources. Since it simultaneously serves as a historic site as well as an urban park, natural resources, as traditionally defined, have played a very small role. The current direction for managing resources at the park is to integrate both natural and cultural resources; for example, managing the present orchard and parade ground as natural resources with their attendant problems of noise, air quality, and vegetation. However, echoing the Park Service’s new emphasis on managing cultural landscapes, this chapter will focus on three areas of cultural resource management--archaeology, curation, and interpretation—which have had an important role in shaping the development of a resource management program at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site.

UNEARTHING THE EVIDENCE--ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXCAVATIONS

Fort Vancouver’s historical significance as the Hudson’s Bay Company’s principal supply depot from 1829 to 1849 has been underscored by its extensive archaeological resources. In 1990, Fort Vancouver National Historic Site had 28 completely or partially excavated archaeological sites. Although methods and theoretical questions have changed over the last 45 years, archaeological investigation has provided the foundations for planning, interpretation, and reconstruction at Fort Vancouver.

_Louis Caywood and the Early Years_

In September 1947, Park Service archaeologist Louis Caywood began excavating the fort site with the assistance of Regional Historian Aubrey Neasham and a $7,500 budget. The National Park Service directed Caywood to locate the original stockade site
while negotiations were underway between the City of Vancouver and the Park Service for surplus land in Vancouver Barracks. If the exact location of the original stockade could be found, the Park Service would have a strong case for obtaining the surrounding property. It was "a game of hide and seek," according to Caywood.¹

For the 1947 excavation, Caywood divided the site into 100-foot square sections, oriented on true north, in a grid pattern measuring 500 feet (north/south) by 900 feet (east/west). These sections were further divided into 10-foot squares. Only after extensive digging, he found the powder magazine and was able to approximate the location of the stockade area. "The next step was to locate definitely the rotted stockade posts," Caywood recalled. "The spot chosen for trenching was in the northwest corner of the stockade. Trenches were dug to intercept both the west and north walls, and strangely the remains of both walls were found simultaneously." Using both the excavation results and historic documentation, Caywood was able to locate the stockade’s position.²

Though the location had been found, determining the extent of the fort was more difficult. Some sections of the stockade wall were obscured by the remains of the 1917 U.S. Spruce Division Mill which overlapped parts of the northeast corner of the stockade area. Yet, the four stockade corners, the burnt foundation of the bastion at the northwest corner, and portions of the stockade wall remained intact underground, actually protected by the large slab of flooring built underneath the Spruce Mill.³

During 1947, the excavation uncovered "large quantities of English earthenware, china, glass, iron, and clay pipes," which was not surprising since Fort Vancouver had been the headquarters for the Hudson’s Bay Company’s western fur trade and a center for trade of English goods. Caywood collected 3,555 pieces of strap iron from the blacksmith’s shop, as well as some 2,000 trade beads, and a large cache of clay pipe stems. The earthenware was mostly blue and white Spode, Copeland & Garrett, or W.T. Copeland, all manufactured in England. Some of the pieces were so well preserved that the manufacturer, named Copeland & Garrett in the 1840s, was able to identify 32 separate China patterns.⁴
The stockade posts of Fort Vancouver were revealed after exploratory excavations by archaeologist Louis Caywood in 1947 and 1948. (Louis Caywood, National Park Service.)
The following year, Caywood returned to Fort Vancouver with a crew of five to seven members and $8,718.36 of funding. But a spring flood of the Columbia River made excavations difficult; "activities on the airport, and the growth of grass and weeds almost obliterated the stakes marking the corners of the grid system" put in place during 1947. Between August and November 1948, more than 40,000 additional artifacts were recovered. "By far the greatest number of finds were made in the three trash pits encountered while trenching for the foundations of the carpenter's shop," Louis Caywood reported to the Park Service, "These pits proved extremely rich in the quantity of restorable objects. In other parts of the stockade only portions of objects have been found, but here all pieces of many artifacts were uncovered."\(^5\)

In addition, Caywood located many of the individual buildings within the stockade during 1948. He identified the bakehouse, a dwelling house, the Chief Factor's House, the kitchen and servants' quarters, the Owyhee Church or schoolhouse, the priest's house, and a carpenter's shop. Unfortunately, at the end of the 1948 season, vandals destroyed portions of the excavations at the site of the Chief Factor's House and along 25 feet of the stockade.\(^6\)

Louis Caywood returned for further excavations in 1950 and 1952. During these later excavations, he was able to locate fourteen additional trash pits, the west stockade wall, and remains of the north stockade wall. He also found a small office and wheat storehouse. Caywood fully explored buildings uncovered earlier, including the bachelors' residence, the Chief Factor's House, and the old and new offices.\(^7\) Besides the new excavations, Caywood further studied the unearthed artifacts to help develop the interpretive program for Fort Vancouver National Monument. Working with Dr. John Hussey, Caywood compiled significant information about Fort Vancouver and the fur trade at the Hudson's Bay Company post. His research helped determine the construction methods for the stockade walls and interior buildings. Caywood also suggested that there remained a wealth of artifacts still in the ground.

Perhaps the most significant find in the 1950 season was evidence of what Caywood called the Emmons stockade of 1828-29, "which was mentioned as being under
Trash Pit No. 4 was found by Louis Caywood's two assistants Rod Smith and Rex Gerald. Many of these Fort Vancouver era items were left in make-shift storage until more satisfactory storage facilities were built in the 1970s. (Louis Caywood, National Park Service.)
construction by Jedediah Smith." This stockade measured roughly 313 feet by 320 feet (nearly square) and the north wall corresponded with the main north wall that replaced it. "The bottoms of all of the posts of the first stockade show evidence of having been burned to prevent decay."8

In 1952, his last year of work at the fort, Caywood completely excavated the well on the east side of the fort. Superintendent Frank Hjort left the well structure open and planned to dig down "to the level of the well top and we plan to slope the banks around this depression and fence it in with concrete posts and wire mesh fencing leaving two openings with paths provided for entrance and exit." With a circular concrete walkway and a "low ornamental wire fence" Hjort hoped to allow visitors a close view of the rock structure.9

**First Steps Toward Reconstruction**

It was not until January 1966 that archaeological excavations resumed at Fort Vancouver. The 1961 legislation had opened the way for reconstruction and the new national historic site planned to rebuild a portion of the north stockade wall. Between May 10 and 27, 1966, under the direction of John D. Combes from Washington State University, a crew dug trenches along the entire distance of the north wall. They located the north gate and collected artifacts in preparation for the reconstruction.10

Though Combes's dig ended June 10, 1966, the Western Regional Office hired Edward McM. Larrabee to finish the excavation of the east wall in July 1966. He found two trash pits with a number of interesting artifacts, including a tumbler base with an "L" engraved on the bottom, which were thought to be the property of Adolphus Lee Lewes, a clerk at Fort Vancouver between 1840 and 1856.11

**Kanaka Village**

Kanaka Village, west of the Fort Vancouver stockade, was another major archaeological site which defined the historic context of Fort Vancouver. The majority of the Hudson’s Bay Company employees lived in Kanaka Village, which was named by
modern historians for the many Hawaiians (or Kanakas) who lived there. There were probably 20 to 40 houses and other peripheral buildings, but only a little is known about the village itself or the culture of its inhabitants. In 1963, the Vancouver Rotary Club donated a sign that marked the location which read: "The Servants and Laborers of Fort Vancouver built homes around a pond located here. The small village these houses formed was populated with half-breed Indians, French-Canadians, Scots, and Hawaiians who gave the village its name."\textsuperscript{12}

In 1968 and 1969, Edward McM. Larrabee was hired to investigate the village site. That summer Larrabee and his wife Susan Kardas "conducted test excavations which located the general area of the Kanaka Village, and two specific ‘domestic concentrations’ within it."\textsuperscript{13} The village site, about 800 feet west of the stockade, was partially obscured by a railroad spur and still had Army buildings located on it. Larrabee’s initial report in July 1968 recommended that the Park Service conduct extensive excavation of the area. The expected construction of an interchange on Interstate 5 increased the sense of urgency.\textsuperscript{14}

During the test excavations over 2,000 objects were collected and cataloged from various parts of the village on Park Service property. "All excavation was by hand," the team leaders wrote in their initial report, "because it was found that the major evidence consisted of a thin, shallow layer of artifacts, which would have been lost in any form of mechanical excavation....Trowelling was used in areas of high artifact yield, and for uncovering features." In Larrabee and Kardas’s experience, "shallow excavation, with careful removal of the sod followed by shovel-shaving, will locate most of the evidence of occupation at the Kanaka Village."\textsuperscript{15}

Perhaps the careful excavation methods were employed because Susan Kardas hoped to use the archaeological data for her doctoral dissertation on social and cultural aspects of the Kanaka Village inhabitants. In order to complete her research in 1969, she hoped to uncover a few more house sites. "I need a small ($2500) amount of money to cover the expense of digging a few more house sites, and have submitted such a proposal to the Park Service," she advised Representative Julia Butler Hansen in
February 1969,

Because I intend to use the data recovered for my dissertation, I am not asking for any salary for my services as excavator, or my travel and living expenses. This, combined with the time of my advisor and use of Bryn Mawr facilities to write up the material the following fall comes to a contribution of about $8000. It would seem that $8000's worth of work received for $2500 spent is a bargain, but perhaps in scholarly enthusiasm I have undersold myself. I have since learned that, attractive as this offer is, and sound as my past work has been, there is at the moment no political pressure on the National Park Service Office of Archaeology to do more research at Fort Vancouver. My chances of getting the money may also be lessened because I am a woman, and archaeology unfortunately is still not fully open to them.16

Political pressure did indeed help. Congresswoman Hansen persuaded Park Service Director George Hartzog to provide the additional $2,500 and created a joint summer Field School in Archaeology with Bryn Mawr and University of Washington students. Susan Kardas was appointed as co-instructor. By the summer of 1969, the team prepared to locate the eastern boundary of Kanaka Village, to excavate a few more house sites, and to determine whether the village was well preserved. Backhoe trenches were cut and a 5-foot-square grid laid down to be excavated by hand. Four village houses were found and the eastern boundary located some 800 feet west of the stockade.

However, "All has not been sweetness and light in the archaeology camp," observed Superintendent Eliot Davis, in a memo to the regional director. The problem seemed to be personality conflicts with the husband and wife team who supervised the dig. Edward Larrabee and Susan Kardas seemed to communicate poorly with the students and several threatened to quit. "Ed Larrabee has been in charge of two digs here and I will be the first to say that he is one of the most competent archaeologists I know, but he is also a hard man to get along with," admitted Eliot Davis:

He has antagonized everyone he has had to work with, including my staff and some of the Army personnel we have to live with all year and from whom we get the work space. Bringing Mrs. Larrabee into the picture has compounded the personality problems as she is harder to get along with than he is and she has a paranoid feeling about her theses which she claims someone is always trying to steal from her.17

Susan Kardas, of course, saw the situation very differently. It was more
complicated than simply being protective of her research. In a letter to Representative Julia Butler Hansen, Kardas disclosed a disagreement between the University of Washington and the Larrabees over the management of the excavation. The person she distrusted most was Dr. Robert Greengo, the faculty advisor for the University of Washington students. The Larrabees were kept from excavating a western portion of the village site slated for highway construction. Instead, David Munsell, the state highway archaeologist, "who operates out of the University of Washington where he is a graduate student," was asked to excavate the site. Consequently, Susan Kardas felt excluded from the original project for which the Park Service had contracted her services. The embitterment of her letters came both from this exclusion and her perception of the sexism that unfortunately prevailed within the field of archaeology in the 1960s.

According to Kardas, Dr. Greengo or David Munsell gave the student workers the impression that this was a University of Washington dig and that they were being exploited to assist Susan Kardas with her dissertation. Kardas felt Greengo was "trying to jockey me off this site." Despite the obvious distrust, conflict of interests, and not so subtle sexism, the excavation at Kanaka Village was completed and Kardas' work "turned up such items as pottery, china, household utensils, coins, gun flints, cannon balls and door handles." Both students from Bryn Mawr and the University of Washington were involved in the dig. And in 1971 Susan Kardas completed her dissertation entitled "'The People Bought this and the Clatsop Became Rich,' A View of Nineteenth Century Fur Trade Relationships on the Lower Columbia Between Chinookan Speakers, Whites, and Kanakas."

The Hoffman and Ross Years--1970 to 1975

In the late 1960s, the Fort Vancouver staff prepared an Archaeological Research Management Plan. The Park Service estimated that $500,000 was needed to complete the "necessary" excavations. Congresswoman Julia Butler Hansen visited the fort site in October 1969 and agreed. She contacted Director George Hartzog immediately: "I was told that additional research money was going to be necessary. If this is true, will you
people see that it gets in the budget. Lord knows that you get everything else that you
put in the budget, so don’t spare the ponies.”
Hartzog replied that they could put
together a 5-year program with $100,000 a year to complete the excavation of the fort
site in preparation for reconstruction.

The Park Service provided $100,000 a year for Fort Vancouver in its budget
between 1970 and 1974. The original plan for the 5-year archaeological program
included a laboratory at the University of Washington. "A laboratory is a necessary
adjunct to any archaeological project," wrote the director of the Western Service Center,
William Bowen. Seventy-five thousand dollars were set aside for Dr. Robert Greengo to
supply all equipment and hire labor for the field and lab work. The Park Service would
provide two Service archaeologists to direct the field work. "We very much like to give
Service people experience in historic sites archaeology," wrote Bowen, "It is obvious that
there will be more and more of this type of research going on in the Service, and we
need to develop an in-house capability in it.”

Dr. Greengo wrote Congresswoman Julia Butler Hansen in July 1970 to justify the
expense of the new lab; "it would be much more economical and efficient to establish the
laboratory for the Fort Vancouver restoration at a center of research where supporting
services and facilities are readily available." Representative Hansen, however, thought
the lab a poor idea and wanted funding to go directly to the excavation work at Fort
Vancouver. Frankly, she had a low opinion of university professors, such as those who
"came back here this year on another matter to say ‘we have come to educate you.’ I
was somewhat dismayed. Congressmen are not stupid, they are not uneducated, and they
don’t need these pompous kinds of pronouncements.” Needless to say, Dr. Greengo
did not get a laboratory.

Another archaeological plan that fell by the wayside was a 20-foot-high inflatable
tent that would cover a quarter acre during winter month excavations. Superintendent
Eliot Davis needed to work out details of the tent with Pearson Airpark Manager Ken
Puttkamer and City Manager Alan Harvey since excavation would take place within the
aviation easement. After the National Park Service purchased the Pearson Airpark
property in 1972, the easement was not a problem, but other obstacles deflated the tent.

National Park Service Archaeologist John J. (Jake) Hoffman was put in charge of the excavations and Lester Ross joined him later as laboratory director. With a crew of about 20, many of whom were Vietnam veterans, and facilities in an abandoned Veterans Administration building near the fort site, they began work in the summer of 1970. They began excavating inside the stockade using a "mining" technique which exposed all the "original living surfaces." This technique insured uncovering structural remnants, examining "inter-house features," and retrieving cultural artifacts. In order to start the excavation, the asphalt pads which had marked the footprints of the fort buildings had to be removed. Superintendent Eliot Davis was relieved to see them go since the black top had been difficult to maintain and repair. Each pad had a concrete "collar" that went 8 inches to a foot deep. The information gathered from the excavations was to help the Park Service reconstruct the stockade buildings and prepare interpretation of the cultural life of the Hudson’s Bay Company at Fort Vancouver.

During 1970, a large number of artifacts were uncovered including a "modern dump of Hudson’s Bay period materials" that had been culled from the site during the Caywood excavations. Bryn Thomas, a member of Hoffman’s crew and currently an archaeologist for Archaeological and Historical Services at Eastern Washington University, described this modern dump northeast of the bakehouse as "Hjort’s Hole," which included mostly metal artifacts in cardboard boxes. He speculates that the first superintendent may have reburied the artifacts deliberately to preserve items for which the Park Service had no funding to preserve or store. Jake Hoffman retrieved the material and sent it to the University of Idaho to be cleaned.

In March 1971, the Regional Archaeologist Paul Schumacher complained to the director of the Western Service Center that "some people in the Service" had criticized or questioned "the need for the very thorough archaeological investigations" proposed at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. "Some people in the Service" meant specifically superintendent Eliot Davis, who was less than happy with the management and progress of the excavations. "We have no way to check on the amounts of money
programmed nor spent on the various phases of the project though we would like to know the percentages spent for labor on the ground, overhead and for supplies," Davis argued to the Pacific Northwest regional director. "If we are to start a three year restoration and be ready for the Fort sesquicentennial in 1975 more speed is essential, and more ground must be covered if we are to justify our appropriations."32

Paul Schumacher insisted that "one does not measure archaeological research by the amount of earth being moved." He planned three months of lab work for every month in the field. The need to clean and catalog "thousands of artifacts from previous excavations, a great deal of which had been miscataloged by local staff members" or extracted from Hjort's Hole, also slowed down the dig. The lines had been drawn. Eliot Davis, feeling public pressure, needed swift action in order to reconstruct the original context of the historic site. Paul Schumacher, on the other hand, wanted to use the Park Service archaeological team to conduct meticulous, perhaps academic, quality archaeological research. Neither extreme seemed appropriate for Fort Vancouver's needs.33

Eliot Davis's desire to speed up excavations was not without adherents. In his first year archaeological report, Jake Hoffman indicated that

Present excavations are conducted less selectively than past efforts at Fort Vancouver. Rather than concentrating on specific structural remains, we are completely exposing the original fort living surfaces. This method is quite successful for gaining information on inter-house features as well as ensuring that major structural remains are completely exposed. This also results in a virtually complete retrieval of artifacts and faunal remains.

Because of the increasing number and complexity of features uncovered, seasonal excavators also took more of the field notes and collected data.34

By July 1971, the bakehouse had been excavated as well as the Chief Factor's House, with firm evidence of the "post-in-sill" construction. In September 1971, they located the base of the flagpole near the southeastern front of the Chief Factor's House. The team had cataloged 96,294 specimens, which represented only a fraction of what had been uncovered.35

Despite the remarkable progress in over a year of archaeological work, problems
surface during the project. For instance, when the National Park Service’s Service Center moved to Denver in 1971, some programs were canceled and allotments withdrawn. Superintendent Eliot Davis found that Fort Vancouver only received $50,000 of $100,000 slated for archaeology in 1971. All excavations were stopped on October 22, 1971, when Jake Hoffman learned that no funds would be available for his laborers. Bryn Thomas recalls that they "lined those units that were incomplete with plastic sheets and backfilled them and the crew was laid off."\textsuperscript{36} 

The following spring, the excavations were revived once more. Besides uncovering the washhouse in May, the most significant find may have been two additional stockade lines at the south end which indicated at least three major periods of fort construction. "Presently, we believe the outermost line to be the latest and thus, the one to be selected for reconstruction," Hoffman informed Regional Archaeologist Charles Bohannon. "Our observations of stockade remains indicate that construction and rebuilding of these features were quite complex." Though Louis Caywood had found one of these stockade lines in 1950, Hoffman was able to explore them more thoroughly. In 1972 the team also uncovered a major fur warehouse with the remains of a fur press and a large quantity of glass beads "below the warehouse’s floor validating its former use as an Indian Trade Shop."\textsuperscript{37} 

During the winter of 1972-1973, Bryn Thomas and Hugh Buten stayed on to excavate the entire west stockade wall and test the east and south walls slated for reconstruction. By the fourth season of digging, excavation methods had changed. Bryn Thomas recalls that they were under pressure to complete the stockade area so they excavated with a backhoe while crews gathered artifacts from the upturned piles of dirt.\textsuperscript{38} However, they completed work on the Indian Trade Shop and Powder Magazine with hand tools. Unfortunately, the crew discovered that a lot of the foundation evidence had been destroyed "by the laying of asphalt as an interpretive device." Yet, they recovered large numbers of trade goods, "including gun parts. We have also found native-made objects."\textsuperscript{39} 

During 1974, the last year of excavations under the 5-year archaeological program,
the Hoffman crew unearthed the blacksmith shop, parts of the Bachelors’ Quarters, parts of the iron shops, and excavated the southeast corner of the stockade in search of a second bastion. Like several other stockade buildings, some of the structures "seem to have been obliterated when the asphalt pad marking the shop's location was put down." Yet, in the Bachelors’ Quarters, they recovered brick and mortar and found subsurface wooden footings. In the blacksmith shop they found "an interesting arrangement of features which reveal how the smith worked; the hard-packed, soot-stained floor where he stood, clean-out pit marking the location of the forge, foundation for the anvil and a barrel-lined quenching pit." As well, they uncovered evidence of "relatively heavy forging activities, e.g. hardware and tool manufactures, wagon and gun repairs, and possibly ship fitting."

**Back to Kanaka Village--The Chances**

While Jake Hoffman and Lester Ross wrapped up the excavation of the stockade, David and Jennifer Chance, affiliated with both the University of Washington and the University of Idaho, were hired to do "salvage archaeology" at Kanaka Village in 1974 and 1975 for the Interstate 5 right-of-way. They discovered a "previously unknown Hudson’s Bay Company fort" which probably enclosed a shipyard, boat repair shop, and residential area built between 1825 and 1829. David Chance informed the Park Service in his progress report that

not all major features of an occupation can be predicted from historical sources, even in the case of such a well-documented site as Vancouver. This is the first time in the Northwest that a historic structure as large as a fort has been discovered solely on the basis of archaeological evidence.

With a crew of 16 students from the University of Washington, the University of Idaho, Central Washington State College, and Portland State University, they excavated 5,144 horizontal square feet between June 16 and September 9, 1975. They worked on the Ingalls House, a Hudson’s Bay Company site, the Kanaka Village pond, and a Hudson’s Bay Company servant’s house. Nearly 80,000 items from both the Hudson’s Bay Company period as well as the later Army Barracks period were cataloged in the field,
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with additional items recovered but not inventoried.41

The Chances, like the Larrabees before them, used careful excavation techniques with a shovel and trowel within five-foot grids. Several different areas were chosen to test because of their varied depth. For instance, the pond area, covered with a layer of garbage from the post-Hudson's Bay Company era, needed deeper excavation. Some areas, such as the Ingalls House, were dug in a checkerboard pattern. Though the five by five-foot unit strategy was "rewarding in some cases," the crew discovered that "common auguring" was a less expensive method of testing for occupation.42

The Hudson's Bay Company period artifacts recovered included beads, buttons, ceramic sherds, glass bottles, clay pipe stems, and iron work. Like Edward Larrabee and Susan Kardas before them, the Chances found that "the multi-ethnic nature of the fur trade labor force is not reflected in the artifacts. The Hawaiian, French-Canadian and other groups working for the Hudson's Bay company used manufactured items like other laborers since the Industrial Revolution."43 The Chances were even more cautious in their report, writing that "there is virtually no evidence of a multi-ethnic or polyglot community at Vancouver during Hudson's Bay Company times. We recovered not a single identifiable Hawaiian (Kanaka), French Canadian, Shetlander, Ordneyman, Norwegian, Iroquois or Cree artifact."44

In 1977, the Washington State Department of Transportation hired Caroline D. Carley, from the University of Idaho, to return to Kanaka Village to take another look at the Hudson's Bay Company Riverside complex found by the Chances three years earlier, and perform more stratigraphic and artifact collection at the pond site. Despite the lack of definite structural evidence, and though the Chances originally identified this feature as a shipyard and residential area, by additional historic research Carley was able to conjecture the presence of a hospital inside the stockade at the Riverside complex which had been constructed to treat patients struck by periodic fever epidemics during the 1830s. However, many questions about this stockade were left unanswered.45

One more excavation of the western portion of Kanaka Village occurred in 1980 and 1981 under the supervision of Bryn Thomas. A new freeway interchange was
planned for the property so the Department of Transportation requested mitigation of construction impacts. From test excavations in 1980, Thomas found that significant archaeological resources remained in areas that would be covered indefinitely by the freeway. Mitigation included data recovery excavations, covering excavation sites with fill to protect them for possible future research, re-routing utility systems, and monitoring all other demolition of buildings. Thomas was able to identify 26 significant building or activity areas from the pre-1860 Village area.46

Volunteer Excavation Efforts at Fort Vancouver

Besides the professional efforts of archaeologists, Fort Vancouver has also benefited from volunteer-run excavations. As early as 1974, volunteers from the Oregon Archaeological Society excavated the Sale Shop within the Fort Vancouver stockade. Ten years later, the Oregon Archaeological Society began to excavate the jail and new office sites. Chuck Hibbs was hired as site director and James Thomson, the regional archaeologist, supervised the project.47 This excavation raised some intriguing questions concerning the relationship of archaeology to the interpretation of Fort Vancouver as a historic site, as well as questions about archaeology as a unique cultural resource in itself. Volunteer Dick Lillig suggested that the archaeological project become on-going, to provide a means of interpreting archaeological resources at the historic site. Indeed, by August 1984 Park Service Archaeologist George A. Teague, from the Division of Internal Archaeological Studies, wrote that the "local consensus is to have some, or all, of the jail excavations left open in order to display archaeological procedures and deposits." Teague suggested that Fort Vancouver display photographs or perhaps a videotape or film to interpret "the principles of stratigraphy, the processes of site formation, and the careful, controlled techniques necessary to make sense of a buried site."48 However, the Park Service wanted to reconstruct the jail on its original location. If the building were reconstructed on the original site, the archaeology would be lost; if the building was reconstructed next to the site, it would confuse the visitor. Because of these concerns, no action has been taken to date on the reconstruction of the
jail. Similarly, the new office site, which was excavated by volunteers during three seasons between 1986 and 1989, has not been reconstructed.

**Recent and Future Projects**

In 1947, Caywood spent about $7,500 to locate the Fort Vancouver stockade and its structures. His discovery was the driving force behind subsequent planning for Fort Vancouver National Monument. In 1985, after the effects of inflation, Fort Vancouver needed $75,000 simply to fund the utility corridor mitigation excavation for the proposed reconstruction of the fur store. Methods and costs have changed in the past 45 years, but more surprisingly, archaeological investigation in the Park Service has become a response to meet federal compliance regulations for proposed projects rather than an integral part of park planning.49

Plans for the fur store at Fort Vancouver have changed all that. As an archaeological study center, the new facility has the potential to attract scholars to study both the cataloged collection of artifacts and the computer data base to expand our knowledge of the fur trade and other themes at Fort Vancouver. It would become the center for symposia and publications, a place to pool information on the preservation of Fort Vancouver as an archaeological site.

To date, only an estimated 20 to 30 percent of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site has been excavated. Archaeologists always take a gamble when a site is dug since the field data and artifacts address only particular questions at a given moment: "What did the architectural structure look like? What kinds of material culture was there and how does this help interpret life at Fort Vancouver during the mid 19th century?" Chances are, however, that once a site is "mined" and a reconstructed building erected, or a freeway constructed, the archaeological resource will be lost to new questions that might arise as techniques change and historical data reveal new cultural issues. Better collection preservation and data analysis techniques may extend the usefulness of the information already gathered, even though archaeologists cannot return to the original site.
CURATING CULTURAL RESOURCES--MUSEUM AND COLLECTION
MANAGEMENT

Introduction

The archaeological excavations at Fort Vancouver helped uncover significant cultural resources of the site. By 1990, Park Service staff, special contractors, and volunteers had cataloged approximately 30,000 diagnostic artifacts. But, nearly 1 million additional pieces of metal, ceramic, glass, bone, and brick have been recovered over the past 45 years and are stored in hundreds of cans in various locations in the Chief Factor’s House and Indian Trade Shop. The preservation and management of this growing collection is one of the most pressing collections management problems at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site today.

What to do With the Caywood Collections?

As Louis Caywood and his small crew dug up artifacts from the ground, they had to clean, restore, catalog, photograph, and store the pieces. "Work will continue on cleaning up iron objects, preserving them with anti-corrode solution and cataloging the finished objects," Caywood assured the regional director in April 1949, "A general spring cleanup of the museum laboratory will be made." There were no fancy techniques or equipment in the early years. The material was cataloged and stored in cardboard boxes labeled with simple catalog numbers and placed on racks in easy reach.\(^5^0\)

The primary need was to preserve iron objects, which showed the worst signs of rust and corrosion. Caywood tried many methods of preservation but settled on "boiling [the pieces] in paraffin instead of the acid and anti-corrode method previously used."\(^5^1\)

Yet, in October Caywood reported that

after these objects have been placed back in storage for a time they show evidence of a desire to rust through small rust pits which the hot paraffin did not replace. Apparently the only satisfactory method of preserving iron objects in this region will be the zinc-sodium hydroxide-paraffin treatment. Apparatus should be procured for this work for next season. A small collection of some of the best specimens of iron objects is being held in readiness awaiting word as to whether or not they can be treated in the Jamestown archaeological laboratory.\(^5^2\)
Even those badly rusted metal artifacts treated at the Jamestown laboratories continued to rust when returned to Fort Vancouver. In the spring of 1950, Caywood even contacted the Rust-oleum Corporation to see if its product had any preservation potential. Nothing came of these inquiries.

It is not surprising that Fort Vancouver had problems with metal corrosion. All materials were stored in buildings with no heat or humidity controls. "The dampness is so bad that the gummed flaps of envelopes stick," Caywood admitted. "Sandpaper soon deteriorates. Tools become rusty. Rust continues to form on the already preserved iron objects from the excavations."

By 1951 there was still no money for even basic storage for the growing Fort Vancouver collection. Ned J. Burns, chief of the Park Service's Museum Branch, regretted that Caywood’s request for "one standard storage case, one herbarium case and one large map file" would go unfilled. "Unfortunately," he wrote, "the high cost of this equipment has prevented us from meeting all the urgent needs. The only equipment we can supply Fort Vancouver this year is document boxes."

The number of artifacts continued to accumulate from the Caywood excavations, creating a serious problem of storage for the monument. Louis Caywood estimated that about 75% of the preservation and cataloging of artifacts from the 1950 excavation was completed but none of the 1952 artifacts had even been cleaned. In 1952, Superintendent Frank Hjort worried that storage needs and artifact preservation had not kept pace with the digs themselves. "I should like to suggest that the funds include amounts for the construction of adequate shelving and either good substantial cardboard or light, wooden boxes of a uniform size in order that the material can be stored in an orderly manner," wrote Hjort to the regional director.

The regional office finally appropriated $500 to hire someone for cataloging artifacts and building shelves to store them. But confusion reigned as the "extra" $500 appeared to exist only on paper. "All archaeological funds for the remainder of the year are programmed," Acting Regional Director Herbert Maier informed Hjort, "and, unfortunately, no additional funds are available for cleaning and storing of artifacts."
Bearing in mind the continued problems with preservation and storage of metal artifacts, it is not surprising that the superintendent reburied these artifacts in "Hjort's Hole," waiting for a day when space and funding were both available.

**Early Efforts to Create a Museum**

As early as February 1949, Louis Caywood suggested that a museum workshop be equipped to construct exhibits for Fort Vancouver. The regional office suggested, instead, that a museum be put on hold "until the Army settles definitely the boundaries of the area." Later that year, Walter G. Rivers, Park Service museum curator, prepared "Fort Vancouver National Monument Project Museum Prospectus," which strongly suggested that Fort Vancouver needed a museum to adequately interpret the history of the Monument. Rivers envisioned "an archaeo logical exhibit-in-place at an interesting corner or other point of the original fort, it may be necessary to limit visitors to the museum area because of the proximity of the airfield to the post site."

However, it was Superintendent Frank Hjort who struggled with creating a temporary museum space with a limited budget to display the artifacts from Caywood's excavations. Just as the regional office had dragged their feet about storage space, it took issue with Fort Vancouver's museum plan. Herbert Maier, the assistant regional director, wrote Frank Hjort that by installing an exhibit case which held, identified, and explained artifacts, he was "going further than the original intent of the authorization. To go beyond that intent would require an exhibit plan." In other words, the regional office approved exhibit labels but did not approve a fuller narrative of explanation or events at the Hudson's Bay Company post, which would require an exhibit plan specifically created by the Regional Office. Hjort, not one to tolerate bureaucratic machinations, retorted that "it is impossible for me to believe that you intended to have these artifacts stacked into exhibit cases without regard to order, design and proper explanation."

Temporary museum facilities did however open on August 4, 1952, in an old
Army fire station. Within twenty days, 625 visitors wandered through to examine such artifacts as metal forks, knives, beaver traps, glass beads, and clay or porcelain pieces. By May 1954, the "temporary" museum and park office opened to the public 7 days a week from 8 am to 4:30 pm. Though "temporary," these offices served Fort Vancouver National Monument for nearly a decade.\textsuperscript{64} The museum was completed and opened to the public in 1962.

**MISSION 66 and the New Visitor Center**

By the mid-1950s, the number of visitors to Fort Vancouver was increasing, anticipating the need for more exhibit space. In January 1960, as construction plans for the MISSION 66 Visitor Center went into high gear, Superintendent Frank Hjort and Historian Jerry Wagers prepared a museum prospectus for 21 new exhibits including panel, case, and diorama exhibits with an emphasis on the fur trade, the Hudson's Bay Company, the founding of Fort Vancouver, and Dr. John McLoughlin's influence on the site. Peripheral exhibits included the establishment and development of the Army post at Vancouver Barracks.\textsuperscript{65}

The museum prospectus also outlined the need for fireproof storage facilities and further preservation of the many artifacts being excavated from the historic site. Since Hjort still had a very small staff, additional museum exhibits would make certain features of the site clear when personal contact with a ranger was not available. The exhibits would also serve as a starting point for tours of the fort site where visitors would receive brochures for self-guiding tours. Finally, the museum would provide necessary research and administrative space.\textsuperscript{66} In order to realize the new museum plan, Fort Vancouver worked with the Hudson's Bay Company and the Oregon Historical Society to create exhibits. For instance, the Hudson's Bay Company suggested that Fort Vancouver buy a trade blanket and small items like tobacco twists through their wholesale stores.\textsuperscript{67}

In January 1967, the exhibit space at the Visitor Center was again revised. Harry Lichter, the former curator of the Oregon Historical Society Museum, initiated improvements such as refinishing maps and features of the Whitman diorama, correcting misspellings, and repairing a beaver trap replica and "the Barkley Medicine Kit."
Museum cases were cleaned, the sea otter pelt was cleaned and glazed, and Superintendent Eliot Davis promised that "if we can get one of the four 'S's' out of Massachusetts we shall at last feel free of embarrassment."  

**Cataloging and Curating Old and New Artifacts**

Though the Visitor Center allowed for greater exhibit space and flexibility, it did not immediately alleviate Fort Vancouver's collection management problems. According to Superintendent Eliot Davis, the early methods of treating recovered cultural material was so slack that by 1965 "artifacts taken from the Caywood digs of 1947 have been lost, strayed or stolen, and some have never been cataloged."  

In 1967 and 1968, Fort Vancouver attempted to recover as much data from these "lost digs." Alan Cherney was hired to catalog or recatalog the material from the Caywood excavations. Even so, the park may never know what or how much had been misplaced.

Superintendent Eliot Davis also wondered what to do with some 800 to 900 pounds of metal artifacts which were beginning to flake and rust, despite the temperature and moisture controlled storage vault in the Visitor Center. Davis sent a good portion of the iron work to Rick Sprague, professor of archaeology at the University of Idaho, for conservation. Though Sprague's method of preservation was adequate--"the iron was cleaned with an air blast and coarse garnet and...dipped or painted with plastic"--Eliot Davis was not terribly pleased with "the finished product [which] is not something that I will want to exhibit in a museum as it does not look like iron. A heavy coat of plastic covers the iron and many of the pieces look as if they had been dipped in gray paint. In some cases it is impossible to see the metal through the preservative." He was disappointed with the "trial and error basis" of the lab work.

By 1968, Fort Vancouver acquired approximately 2,500 additional fragments from Edward Larrabee and Susan Kardas's dig at Kanaka Village. These recovered artifacts were more systematically cataloged into the permanent collection at Fort Vancouver.

Fort Vancouver also cataloged the artifacts collected from the stockade excavations of the early 1970s. For instance, when digging ceased in the fall of 1971
because of budgetary problems, the team members retained in the winter of 1971-72 continued with museum cataloging and analytic activities. With the help of the National Historic Sites Service of Canada, Jake Hoffman launched an extensive program of ceramic analysis and identification based on the Fort Vancouver collections. Much of this involves crosschecking of pattern samples between Fort Vancouver and the Hudson's Bay component at Lower Fort Garry, Manitoba [which] should provide us with manufacturers' names and probable dates of manufacture. From these data, we anticipate making credible statements regarding the use and distribution of various ceramics through time at Fort Vancouver.72

Reconstruction and Curation in the 1970s

During the 1970s at Fort Vancouver the excavation of the stockade area and planned reconstruction offered new challenges to provide "sufficient physical surroundings" for interpretation of the historic fort. In 1974, Superintendent Donald Gillespie wondered how to best create a new kind of "exhibit space" inside the stockade.73 It was a simple matter when the only structure to furnish was the bastion. But after Fort Vancouver completed the bakehouse, Chief Factor's House, and kitchen, the Park Service realized that more specific furnishing plans were needed for the stockade structures. David Hansen, the new curator transferred to Fort Vancouver in October 1974, appeared to be "the logical person to head up the furnishing program."74 With assistance from John Hussey, Regional Historian Vernon Tancil, and the NPS archaeologists working on the site, David Hansen, formerly with the Division of Reference Services and an expert in 19th-century furnishings, revised the Oregon Historical Society Furnishings Plan and converted a $179,000 budget into well-researched and detailed interiors for the Chief Factor's House and the kitchen. Furnishing of the reconstructed buildings inside the stockade was completed by the end of 1979.75 Objects for the Chief Factor's House and kitchen were cataloged by 1980.

Besides providing historic structures for interpretation, the reconstructed buildings also provided a potential solution to the continuing storage problem at Fort Vancouver. As late as 1975, much of the artifact collection was stored off-site in old Army buildings
David Hansen became curator at Fort Vancouver in October 1974 and furnished the reconstructed buildings at the fort site, including the Chief Factor's House Mess Hall, shown here. (National Park Service.)
and a building owned by the Veterans Administration, which had no humidity control. Robert Olsen, staff curator at the Park Service's Division of Museum Services, worried about the archaeological specimens which were being stored in paper bags and cardboard cartons. "Every time the containers are handled damage will occur," Olsen told the Chief of the Park Service Division of Museum Services. "Changes in humidity and temperature will effect both the specimens and the containers." Olsen suggested that the majority of non-diagnostic artifacts be stored in sealed five-gallon cans which would provide an air-free environment.

To test this project, specimens from the Jake Hoffman and Lester Ross excavations of the early 1970s were canned with silica gel, sealed, and stored. By 1977, approximately 1,400,000 artifacts were preserved in some 1,800 five-gallon cans, which provided better protection than the paper bags and cardboard boxes in which they had once been. However, once the sealed five-gallon cans were stored on the top floor of the Chief Factor's House, their weight created problems, "putting stress on the rest of the house, as the house was not built to carry so much concentrated weight in the attic."

When the Indian Trade Shop was reconstructed and furnished in 1982, some of the collection was moved to the loft of that building, as well as the basement of the Chief Factor's House. Most of the artifacts from the Hoffman/Ross digs and the "non-diagnostic" material "recovered from data recovery excavations, monitoring activities in the park, and casual donations," remained uncataloged, but were placed in five-gallon cans to be sorted and cataloged later. By the mid-1980s, Fort Vancouver National Historic Site still had not finished curating thousands of artifacts.

**The Fur Store and the Future**

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, Fort Vancouver continued to improve its methods of preserving and managing the archaeological record. By 1987, a computer cataloging system (ANCS) was in use after the initial glitches were eliminated. The database will become one of the major research tools for scholars working on the Hudson's...
Bay Company period. From the summer of 1987 to the summer of 1991, cataloging add-on funds, provided by the Park Service’s Washington Office, funded a museum aid to assist park curator David Hansen in cataloging artifacts recovered during the 1984 to 1988 excavations of the jail and new office sites inside the fort. By the spring of 1992, Douglas Magedanz, a former seasonal park ranger, filled the position, which had been converted to a full-time museum technician position.

In addition, the Caywood material was re-cataloged in 1988 and 1989 to bring the collection up to current NPS 28 cataloging standards. In 1990, other portions of the diagnostic collection were re-cataloged, especially those artifacts recovered during the 1971 to 1975 archaeological excavations of the fort interior. During this ongoing project, all of the park’s old catalog cards were entered into a cultural resources data base on the ANCS computer program, standardizing the entire system and making the information easier to access.

Another continuing project was the preservation of iron objects. Some preservation had been done on site in large tanks with an electrolytic solution from 1985 to 1988. Though the results were better than Rust-oleum, there remained a concern with the disposal of the potentially harmful solution, which could only be "neutralized" with acetic acid, then disposed. The fur store, once completed, will have an air-abrasion unit which cleans the metal before it is coated with tung oil for protection.

Fort Vancouver acquired a new preservation problem by the 1980s. The reconstructed buildings and interior furnishings were susceptible to long-term deterioration. In July 1989, Regional Curator Kent Bush found evidence of "wood rot in the floor of the Bakehouse, accelerated deterioration due to wood rot of the cannon carriages, and a powder-post beetle infestation in the Chief Factor's House." The most serious of these problems was the powder-post beetle infestation in some pieces of furniture in the Chief Factor’s House. In 1990, a team from the Pacific Northwest Regional Office and Fort Vancouver developed a collections management plan to take care of these preservation problems as well as outline archive management techniques and security and storage procedures.
Another resource issue of the late 1980s was the fate of the Native American remains in Fort Vancouver's collection. Though the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (Public Law 101-601) was not enacted until November 16, 1990, the draft legislation affected Park Service policy several years earlier. The federal legislation required all governmental agencies, including the National Park Service, to inventory their collections, identify the cultural affiliation, and attempt to return any Native American skeletal remains to the affiliated tribes. Fort Vancouver's collection contained more than nine identifiable human skeletal remains that were recovered during the excavation of the North wall of the stockade in 1966. The forensics report on these remains provided strong evidence that they were of Native American origin. In February 1988, the regional archaeologist and regional curator inspected the collection at Fort Vancouver and decided that it was best to try and repatriate the remains. But, many of "the Coastal groups require the remains be 'sponsored' for re-burial by tribal members willing to accept the costs associated with the required ceremony." Though members of the Chinook tribe, the local band along the Columbia River, were contacted about the skeletal remains, they have not requested their return and Fort Vancouver still retains them in their collection.

The recently reconstructed fur store has great potential as both an archaeological research center and a controlled storage facility. With an estimated 1,400,000 objects in Fort Vancouver's collection (about 20% "diagnostic"), the fur store will not only bring together the artifacts in one repository at the national historic site, but will ease the problems of cataloging that collection and making the specimens readily available for research and analysis.

INTERPRETING THE SITE--THE HISTORIC CONTEXT

Introduction

Once cultural resources are uncovered, recovered, preserved, studied, and cataloged, they become the basis for interpreting a site's significance. At Fort Vancouver, with the help of many researchers, the recovered archaeological resources
have provided a strong basis for interpretation. Yet, how the Park Service has presented the historic interpretation of Fort Vancouver has not remained static. From simple wayside panels and asphalt pads that marked stockade structures to volunteer interpreters in period dress who convey the feeling of the period, the goals and methods of interpretation at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site have changed dramatically over the past 45 years.

**Interpreting the Archaeological Site**

During the 1947 excavation, Louis Caywood allowed the public access to the archaeological site. Indeed, local interest in the excavation was so high that Caywood was often overwhelmed by visitors. For example, one day in October 1947, he was forced to close the doors of the building where he displayed artifacts after 100 people squeezed their way inside. He only let the remaining people in 15 at a time and the "open house" lasted from 2:00 to 4:00 pm, though he could not estimate how many visitors came through that day. In the first month of the second year's excavation, a total of 71 curious visitors came to view the excavations and unearthed artifacts.\(^{84}\)

Continued public interest and the *ad hoc* nature of the monument's interpretive program presented challenges to Caywood. He tried desperately in the fall of 1948 to get the regional office to print even the most basic folder explaining the site. Instead, he received a memo from the assistant director, Hillory A. Tolson, which regretfully informed him that "In view of the current unsettled status of Fort Vancouver National Monument it has been decided to postpone the preparation and publication of a 2-fold folder relating to that area, at least for this fiscal year."\(^{85}\)

In 1949, the archaeological site and Louis Caywood's artifacts continued to attract attention. September brought 51 visitors who "inspected exhibits in the museum and looked over the site of Fort Vancouver" and by the summer of 1950, when Vancouver celebrated the 125th anniversary of the founding of Fort Vancouver, thousands of visitors flocked to the excavation site as well as the museum laboratory.\(^{86}\)

When the first superintendent, Frank Hjort, arrived at Fort Vancouver in the
winter of 1951, he pressured the Park Service to develop interpretive programs for the yet-to-be-established monument. The first such program simply entailed four weatherproofed panels and an orientation map to be placed "at the parking area overlooking the stockade site at Fort Vancouver National Monument." The panels were to outline the story of the Quest for Furs, Fort Vancouver, the Tide of Migration, and the advent of the United States Army. By August 1952, the panels were completed at the Park Service's Washington, D.C., Museum Laboratory and sent to Fort Vancouver.87

Two years later, Superintendent Hjort continued to prepare an interpretive plan for the monument.88 Though the basic interpretive needs of the monument would be met by the four-panel outdoor display when installed in the fall, Frank Hjort lamented in September 1954 that other "interpretive devices such as a self-guiding tour at the fort site is impractical at this time due to the fact that aircraft [from Pearson Airpark] are using the runway which overlaps the fort site."89

Once the monument was officially established in 1954, Superintendent Hjort was able to establish a museum and install interpretive signs. He still wanted to instigate the self-guided tour at the fort site with "a numbered-post, mimeographed-leaflet type tour."90 But Hjort also believed that on-site markers were of limited use with few "uniformed, well-trained personnel."91 The small staff precluded constant personal interpretation at the fort site.

MISSION 66 Interpretation

Interpretation was an important part of the MISSION 66 master planning process beginning in March 1958. The plan reiterated the importance of integrating archaeological and historical research to create the context for interpretation. Prior to building the museum, the fort site was treated as the primary "exhibit." Since reconstruction was not being considered at that time, the new exhibits had to convey a sense of the original fort through visual aids. Elaborating on his earlier ideas for a self-guided tour, Frank Hjort envisioned that visitors would "travel through the monument by
private automobile, in organized tours, by bus," on restored historic roadways leading to the fort site, by way of the parade ground, the Hudson’s Bay Company cemetery, Kanaka Village, and the replanted orchard. At various tour stations, three push-button-controlled tape recordings would describe the story of Fort Vancouver and the footprint of each structure at the stockade would be identified by a numbered "concrete marker flush with the ground" that corresponded to numbers in a brochure.

By June 1960, however, a "temporary and not very satisfactory system" of weed killer on the grass was used to mark the building foundations at the fort site. The excavated well in the northeast corner of the fort stockade also provided a visible marker for interpretive tours. In 1961, the building foundations were covered with blacktop and, after the north wall was reconstructed in 1966, new aluminum interpretive signs on metal posts marked the buildings within the stockade wall, replacing the four display panels at the fort site.

Technology and Interpretation

Visitors in automobiles following push-button self-guided tours with audio-visual stations--these were the visions of a new technological age that influenced the Park Service and the development of interpretation. When Fort Vancouver completed the Visitor Center in 1962, audio-visual capabilities were added to Fort Vancouver exhibits. The first such device purchased in September 1961 was a Selectroslide, as the staff prepared to install the new exhibits for the museum. By 1963, Fort Vancouver added a Bell & Howell projector and a projector screen. Fort Vancouver traded its Viewlex projector for a Kodak Carousel in 1964 and in June 1965, a Mohawk Repeater with a ceiling speaker and wall button was installed near the Whitman diorama. By the spring of 1966, Fort Vancouver received a new 900 Kodak Carousel projector and Cousino Repeater to add to its growing audio-visual melange.

New technology allowed Fort Vancouver to provide entertainment and educational services to the public. In the spring of 1964, Fort Vancouver initiated a motion picture program. Regularly scheduled "educational" films from "oil companies,
Though not the best solution for interpretation of the fort site, the avigation easement restriction in the late 1950s only allowed marking the building sites with concrete pads and flat markers. (Frank Hjort, National Park Service.)
agencies of the Federal Government, and from leading automobile manufacturers" were shown in the audio-visual room. A total of 5,340 individuals attended 345 showings.97

Technology, however, came with a price tag. When new Superintendent Harold Edwards arrived at Fort Vancouver in July 1963, he found the 1961 model slide-sound cabinet out of commission. "This monster has sat silently and dark in a corner of our A.V. room since its arrival at FOVA some two years or more ago."98 In addition, the Viewlex projector was without a remote control and the staff could not "run a full box of slides through the projector without jamming and ruining the slides."99 Fort Vancouver realized it could not become a slave to technology, but had to rely more on human contact as a means of conveying the historic message.

**Interpretation During the 1960s**

By February 1962, the new museum exhibits were installed in the Visitor Center. Visitation sky-rocketed. More than 7,000 people viewed the new exhibits during March alone, nearly 6,500 more than March of the previous year. By the summer of 1962, visitation was up dramatically because of the Seattle World's Fair and an influx of tourists from California.100

Because of the increased visitation, the staff at Fort Vancouver was spread thin. By the middle of the 1960s, Superintendent Eliot Davis initiated a volunteer "Junior Rangers" program to assist with interpretation and general operations at the park. Local youngsters donated their time in exchange for the experience of working at the historic site. By 1969, however, the program was phased out due to the public concern for the young teenagers' safety.101

Historian Robert C. Clark and Superintendent Eliot Davis developed performance guidelines for these volunteers and seasonal interpreters which stressed communication skills and cooperation with both the public and other staff members. The 1969 guidelines encouraged park employees to develop a social consciousness. The interpreter was to be "active in developing his commitment to the importance of environmental understanding in our society and an environmental approach to his
interpretive efforts.\textsuperscript{102}

\textbf{Off-Site Visits--School Services}

Throughout the 1950s, Superintendent Frank Hjort traveled to public schools and addressed civic groups in Vancouver and Portland to give "the regular Fort Vancouver lecture with slides."\textsuperscript{103} By the 1960s, Fort Vancouver had developed a fuller school program; together with State and local assistance, park staff developed a variety of educational programs for students. For example, in 1963 and 1964 the Oregon State Department of Education and Fort Vancouver produced a fourth grade television series called "Explorations with Bucky Beaver!" Two or three episodes dealt specifically with the history of the Hudson's Bay Company and the fur trade which fit neatly into school curriculum.\textsuperscript{104}

Besides visiting schools, park rangers conducted audiovisual programs and tours of museum exhibits and the fort site for many school groups. They used props such as seal pelts, sea otter skins, and beaver hats to help describe life at Fort Vancouver. By the late 1960s, there had been a dramatic increase in school group visitation and the park staff created another specially targeted interpretive slide show for third grade children.\textsuperscript{105}

In an attempt to engage city children more directly with a living history concept in the 1970s, the director of the Park Service, William J. Whalen, established an Urban Initiative program "to better serve urban and special populations by expanding cultural, recreational and educational programs." The program stressed environmental awareness, job training (urban partnership), recreation, workshops, exhibits, and creative programs.\textsuperscript{106} The park, under the guidance of Bruce Guisti of Washington County's (OR) Special Education Division, created a program for fourth, fifth, and sixth graders in the fall of 1979. The students would plan a particular research project leading up to an overnight stay at the park. For instance, some students worked with the fort's interpretive staff to prepare food in the kitchen attached to the Chief Factor's House under the same conditions as a 19th century Hudson's Bay Company employee.\textsuperscript{107} The
program tied into already established school curriculum, where Fort Vancouver played an important role and was extremely popular with the children. The Urban Initiative program only lasted a year, but the park continued to work with local schools and tailor presentations to school group needs at the fort.\textsuperscript{108}

In the 1980s, Supt. James M. Thomson renewed an off-site program for elementary schools which used interpreters wearing period clothing who visited classes for an hour and showed reproduction fur trade items.\textsuperscript{109}

\textbf{New Social Issues of the 1970s}

By the 1970s, the needs of Fort Vancouver and its interpretive program shifted just as the social world around them changed. Increasingly, the public showed concern for the state of the environment which, in turn, brought a new angle to interpreting the fur trade. In June 1971, Fort Vancouver prepared an "Interpretive Prospectus for Fort Vancouver National Historic Site," which described the fur trade as exploitative and endangering various animal species. The regional office wanted Fort Vancouver to emphasize this environmental theme more clearly and tie the fur trade directly to environmental problems of the present day. For interpretive purposes, the Hudson's Bay Company fur trader became an inadvertent exploiter who came to the Northwest country to use the natural resources. He sought the hides of animals to satisfy his growing need for luxuries. He knew little of the balance of nature and few, if any, could envision the effect on the natural resources of the future. And so he set about unbalancing the balance, without realizing it.\textsuperscript{110}

The Park Service also explored the growing interest in "multi-culturalism." Instead of focusing on the fur trade as indicative of a British white male culture, the interpretive program could acknowledge the myriad cultures which made up the economic and social life at Fort Vancouver. For instance, inter-cultural marriages between fur traders and native women were common, yet they were probably not acknowledged by park interpreters in the 1950s.\textsuperscript{111}

The new emphasis on environmental awareness and multi-culturalism was not necessarily rewriting history, but it did highlight history in a way that reflected late-20th-
century social concerns. In order to emphasize the new themes, Fort Vancouver's interpretive prospectus proposed omitting much of the written text. Instead, the visitor would be surrounded by the aura of the 19th century using audio-visual stimuli, displays, dioramas, and background music. The artifacts, too, would become self-explanatory within this new ambiance, thus making excessive labeling unnecessary. Most importantly, a "freewheeling manner" of interpretation would not bore the visitors.\textsuperscript{112}

Although most of the 1971 interpretive plan was not implemented, environmental concerns and multi-culturalism have been enduring themes for interpretation at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. In 1981, Fort Vancouver's "Annual Statement for Interpretation and Visitor Services" emphasized environmental and energy-minded interpretation. As well, the interpretation of the reconstructed buildings would expose the visitors to "the cultural differences of the many racial, ethnic and social groups that lived at the fort site in the early 19th century. Among these groups are middle class British gentlemen, laboring class Europeans, French Canadians, Hawaiians, Northwest Indians, and women."\textsuperscript{113}

\textbf{1970s--Living History}

According to the 1972 superintendent's annual report, the Fort Vancouver interpretive program consisted of "individual contacts at the visitor center and on the grounds, guided tours through the fort area and formal talks in the visitor center with audiovisual programs on request."\textsuperscript{114} But, as the reconstruction of the buildings within the stockade continued in the mid-1970s, "individual contact" took on a new meaning. Living history demonstrations by interpreters in period clothing, who recreated life at Fort Vancouver in 1845, provided the new historical ambiance at the fort site. Robert C. Amdor, the chief of interpretation and resource management at Fort Vancouver, initiated "spinning demonstrations in the Visitor Center; Hudson's Bay spodeware repair; vegetable garden on Fort site grounds; establishment of an interim trade store inside the stockade which was manned by a costumed clerk of Hudson's Bay period."\textsuperscript{115} The produce from the vegetable garden was distributed to both the park visitors and local
food bank programs.

In November 1974, as the reconstructed bakehouse neared completion, Fort Vancouver sought State approval to operate the ovens as part of its interpretive program. "As a trial our initial effort will be to operate through the cooperating association and secure a work-study student as a baker," Superintendent Donald Gillespie wrote the regional director. Clark College, with its baker's program, would have an accessible pool of applicants.\textsuperscript{116}

Historically, the bakers of Fort Vancouver baked enough loaves of bread for 300 people a day as well as sea biscuits for rations to lower class employees, the company's fur brigades, company ships, and Russians in Alaska connected with the fur trade. The staff at the historic site had less ambitious plans and estimated a modest start up cost of $1,000. However, they had not estimated the red tape. The Washington State Department of Agriculture, Dairy, and Food Division performed an on-site inspection of the bakehouse ovens and found water leaks, an open stairway, rough and exposed timber beams, and unsealed wood work tables and bins to be a danger to "product reliability."

Another snag for the bakehouse program came from the Southwest Air Pollution Control Authority. Fort Vancouver's initial plan called for 20 hours of bread baking a week, mostly on weekends, producing nearly 320 loaves of bread and 400 sea biscuits, then selling them at a nominal price to visitors.\textsuperscript{117} But, the Southwest Air Pollution Control Authority filed an "Order for Prevention" before bakehouse construction was even complete. The order threatened to prevent construction if "all known and available reasonable means of emission control are not provided." The bakehouse would have to install "equipment [which] incorporates advances in the art of air pollution control developed for the kind and amount of air contaminant emitted by the equipment." The application submitted by the Park Service to construct wood burning ovens did not "provide all known and available means of emission control, evidence that the system is designed and can be operated without causing a violation of the emission standards nor demonstrate that the facility will not aid in the contravention of the ambient air standards."\textsuperscript{118} In plainer words, modern air pollution standards threatened to stop the
Park Ranger Dick Maxwell demonstrates baking techniques in the wood burning ovens of the reconstructed bakehouse at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. (Bill Murphy, Oregon Journal.)
use of the reconstructed 1844 bakehouse.

Though Fort Vancouver received special permission to fire up the bakehouse ovens on March 19, 1975 for Fort Vancouver's Sesquicentennial celebration, it was doubtful whether the Environmental Protection Agency would let it run baking demonstrations on a permanent basis. Indeed, the ovens lay dormant until the fall of 1976, when they were fired up for the second time. Apparently, poor construction would not allow for extended use. "The shape of the oven roof is improper and mislaid," bemoaned Superintendent Gillespie,

The mortar joints should not have been used in preference to abutting the brick (in the arch of the oven). The cracks that have developed are said to be normal and we were advised that concern for structural damage is not necessary. We were concerned because of substantial cracks on the oven face and rear of the exterior that have developed.

Despite the structural problems, the ovens were again used for baking demonstrations once the State legislature passed a bill that allowed Fort Vancouver to burn wood for occasional use.

Besides the bakehouse, the reconstructed blacksmith shop also functioned as a specific site for historic demonstrations. After its reconstruction, Michael Darrig was hired in March 1982 as a museum technician/blacksmith to furnish the shop with proper forging tools and develop a "living history" interpretive program. The development of a fully functional shop proved to be a considerable challenge due to design deficiencies in the reconstruction of the shop and lack of information about 19th-century British forges. The safety problems included improper forge firepot designs, forge flues which would not draw, nonfunctional bellows, insufficient lighting to work safely, excessive infrared radiation from the forge, unreliable structural integrity, and a lack of weatherproofing and heat for winter operations. Over the years, most of these problems have been resolved.

In the spring of 1982, Darrig began recruiting and training volunteers to assist in the blacksmith shop interpretive program. The dedicated group eventually grew to about 30 individuals and has organized as the Fort Vancouver Blacksmith's Association, the first independently organized volunteer group at the park. This group began producing
iron objects to furnish the blacksmith shop and Indian Trade Shop by the late spring of 1982. The group has produced all of the hardware for the fur store and intend to produce hardware for other fort buildings.

In 1987, Mike Darrig won a position classification appeal which resulted in his position being converted to a wage-grade blacksmith. Despite this position classification change, Superintendent James Thomson and Darrig disagreed over the basic purpose of the blacksmith shop. According to the policy of the regional office at that time, the primary emphasis of the blacksmith shop was to demonstrate the process of 19th-century smithing. Under this policy, the volunteer blacksmiths would not be allowed to manufacture objects at the forges, but simply assist the activities of Darrig as the interpreter. The volunteers complained bitterly about the restrictions on their activities and the superintendent decided not to enforce the production prohibition, though questions remained about whether and how park policy might be administered. 123

When Dave Herrera replaced James Thomson as superintendent in 1990, he gave his support to the growth of the blacksmith program, which now operates the shop five days a week year round, with 30 or more active volunteers.

Besides the bakehouse, the Chief Factor’s House opened for tours in September 1976. In the attached kitchen, cooking demonstrations and occasional candle-making took place. By 1977, the living history demonstrations occurred at the bakehouse, a temporary trade shop, the kitchen and the visitor center information area. 124 The historic orchard and garden are also important to interpretation at Fort Vancouver. The orchard was replanted in 1961 and 1962 with a variety of apple, pear, plum, and cherry trees (the peach and nectarine trees which were planted did not survive). There was no formal nor consistent interpretation of the orchard area until the late 1970s when Superintendent James Thomson prepared an orchard policy for Fort Vancouver. Among other things, the policy gave the chief of interpretation and resource management responsibility for managing the orchard and insisted that only uniformed personnel harvest the fruit. 125 The orchard was not only to visually represent the historic varieties of Fort Vancouver tree species, but also provided an area for interpreting early
19th century agricultural practices, for which the Hudson's Bay Company was famous.\textsuperscript{126}

The garden program "really blossomed" in 1986 when Robert Appling became chief of interpretation and resource management. At that time, the garden was tended by the maintenance man for several seasons. Since then, Park Ranger Rick Edwards and VIP Julie Daly have overseen the volunteer program of 30 to 35 master gardeners who research plants and seed sources to maintain an historically accurate garden. In October 1990, "garden ornaments" were added, including "a sundial, two rose trellis manufactured by the fort blacksmiths, and two benches built by one of the garden volunteers."\textsuperscript{127}

**Special Interpretive Events**

Some of the most rewarding aspects of the living history program, especially for the volunteers, are the special events which Fort Vancouver hosts throughout the year. Unlike the annual activities such as the Fourth of July celebration, these events fit more comfortably within the historic context of Fort Vancouver. For instance, in May 1978, Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, along with Canadian dignitaries, celebrated Queen Victoria's Birthday for the first time. The following year was the first for another special event, the Fur Brigade Encampment. Outside of the stockade, about 20 participants set up a camp for two days in August and displayed crafts, tested their trapper's skills of tomahawk throwing and story telling, and generally lived the life of 19th-century Hudson's Bay Company fur trappers and traders for the benefit of visitors.\textsuperscript{128} In 1984, Fort Vancouver observed the 200th birthday of Dr. John McLoughlin with a ceremony on the Chief Factor's House veranda and a dinner served in the mess hall. Guests included some descendants of Dr. McLoughlin, as well as Congressman Don Bonker, Oregon Historical Society Director Thomas Vaughan, Deputy Regional Director William Briggle, and other distinguished citizens.

Two other annual special events are the Candlelight Tour and the Christmas celebration. The Candlelight Tour began in the fall of 1983, and is meant to give the visitors an accurate picture of early evening life at Fort Vancouver in 1845. Each year
the staff strives for more authenticity in their depiction. By the late 1980s the chief of interpretation and resource management insisted on dress rehearsals, which would help volunteers pay attention to details of setting and period clothing, development of a particular character, authentic accents, and consistency of action. The staff wrote a general scenario for the evening, in which scenes are enacted in the Chief Factor's house, the kitchen, the bakehouse, the Barclay Quarters, the hospital dispensary, and the Indian Trade Shop. Each scene is lit simply by candlelight and the visitors pass through designated areas to watch the interpreters cooking, eating, or discussing trade.129

Interpretation in the Late 20th Century

Today Fort Vancouver feels its 20th century surroundings more than ever as it struggles to maintain a 19th century context for interpretation. Pressure from Pearson Airpark and its supporters has especially touched a raw nerve. Chief Ranger Robert Appling and Management Assistant Glenn Baker pessimistically assessed the situation at Fort Vancouver several years ago: the historic site "is not attractive enough to sway the thinking of local politicians or citizens who somewhat resent the federal presence and view the park as a resource to make inroads for their own purposes."130 Without public support, how does a park survive? Some of the staff feel that to tap the potential support, a reconstructed fort is not necessarily enough. The key is an expanded interpretive program and a promotional package to match. Instead of two or three volunteers in period clothing, visitors should encounter 8 or 10 clerks, gardeners, blacksmiths, or bakers at a time, to awe the visitor with a sense of the past. Unfortunately, the current budget for interpretation at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site cannot provide for this level of interpretation.

The reconstructed fur store will probably help Fort Vancouver obtain local support. The interpretation of the store will include a history of fur processing. Inside, 2,500 fur pelts, hides, and skins, as well as kegs, casks, scales and weights, ledgers, account books, wheelbarrows, leather water buckets, and lanterns will furnish the bailing
Fort Vancouver VIPs (from left) Clay Shelton, Marv Benson, and Art Wagner as Hudson’s Bay Company gentlemen playing cards in the public mess hall of the Chief Factor’s House during a candlelight tour. (Ed Vidinghoff.)
Yet, the new space for interpretation also demands sensitivity to changing social issues. The fur store has generated some complaints from animal rights advocates who condemn the "glorification of the exploitation of animals." These concerns might affect the way in which the fur store is interpreted.

The Cultural Landscape Report, completed in 1992, promises to help redefine the interpretive direction of Fort Vancouver. As it identifies significant layers of the constantly changing history of the Hudson's Bay Company complex, it will give the park guidance for both treatment of the natural and cultural landscape, including how to restore historic vegetation and how best to interpret those historic features that have been reconstructed. The study will induce Fort Vancouver to look beyond the immediate environs of the stockade and seriously consider the entire complex and how to interpret the surrounding fields, Kanaka Village, the historic waterfront, and other areas adjacent to the site. Whether the Cultural Landscape Report guidelines and recommendations are used by Fort Vancouver, however, depends on the disposition of the Pearson Airpark property after 2002, a decision which now awaits recommendations by the Historical Reserve Commission, and may ultimately depend on a vote in Congress.
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Park Staff and Administration

In the Beginning: Louis Caywood

During the formative years of Fort Vancouver National Monument, there were many questions about the organization and management of the new Park Service unit. Even before the legislation created Fort Vancouver, John C. Preston, the superintendent of Mount Rainier National Park, asked to be appointed coordinating superintendent to the new monument, just as he had been for Whitman Mission National Historic Site in eastern Washington. Preston felt they "could keep the records, do the accounting, and give what other 'parental' advice seems necessary" since the monument was fairly small.¹

Instead, Louis Caywood was appointed "Archaeologist-in-Charge" in the fall of 1949, after Park Service Administrative Officer C.E. Persons accepted "physical custody and accountability of the land and building (Parcels No. 1 and 3) of the proposed Fort Vancouver National Monument."² Caywood was the logical candidate for custodial duties since he spent most of his time at Vancouver working on the excavation of the fort site.

Caywood’s first duty was to find administrative quarters in one of the many vacant Army buildings remaining on the site. He managed to commandeer a rent-free laboratory space in the summer of 1948. The following winter the War Assets Administration furnished a coal stove for heating the building, though there was no available running water.³ Caywood also thought one of the other buildings on the soon-to-be Park Service property would be appropriate for use as a temporary office. But, since the boundaries had yet to be established and the monument thus officially created, no funding was available for administration. Caywood continued to live off the good graces of the Army and War Assets Administration.
As lone resident of the newly authorized monument, Caywood's monthly reports read much like an explorer's journal. For instance, during a January storm, Caywood noted that "Ice choked the Columbia River to such an extent that only the most powerful tugs made the trip up to the Dalles."4

Besides battling the elements, Caywood also battled the regional office to get recognition as a site. In the winter of 1949-1950, Caywood wrote the regional office: "It would be appreciated if copies of all correspondence for the Ft. Vancouver files be sent to this office rather than the Portland Office."5 Mail had been directed to Neal Butterfield, acting chief of the Columbia Basin Recreation Survey, where Fort Vancouver files were kept since a permanent office and superintendent had not yet been appointed. But Caywood insisted that all correspondence be directed to him at the fort site and by January 1950, the regional director declared that "all correspondence for Fort Vancouver National Monument (Project) will be addressed to Archaeologist Louis R. Caywood, Fort Vancouver National Monument, Post Office Box 186, Vancouver, Washington."6 A minor victory had been won.

**The First Superintendent: Frank Hjort**

When John Preston requested for the second time to be appointed coordinating superintendent of Fort Vancouver in March 1950, Regional Director O. A. Tomlinson again refused because he felt that the regional office should closely supervise the planning and development of the new monument.7 Tomlinson thought that someone with more experience at an historic site would be a more appropriate choice for a park administrator. And so on January 7, 1951, Frank Hjort was appointed the first superintendent of Fort Vancouver National Monument. Hjort had joined the Park Service in 1940 and had been stationed at Hawaii National Park during the attack on Pearl Harbor in World War II. By the late 1940s, however, he asked to be brought back to the mainland and was transferred to Fort Vancouver.

The urban park experience was very new to Frank Hjort. He successfully walked the political tight ropes and established good public relations with the City of Vancouver.
Hjort joined many civic groups, including the Stockaders, a Vancouver booster organization, of which he became president in December 1954. There was even a movement among some in Vancouver to rename the city "Fort Vancouver," which characterized the public respect for Hjort and all he had done to develop the Monument into a regional tourist stop.  

Besides establishing a reputation for the new Monument, Frank Hjort juggled several aspects of Park management. The archaeological excavations of 1948 and 1949 had uncovered a plethora of artifacts which composed Fort Vancouver's first major museum collection. In May 1954, the first "temporary" office and museum, housed in an old Army firehouse just north of the fort site, opened to display many of these artifacts. By the spring of 1955, the museum was open 7 days a week, from 8:00 am to 4:30 pm, and the visitation had increased from about 140 to 450 people a month.

However, the artifacts which Caywood had uncovered could not all be displayed in the limited space. Park Service Historian John Hussey remembers Frank Hjort as an enthusiast for history and "a great one for seeing that things were neat." Since storage and display space was limited, most of the old iron artifacts were "stored perhaps not too neatly in the old post firehouse, used by the park as a repository for items recovered by archaeologists." John Hussey believes that Hjort "ordered the maintenance man to take out a good deal of this historical source material and bury it." Indeed, in the 1970s archaeologists recovered many pieces of iron work from what has been dubbed "Hjort's Hole."

Frank Hjort also began to assemble a staff that could assist him in developing an interpretive program for the monument. Since the old fort site was off limits to visitors, this was not an easy task. In October 1955, Edgar A. Smith was hired as the first seasonal ranger-historian to assist with interpretation. Hjort, Smith, and clerk-stenographer Lillian Crom staffed Fort Vancouver, rotating weekend duty to maintain a 7-day schedule.

In February 1957, Edgar Smith resigned and was replaced in March by James E. Alexander, the seasonal ranger for weekend duty. But it was not until August 1958,
that a permanent park historian, Jerry D. Wagers, came on duty under the MISSION 66 staff expansion program. The MISSION 66 Master Plan called for one superintendent, one administrative aide, one permanent maintenance person, and one historian with the help of seasonal ranger-historians for interpretive work. With these 4 staff members on board, the day-to-day operation of the monument still required overlapping duties to cover the seven day week operation. Both the superintendent and the administrative aide had to handle interpretive duties during the year and the Historian "must, of course, be able to pinch-hit for the Administrative Aid to a certain degree and be well enough versed to act as Superintendent during his absences."13

During his tenure as park Historian, Wagers began valuable work on an administrative history of the monument, though he never completed it. By September 1960, however, Wagers transferred to Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis and eventually worked his way up through the ranks of management in the Park Service. By the mid-1970s, he had become the Director of the North Atlantic Region.

William R. Sampson replaced Wagers as historian at Fort Vancouver. The Columbian described Sampson as a "bespectacled" 27-year old. He had served as a seasonal ranger in the Park Service periodically since 1954. At Fort Vancouver, he was to "conduct background research for new exhibits in the monument’s proposed museum, act as a guide for groups visiting the museum and keep track of artifacts and documents belonging to the museum."14 Sampson also was working toward his master’s degree in history from the University of Wisconsin and went on to become a professor at the University of Alberta after his tenure with the Park Service.

**A Brief Interlude: Harold Edwards**

In February 1963, Frank Hjort was appointed superintendent of Badlands National Monument and William R. Sampson acted as superintendent at Fort Vancouver until July 7, 1963, when Harold O. ("Hal") Edwards arrived. Edwards transferred from a chief ranger position at Big Bend National Park in Texas. He was a graduate of the University of Idaho and had nearly 30 years of service with the federal government,
having come into the National Park Service in 1935 when he was in charge of a Civilian Conservation Corps camp in the Wenatchee National Forest in eastern Washington. He served at various park units, including Great Smoky Mountains, Rocky Mountain, and Yellowstone National Parks.\(^{15}\)

Under Hal Edwards the staff remained extremely small: a superintendent, administrative assistant, historian, and maintenance foreman, assisted by several temporary seasonals. When William R. Sampson requested a year’s leave to pursue his master’s degree in August 1963, Robert C. Clark replaced him as historian.\(^{16}\)

Unfortunately, Hal Edwards died in an auto accident November 21, 1964, along with his wife and grandson. It was an unexpected shock for the staff at Fort Vancouver. Both Charles L. Peterson, superintendent at Fort Clatsop, and Administrative Assistant Rose M. McCarty (who had replaced Lillian Crom in May 1962) served as acting superintendents until a replacement for Edwards was found nearly three months later.\(^{17}\)

**New Directions: Eliot Davis**

Eliot Davis was particularly well qualified for his role as superintendent at Fort Vancouver. Trained in geology and public administration, he spent some precarious years during the Great Depression as an archaeologist for the Tennessee Valley Authority, removing native artifacts from mounds in the Midwest before dam projects got underway. He joined the Park Service in 1939 and spent the next 25 years working in parks from Grand Teton to Grand Portage. In the 1950s, his experience as chief ranger at Isle Royale in Michigan and his superintendency at Grand Portage National Historic Site helped him develop a broad interest and knowledge of fur trade history and interpretation. Eliot Davis was a natural choice for superintendent at Fort Vancouver in February 1965.\(^{18}\)

Described by one newspaper as "the soft-spoken bespectacled Park Service employee," Superintendent Davis had a surprisingly sharp sense of humor.\(^{19}\) One can see his humor in the superintendent reports he filed with the regional office. For instance, regarding "wildlife" at Fort Vancouver, he reported that "A crow flew through
the open door of the visitor center thinking he could make it all the way, but he was fooled by the clean windows. After release he flew off in an erratic manner - probably looking for one of those three-way headache remedies."

His humor probably helped him through some difficult moments as he assisted Fort Vancouver toward a program of full reconstruction. His political savvy and congenial relationship with Representative Julia Butler Hansen helped initiate funding for a park master plan in the late 1960s and eased the Park Service purchase of the Pearson Airpark property from the City of Vancouver in 1972.

Davis reassessed many of the staff needs at Fort Vancouver and attempted to adapt to increased visitation and new Park Service policies. In May 1965, the staff consisted of a superintendent, a historian, an administrative assistant, and a maintenance foreman, though the Park still maintained a 7-day-a-week schedule. Davis complained that the "Administrative Assistant regularly assists in public contact and interpretive work, and the absence of a permanent Ranger means that protection work is done by other staff members."21

By the end of 1966, Davis added a new part-time clerk typist, Marlys L. Ford, to help with the ever-growing paperwork.22 A new administrative officer, Glennis Shute, transferred from Whitman Mission National Historic Site in November 1966. She was one of the few women who worked as administrative officer in the Park Service; administrative positions were usually perceived as training grounds for future superintendents, who tended to be male appointees.23

Robert E.S. Clark, the chief park interpreter and historian, helped expand the library collection, which Eliot Davis counted as a priority during his tenure. Clark compiled and bound several invaluable collections of Fort Vancouver records—monthly superintendents' reports from 1953 to 1967, a collection of early master planning documents, and various prospectuses and exhibit plans. Despite his eager and well trained staff, Eliot Davis had to close the site on weekends by December 1968 due to his inability to fund another permanent position.24

Under Eliot Davis’ administration, the staff at Fort Vancouver also became
responsible for an annual inspection of the John McLoughlin House in Oregon City, Oregon. The property was a national historic site in nonfederal ownership administered by the McLoughlin Memorial Association under a cooperative agreement worked out with the secretary of the Interior on February 19, 1941. This cooperative agreement required the secretary of the Interior to regulate the way that the Association maintained "the historical character of the McLoughlin House" and "to provide a national historic site plaque and such planning and technical advisory assistance as may be requested and possible within the limits of existing appropriations." The National Park Service office in Portland, Oregon had been responsible for making annual inspections and consulting with the staff at the site. Once Fort Vancouver was established as a national monument there was some cooperation between the park and the McLoughlin House. For instance, display items were borrowed and lent between the two entities and the Park Service would sometimes advise the staff at the McLoughlin House concerning cataloging methods or preservation of cultural resources.

However, it was not until January 1966 that Fort Vancouver officially took over the responsibilities for the McLoughlin House under the cooperative agreement with the secretary of the Interior and "Historian Clark made the annual inspection of the McLoughlin House at Oregon City." In subsequent years, a Fort Vancouver staff member would inspect the property or accompany a member of the regional office staff on that inspection.

In July 1969, Davis tried once more to expand his staff with a historian or technician position. "We have reached a saturation point with one historian and have had to turn schools away for the past two years," Davis told the new Park Service Northwest District director, John A. Rutter. Indeed, since permanent staff were spread thin at Fort Vancouver, the superintendent relied heavily on volunteers to perform many functions his staff could not.

One of the earliest volunteer and educational efforts at Fort Vancouver began in April 1965. Called the Junior Ranger Program, local youngsters donated their time in exchange for on-the-job training in preparing museum exhibits, preserving historical
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artifacts, operating audiovisual equipment, and communicating the history of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site effectively to the public. Park Service Director George Hartzog commended the Junior Rangers' efforts: "The National Park Service is certainly fortunate to have young men, such as you, who are willing to contribute their time in the performance of worthwhile public services." By 1969, however, the program was phased out due to Park Service concern over liability for the young teenagers' safety. The regional office feared that a Junior Ranger's parents might file "tort claims if one was injured."

In 1969, with the passage of the Volunteers-in-Parks Act, Fort Vancouver renewed its efforts to solicit and coordinate volunteer help. By 1972, three people, (probably Vernon Chapman, Dick Lillig, and Art Wagner) volunteered at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site to help with public contact, library cataloging, and artifact identification and storage. Fort Vancouver's new interpretive program of "living history" demonstrations at the reconstructed fort also required a larger number of volunteers.

Eliot Davis saw both permanent and volunteer staff in the Park Service as a new breed of the 1970s. The Park Service was a potential outlet for the "socially motivated" student. The agency might "become an 'environmental peace corps' and is now moving toward this direction somewhat."

In 1972, Davis was the first superintendent to retire from Fort Vancouver. John Rutter, the regional director, had implored him to stay another year, particularly because of his public relations ability, but to no avail. Davis had not only developed the 1969 Master Plan, giving a new direction to Fort Vancouver policy, but created strong ties between the community and the park. Even the Hudson's Bay Company honored his tenure at Fort Vancouver; they gave him two HBC Beaver tokens (one full and one half token) when he retired.
Repair and Reconstruction: Donald Gillespie

Eliot Davis retired on June 30, 1972, and Glen E. Henderson, chief of interpretation and resource management at Crater Lake, became acting superintendent at Fort Vancouver. By August, Donald Gillespie, the newly-appointed superintendent for Fort Vancouver, arrived from Washington, D.C. A native of Washington State, he started his career with the Park Service in 1964, at Wind Cave National Park in Hot Springs, South Dakota. Since 1964, he had served at Jewel Cave National Monument as management assistant and as manager of Ford’s Theatre National Historic Site from 1969 until he came to Fort Vancouver.

Like Eliot Davis, Gillespie had to appease a variety of political powers. For instance, Representative Julia Butler Hansen would call and ask Superintendent Gillespie, as she had Davis, "What do you want for the Fort this year in terms of appropriations?" Gillespie found himself between a rock and a hard place, namely Regional Director John Rutter, whose authority Gillespie did not want to over-step. Gillespie knew that "a superintendent in most areas has to be politically astute enough to know that he’s not in charge of the decision making process," but more likely an orchestrator of events. Actually, Gillespie was a little of both.

Indeed, with the congressional help of Representative Julia Butler Hansen, Gillespie orchestrated much of the fort reconstruction during the 1970s. He had an eye for detail and wanted to do the job right. "At the time we were doing our Master Plan, it was considered abhorrent to do fake reconstruction," to have modern materials inside the walls with a reconstructed exterior. If the original structure had been post and sill, then that was how the reconstruction would be done.

Gillespie also orchestrated the innovative living history interpretation program. He hired Chief of I&RM Robert Amdor to head up the program in November 1973. Amdor transferred from a supervisory ranger position at Golden Spike National Historic Site to set up the "living history exhibits--demonstrations of crafts practiced by the fort’s original inhabitants." It was probably Robert Amdor who initiated a work-study program with Portland Community College, a program designed to find students to
Chapter Nine

portray a gardener and a miller at Fort Vancouver. The special skills he asked for were "willingness to learn 1845 type organic gardening and the set up and operation of a hand or animal powered grist mill". The Park Service hired the students as seasonals and the college agreed to pay 25% of the students' salaries. Ultimately, Amdor sought students to pose as a clerk, a gardener, a spinner, a voyageur, and a miller. In 1976, Sam Vaughn took over for Amdor and expanded the work-study program with Portland Community College.

Besides the reconstruction and living history programs, Gillespie orchestrated the expansion of the curatorial staff. Curation had often been the extra duty of the project archaeologists, the chief ranger, or the superintendent. But, in 1974, Fort Vancouver found the perfect opportunity to fill several needs with one individual. David Hansen, the son of retiring Representative Julia Butler Hansen, transferred to Fort Vancouver in October 1974 from the Park Service's Division of Reference Services at Harper's Ferry in West Virginia. He had also garnered experience by working with the Park Service's Division of Archaeology and History Preservation in Washington, D.C. Hansen had a master's degree in history but was also an expert in 19th-century historic furnishings. He became park curator and prepared the furnishing plans for all the reconstructed buildings within the stockade as well as overseeing curation of the growing collection of artifacts.

In August 1978, Donald Gillespie accepted a transfer to Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore in Michigan. Some have speculated that his transfer was a result of his controversial stance on the annual Fourth of July celebration held at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. Certainly he objected the loudest to the effects of the event on the park. In 1976, along with the City's Fourth of July Committee, Gillespie made a concerted effort to relocate the event to another locale. He felt that the Park Service did not have the staff to manage the large crowds or ensure their safety. A television station in Portland even printed a commemorative T-shirt showing Gillespie inside the stockade with a firework coming down on his head as he stuck his head outside the open gate. Whatever the reason for transfer, Gillespie had brought the site through its major
Opposition in the 1980s: James M. Thomson

After Gillespie transferred, James M. Thomson arrived from White Sands National Monument in New Mexico in August 1978. Thomson entered the Park Service after a stint in the Army, as a member of the First Infantry Division during World War II. From storming the beaches at Normandy, he settled into a quieter life as a seasonal park ranger at Yellowstone National Park in 1949. Trained in forestry at Washington State College, he found a permanent position with the Park Service within a few years. Thomson’s first superintendency was at Salinas National Monument, but he also spent time at Great Smoky Mountains National Park and Fort Clatsop National Memorial. After 5 years at White Sands National Monument, he transferred to Fort Vancouver.

In many ways, James Thomson was the most embattled superintendent. For instance, in 1986 John Wulle and the Pearson Airpark Historical Society began their fight to retain general aviation at the airfield. The rumors that the city was going to sell the eastern half of Pearson property for a Trial Blazer’s arena had united the supporters of Pearson Airpark who incessantly confronted the Park Service about extending the use of the airfield beyond 2002.

The Waterfront Park also became a point of contention during Thomson’s tenure. The city would sometimes break ground for utility or sprinkler systems on the waterfront property without first notifying the Park Service. On one occasion the regional archaeologist was called in by park staff and found artifacts lying around the city’s freshly dug trenches. The superintendent filed a stop work order, which did not help the fragile relationship between Fort Vancouver and the city.

Office space for the growing staff and collections at Fort Vancouver was at a premium during Thomson’s early administration. The Visitor Center housed the superintendent, the chief of interpretation and resource management, and the curator who worked in the basement. In the summer of 1980, Superintendent Thomson moved his office, Administrative Assistant Marlys Ford, and Curator David Hansen into office
space at Officers' Row. In 1987, the park renovated one of the staff residences into an administration building. The curatorial and interpretive staff and library was moved to the Indian Trade Shop at the fort site by the late 1980s.

In 1986, Robert Appling transferred to Fort Vancouver as the chief of interpretation and resource management. Appling had worked at Craters of the Moon for three summers as a seasonal, then took his first permanent position at Jewel Cave. At Fort Vancouver, he replaced Kent Taylor and spent much of his time revitalizing the interpretive program, including improving the coordination of volunteers, replanting the garden, and updating the park’s collection of period clothing.

After 43 years of government service, James M. Thomson retired from Fort Vancouver National Historic Site on December 30, 1989. Robert Appling took over as acting superintendent.

Planning for the Future: Dave Herrera

After Thomson's retirement, Dave Herrera was appointed superintendent and came on duty in February 1990. Herrera speculates that his childhood in a tough South Bronx neighborhood in New York City prepared him for his job at Fort Vancouver, but his educational background and work experience also helped. After receiving a BA in psychology, with a minor in education and sociology, and a master's degree in public administration from the University of Utah, Herrera worked for the City of Denver's planning division and later administered employment and training programs for southwestern Nebraska. In 1979, he applied for a position at the National Park Service, Midwest Regional Office in Omaha, Nebraska and was appointed youth programs officer for three years, then legislative specialist. His first superintendency was at Whitman Mission National Historic Site.

Herrera's experience with youth, education, public administration, and even legal issues has probably given him the wide range of skills needed to handle the hottest political problems which he inherited at Fort Vancouver, such as those produced by Pearson Airpark and Waterfront Park. Ironically, one of the most controversial issues
that Herrera has faced has been the children's playground. "I was abhorred that there was a city-style recreational playground at a national historic site and I wanted to find a way to get rid of it," Herrera confessed. However, immediately after he removed the old equipment, there was a public outcry. "We removed half of the equipment," Herrera recalls, "then waited a couple of weeks and there was no reaction, then I gave the order to take it all out." The local newspaper ran a large front page article and subsequently a group of outraged parents started a letter-writing campaign. Though the playground, built in 1970, had not been used a lot, and the equipment was deteriorating, Regional Director Charles Odegaard, who received many of the complaints, told Herrera to replace the equipment. The superintendent replaced the playground with a less obtrusive version near the picnic shelter.41

Pearson Airpark continued to present problems. As the fight to maintain general aviation beyond the year 2002 heated up, pilots began flying low over the fort site. Herrera contacted the FAA to research regulations of aircraft and filed several complaints which resulted in one pilot getting a written warning. The airport issue has divided the public's loyalty and created an atmosphere of controversy which has eroded some of the local support for Fort Vancouver. Dave Herrera feels that there is not always a strong sense of community pride in the national historic site. He hopes that his forthright actions concerning the playground and Pearson pilots gained him and Fort Vancouver the respect that may have been missing in the past 10 years. "My intent was to take this back as a national site. We tried to raise the level of consciousness of the people of this town."42

In order to "take Fort Vancouver back as a national site," Herrera has turned down many special use requests that did not fit into the historic purpose of the park. Hawaiian luaus for 3,000 people, church services, or aerobics exercise videos set within the stockade would not enhance the interpretation of Fort Vancouver. Herrera has also focused on safety at the events that continue to take place at the fort. For the Fourth of July celebration, he has successfully closed the waterfront and SR 14 to parked vehicles.

Other interpretive programs have been revived. Within the past two years the
volunteer blacksmith program has grown from one or two blacksmith employees to over 30 volunteers, who recently made all of the hardware for the new fur store for a considerable savings to the park. The newly reconstructed fur store will also help to revive visitor interest in Fort Vancouver with a new interpretive program.

The future holds many new directions for Fort Vancouver. Besides the reconstructed fur store, a recent cultural landscape report will give new guidelines for further restoration and development at the site. Dave Herrera considers the landscape "inappropriate for a National Historic Site, it is chopped up by Fifth Street, and other roads." The cultural landscape report recommends reconnecting disparate areas of the site with a new roadway system and pedestrian overpass. The Kanaka Village area, waterfront park, and the parade ground north of the fort site would also be interpreted as parts of the cultural landscape. Herrera considers these improvements and continued reconstruction at the stockade necessary to maintain the historic integrity of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. "It has always been a struggle of getting the American public to know and appreciate the history of Fort Vancouver," Herrera admitted. "I suppose that maybe as the reconstruction nears completion, maybe only at that point will the region or the Nation really know and have some regard for this place."
Chapter One: Overview


2. Charles F. Bohannon, Cultural Resources Report, The Development of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, Dec. 5, 1977, p. 3, Acc. no. 84-0007-6, Box 3, H2215, FRC Seattle. Bohannon briefly introduced the concept of compromise between preservation and public use as a management tool. I have expanded this concept as it applies to Fort Vancouver.

3. Charles F. Bohannon, Cultural Resources Report The Development of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, December 5, 1977, p. 3, Acc. no. 84-0007-6, Box 3, H2215, FRC Seattle.

Chapter Two: The Creation of Fort Vancouver National Monument


5. Carl Landerholm, Vancouver Area Chronology, 1784-1958, (Vancouver, Washington, 1960), p. 232; The Columbian, July 13, 1921. Though we assume that the 1910 stone monument was placed from information in Bonneville’s notes, this new discovery was
probably a map that marked out the exact location of the stockade.


11. Sampson, "Vancouver's Heritage Preserved," p. 5. About the same time Congress passed a bill calling for a commemorative 50 cent coin for the 100th year anniversary of the founding of Fort Vancouver.


17. Attachment to letter, Fay G. Peabody to W.P. Bonney, March 5, 1935, Washington State Historical Society Correspondence, 1924-1950 Historic Sites - Clark Co. - Fort Vancouver, WSHS. In December 1952 the City of Vancouver applied for the property around the Apple Tree but the Army had not yet declared that area surplus. A January 1953 memo from James N. Gibson, Chief, State Cooperation, to the Regional Director indicates that this land, adjacent to the airport, might also "allow the development of runways entirely on city land, thereby releasing the Fort Vancouver National Monument from the present infringement caused by use of some federal land for landing purposes." [Memorandum, James N. Gibson, Chief, State Cooperation, to Regional Director, January 9, 1953, Acc. No. 84-0004-3, Box 2, L2225, FRC Seattle.]
Endnotes


20. Hagen, Preliminary Investigation, p. 3.


34. The Sun, February 25, 1947.

35. Administrative History Drafts Fort Vancouver, pp. 6-7.


38. Memorandum, B.F. Manby to Regional Director, May 1, 1947, Jerry Wagers notecards, FOVA.

39. Memorandum, O.A. Tomlinson to Park Service Director, April 21, 1947, Jerry Wagers notecards, FOVA.

40. Memorandum, B.F. Manby to Park Service Director, May 1, 1947, see also Olcott to Regional Director, April 16, 1947, Jerry Wagers notecards, FOVA, The Columbian July 24, 1947.

41. Letter, Chapin Foster to W.K. Peery, Vancouver, WA, May 21, 1947, Washington State Historical Society Correspondence, Folder - Vancouver Barracks (Special Events) Fort Vancouver, Vancouver Washington, 1947-8-9, WSHS.

42. Charles F. Bohannon, "The Development of Fort Vancouver National Historic Site," December 5, 1977, Acc. 84-0007-6, Box 3, H2215, FRC Seattle.

43. Memorandum, Sanford Hill, Regional Landscape Architect, to Regional Director, September 4, 1947 and H.L. Crowley, Acting Regional Director, to the Park Service Director, September 4, 1947, Jerry Wagers notecards, FOVA.


45. Memorandum, Raymond Hoyt to Regional Director, November 26, 1947, Jerry Wagers notecards, FOVA; memorandum, O.A. Tomlinson to Newton B. Drury, Park Service Director, December 1, 1947, in Administrative History Drafts Fort Vancouver, p. 10.

46. Memorandum, Raymond Hoyt to Regional Director, November 28, 1947, Jerry Wagers notecards, FOVA.

47. Memorandum, Newton Drury to O.A. Tomlinson, Regional Director, December 11, 1947, Jerry Wagers notecards, FOVA.
Endnotes


49. Letter, Vancouver Mayor Anderson to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Seattle, April 1, 1948, Jerry Wagers notecards, FOVA.


54. The Clark County Review, June 17, 1948.


58. The Columbian, June 1, 1948.


Endnotes

64. The Columbian, October 28, 1948.

65. Transcript from telephone conversation between Raymond Hoyt and Herbert Maier of Region Four and Mr. H.W.K. Hartmayer, War Assets Administration, Seattle, Washington, December 28, 1948, Box 290, file 620, NA San Bruno.


67. Telegram, Herbert Maier to O.A. Tomlinson, January 11, 1949 Box 290, file 602, NA San Bruno.

68. Memorandum, Raymond E. Hoyt to files, January 20, 1949, Box 290, file 602, NA San Bruno.

69. Letter, Thomas L. Peyton, Director of General Real Estate Disposal Division, War Assets Administration, to the National Park Service Director, April 22, 1949, Box 290, file 602, NA San Bruno.

70. Letter, Kenneth C. Royall, Secretary of the Army, to The Secretary of the Interior, March 2, 1949, Box 290, file 602, NA San Bruno.

71. Letter, Secretary of the Interior to Kenneth C. Royall, Secretary of the Army, April 1, 1949, Box 290, file 602, NA San Bruno.


74. Letter, Gordon Gray to the Secretary of the Interior, June 16, 1949, Jerry Wagers notecards, FOVA.

75. Letter, the Secretary of the Interior to Gordon Gray, Secretary of the Army, July 27, 1949, Box 290, file 602, NA San Bruno.


77. The Columbian, March 20, 1950.

79. Letter, Donald Stewart to Senator Wayne Morse, May 23, 1950, Jerry Wagers notecards, FOVA.

80. Memorandum, A. E. Demaray, Associate Director, to Regional Director, Region Four, July 31, 1950, Box 290, file 602, NA San Bruno.


82. Memorandum, B.F. Manby, Regional Chief of Lands, to Regional Director, October 17, 1951, Box 290, file 602, NA San Bruno.

83. Memorandum, Sanford Hill, Assistant Regional Director, Region Four, to Superintendent, Fort Vancouver National Monument, October 24, 1951, Box 289, file 201-17, Agreements, NA San Bruno.

84. Memorandum, Philip C. Puderer, Acting Chief, Real Property Disposal, to the National Park Service Director, July 18, 1952, Box 290, file 610, NA San Bruno.

85. Memorandum, Philip C. Puderer, Chief, Real Property Disposal Branch, to Assistant Director Lee, December 24, 1952, Box 290, file 610, NA San Bruno.


87. Memorandum, Acting Regional Director to National Park Service Director, March 31, 1954, Acc. No. 67A846, Box 1, L1417 - 5-1953 to 12-31-54 - FOVA, FRC San Bruno.


89. The Columbian, August 15, 1955.

Chapter Three: The Legislative History of Fort Vancouver

1. See Chapter Two, The Creation of Fort Vancouver National Monument, for more details on the early legislation.

Endnotes


Endnotes

3283, UW Manuscripts.


25. Memorandum, Chief, Archeological Research to Park Service Director, August 29, 1969, Record Group 79, H2215, Archeology and Historical Research, FOVA, FRC Seattle.


Endnotes

30. Letter, Mike McCormack to Sidney R. Yates, April 27, 1976, Acc. 84-0007-6, Box 3, file H30, Archeological and Historical Research FOVA, 1-1-75 to 12-31-77, FRC Seattle.

31. Memorandum, C. Richard Neely, Senior Attorney, Pacific Northwest Region, to Office of Legislative Counsel, Department of the Interior, March 23, 1984, Pacific Northwest Regional Office Planning Division files, Pearson Correspondence prior to 1987, PNRO.

32. Memorandum, C. Richard Neely, Senior Attorney, Pacific Northwest Region, to Office of Legislative Counsel, Department of the Interior, March 23, 1984, Pacific Northwest Region Planning Division files, Pearson Correspondence prior to 1987, PNRO.

33. The Columbian, February 27, 1989 and The Oregonian, February 25, 1989; letter, Representative Jolene Unsoeld to William Penn Mott, Jr., Park Service Director, February 24, 1989, L38 Pearson Airpark misc., FOVA.

34. Letter, Jolene Unsoeld to Sidney R. Yates, Chairman, Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, Pacific Northwest Region Planning Division files, FOVA/Unsoeld original Initiative, PNRO.


37. Memorandum, Stephanie Toothman, Chief, Cultural Resources Division, Pacific Northwest Region, to Regional Director, Pacific Northwest Region, October 29, 1990, Planning Division files, Pearson Correspondence 1990, PNRO.


Chapter Four: Site Planning and Development

1. Memorandum, John A. Hussey, Regional Historian, to Regional Chief of Interpretation, November 1, 1954, Acc. no. 67A846, Box 1, L1417 - 5-1953 to 12-31-54 - FOVA, FRC San Bruno.

Endnotes


8. Memorandum, John A. Rutter, Regional Director, to Director, attn: Chief, Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation, August 9, 1968, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 5, H30, FRC Seattle.


Endnotes


18. See Chapter Seven for a more detailed account of the development of the waterfront property at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site.


22. Letter, Mayor Verne Anderson to O.A. Tomlinson, October 11, 1948, Box 290, File 600, NA San Bruno.

23. Memorandum, Harold G. Fowler, Park Planner, Region Four, to the Regional Landscape Architect, November 1, 1948, Box 290, file 600, NA San Bruno.


25. Letter, Russell Mack to Donald J. Stewart, February 2, 1949, Chapin Foster Correspondence, 1940s-1950s, Folder, Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society, WSHS.


31. Memorandum, Aubrey Neasham, Regional Historian, to Regional Director, December 10, 1951, Box 290, File 204 - Inspections, NA San Bruno.


33. Memorandum, Superintendent to Regional Director, July 9, 1951, Box 290, File 600, NA San Bruno.

34. Memorandum, Volney J. Westley, Acting Regional Landscape Architect, to Superintendent, October 8, 1951, Box 290, file 600, NA San Bruno.

35. Memorandum, Sandford Hill, Assistant Regional Director, to Superintendent, April 21, 1952 and Memorandum, Chief, Project Programming to Superintendent, June 24, 1952, Box 290, file 600, NA San Bruno.

36. Memorandum, Frank Hjort, superintendent, to Regional Director, October 11, 1951, Box 290, file 600, NA San Bruno.


38. Letter, Senator Wayne Morse to Conrad Wirth, September 16, 1953, Acc. no. 67A846, Box 1, L1417, 5-1953 to 12-31-54, FRC San Bruno; and Memorandum, Ronald F. Lee, Assistant Park Service Director, to Director, Region Four, November 2, 1953, Acc. no. 67A846, Box 1, L1417, 5-1953 to 12-31-54, FRC San Bruno.

39. Confidential memorandum, Lawrence Merriam, Regional Director, to Frank Hjort, Superintendent, February 12, 1954, Acc. no. 67A846, Box 1, L1417, 5-1953 to 12-31-54, FRC San Bruno.


41. Memorandum, National Park Service Director to Director, Region Four, July 26, 1954, Acc. no. 67A846, Box 1, L1417, 5-1953 to 12-31-54, FRC San Bruno.
Endnotes

42. Memorandum, Conrad Wirth, Park Service Director, to Assistant Secretary of the Interior Lewis, January 4, 1955; and Memorandum, Park Service Director to Secretary of the Interior, October 4, 1954, Acc. no. 7969A1292, Box 12, L1417, FOVA, 1-1-65 to 12-31-65, FRC San Bruno. See Chapter Two for a discussion of the possible sequence of events that led to the reduction of acreage at the proposed Monument.


44. The Columbian, "ca. 1959", file Newspaper clippings on Fort Vancouver National Monument, FOVA.


46. Memorandum, John Hussey, Regional Historian, to Regional Director, January 19, 1965, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 5, H30, FRC Seattle.

47. Memorandum, Frank Hjort to Director, Region Four, February 27, 1962, Acc. no. 66A1069, Box 10, D22, Vol 3 1-1-61 to 12-31-63, FOVA, FRC San Bruno.


49. Memorandum, Regional Director to Superintendent, Fort Vancouver, July 13, 1962, Acc. no. 66A1066, Box 8, D18, 1-1-61 to 12-31-63, FRC San Bruno.

50. Memorandum, Harold O. Edwards, Superintendent, to Regional Director, September 11, 1963, Acc. no. 66A1068, Box 8, D18; 1-1-61 to 12-31-61, FOVA, FRC San Bruno.


52. The Columbian, January 20, 1965.

53. Memorandum, John B. Wosky, Acting Regional Director, Western Region, to Park Service Director, September 24, 1965, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 5, H30, FRC Seattle.
54. Memorandum, Edward A. Hummel, Regional Director, to Park Service Director, June 9, 1966, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 6, L1417, FRC Seattle.

55. Memorandum, Edward A. Hummel, Regional Director, to Park Service Director, June 24, 1966, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 6, L1417, FRC Seattle.


57. Memorandum, Russell E. Dickenson, Chief, Division of New Area Studies and Master Planning, to Director, Western Region, April 17, 1967, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 6, L1417, FRC Seattle.

58. Memorandum, Eliot Davis, Superintendent, to Regional Director, July 19, 1968, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 5, H30, FRC Seattle.

59. Memorandum, Eliot Davis, Superintendent, to Regional Director, March 25, 1968, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 6, L1417, FRC Seattle.


64. Master Plan, Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, 1969, p. 34.


67. Memorandum, Donald Gillespie, Superintendent, to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, November 17, 1975, D18 Master Plan (March 1972 - December 1975), FOVA.
Endnotes


71. Memorandum, Richard Winters, Associate Director, Recreation Resources and Professional Services, Pacific Northwest Region, through Deputy Regional Director, to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, July 2, 1987, Planning Division files, Pearson Correspondence 1987 and 1988, PNRO. See also Memorandum, Richard Winters, Associate Director, Recreation Resources and Professional Services, Pacific Northwest Region, to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, January 22, 1988, PNRO.


74. Completion Report for "Marking Fort Site," November 14, 1960, Acc. no. 73-A1296, Box 2, FRC Seattle.


82. Letter, John A. Rutter, Regional Director, to J.C. Finlay, Parks and Recreation Department, Edmonton, December 13, 1967, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 5, H30, FRC Seattle.


85. Robert F. Smith, Project Supervisor, Completion Report for Reconstruction of Palisade and Gate, July 26, 1967, Acc. no. 73-A1296, Box 2, FRC Seattle.

86. Completion Report for Reconstruction of Palisade and Gate, July 26, 1967, H22 1965 - Completion Report Reconstruction of North Wall and Gate, FOVA.


Endnotes

92. Telephone interview with Eliot Davis, September 3, 1991; Memorandum, Eliot Davis to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, November 12, 1970, Acc. no. 83-0002-6, Box 2, A6435, FRC Seattle; Completion Report for Playground, June 1970, Playground Equipment Completion Report, FOVA.

93. Letter, Bruce E. Hagensen, Mayor, to Charles Odegaard, Director Pacific Northwest Region, March 19, 1990, A36 Removal of Playground equipment, FOVA.

94. Letter, Charles Odegaard to Bruce Hagensen, Mayor, March 20, 1990, A36 Removal of Playground Equipment, FOVA.

95. Memorandum, Regional Director to Dave Herrera, Superintendent, April 2, 1990, A36 Removal of Playground Equipment, FOVA. See also The Columbian, April 1, 1990.


98. Memorandum, Merrill J. Mattes, Manager, Historic Preservation Team, Denver Service Center, to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, February 7, 1974, Acc. no. 83-0005-10, Box 2, H30, FRC Seattle.


103. Completion Report for Reconstruction Phase II Buildings, Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, July 1, 1976, D52 Contracts 1975, FOVA.

104. Memorandum, George A. Thorson, Historical Architect, Historic Preservation Division, DSC, to Assistant Manager, Pacific Northwest/Western Team, DSC, December
Endnotes

17. 1976, Acc. no. 84-0007-6, Box 3, H30, FRC Seattle.

105. Memorandum, Edward J. Kurtz, Acting Regional Director to Manager, Denver Service Center, October 20, 1977, Acc. no. 84-0005-6, Box 6, D22 Construction Programs FOVA 75-77, FRC Seattle.

106. Memorandum, James M. Thomson, Superintendent, to Regional Director, May 17, 1979, D52 L. Koue contract 1978, FOVA.


108. Memorandum, Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce to Vancouver City Council, February 14, 1980, D22 Bandstand Construction, FOVA.

109. Memorandum, James M. Thomson to the Regional Director, March 18, 1980, D22 Bandstand Construction, FOVA.

110. Memorandum, Regional Director to James M. Thomson, Superintendent, April 2, 1980, D22 Bandstand Construction, FOVA.

111. Letter, Patricia Stryker to Charles F. Bohannon, Pacific Northwest Region, April 24, 1980, D22 Bandstand Construction, FOVA.

112. Letter, Charles H. Odegaard, Acting Regional Director, to Jeanne M. Welch, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, May 19, 1980, D22 Bandstand Construction, FOVA.


114. Memorandum, Superintendent to Regional Director, March 11, 1985, H20 Collections Management/Preservation, FOVA.

115. Memorandum, William J. Briggle, Deputy Regional Director, to Superintendent, April 24, 1985, H20 Collections Management/Preservation, FOVA.


117. Letter, James M. Thomson, to Don Bonker, May 6, 1987, D22 Fur store Folder #1, FOVA.


119. Various public letters in file A36 Fur Store Complaints, FOVA.
Endnotes

120. Letter, Charles Odegaard to Helen Jones, President International Society for Animal Rights, Inc., June 6, 1990, Fur Store Complaints, FOVA.

121. Letter, David Herrera to Jon David Kessler, December 11, 1990, A36 Fur Store Complaints, FOVA.

122. Memorandum, Dave Herrera, Superintendent, to Regional Director, March 27, 1991, A2615 Report PN Congressional Delegation, FOVA.


Chapter Five: Fort Vancouver and Public Relations

1. Memorandum, Archeologist to Director, Region Four, April 6, 1950, Box 291, file 740-02, NA San Bruno.

2. Memorandum, Assistant Director, Region Four, to Superintendent, April 2, 1951, Box 291, file 901, NA San Bruno.


9. "Address of Regional Director Lawrence C. Merriam At Fort Vancouver Visitor Center Dedication," March 18, 1962, in MISSION 66 Dedication and Correspondence


12. Memorandum, Eliot Davis to Director, Western Region, May 16, 1968, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 4, A8215, FRC Seattle.

13. Memorandum, Eliot Davis to Regional Director, July 9, 1968, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 4, A8215, FRC Seattle.

14. Memorandum, Eliot Davis to Director, Western Region, June 6, 1969, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 4, A8215, FRC Seattle.


23. Memorandum, Harold G. Fowler to the Regional Landscape Architect, November 1, 1948, Box 290, file 600, NA San Bruno.

Endnotes


27. Memorandum, Frank Hjort, superintendent, to Director, Region Four, July 1, 1952, Acc. no. 84-0004-3, Box 2, L2225, FRC Seattle.


30. Memorandum, R.W. Allin, Field Representation, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, to the National Park Service Director, March 1, 1963, Acc. no. 84-0004-3, Box 2, L2225, FRC Seattle.

31. Letter, Dale Q. Haskins, Acting Director, BOR, Pacific Northwest Region, to John E. Slayton, Vancouver City Manager, December 27, 1963, Acc. no. 84-0004-3, Box 2, L2225, FRC Seattle.

32. Memorandum, H.L. Crowley, Acting Assistant Regional Director, to Superintendent, July 23, 1952, Box 289, file 0-10, NA San Bruno.

33. Memorandum, Superintendent to Regional Director, July 8, 1952, Box 289, file 0-10, NA San Bruno.


35. Memorandum, Eliot Davis, superintendent, to Director, Western Region, March 26, 1968, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 6, L1417, FRC Seattle.

37. Letter, Brad Skinner, Assistant to the Vancouver City Manager, to Donald Gillespie, February 1, 1973, Acc. no. 83-0005-10, Box 3, L1425, FRC Seattle.

38. Memorandum, Donald Gillespie, to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, February 12, 1973, Acc. no. 83-0005-10, Box 3, L1425, FRC Seattle.


41. Memorandum, James M. Thomson, Superintendent, to Regional Director, April 8, 1988, L30 Memo/Agreement - Waterfront, FOVA.

42. Memorandum, Donald Gillespie to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, April 7, 1975, A44 Central Parks/Bike Trail, FOVA; *The Columbian*, May 30, 1974.


44. Letter, Ethel Lehman, Chairwoman Vancouver Central Park Steering Committee, to Donald Gillespie, Superintendent, June 24, 1977, A44 Central Parks/Bike Trail, FOVA.


46. Letter, James M. Thomson to Jim Justin, Vancouver Mayor, August 7, 1979, A44 Central Parks/Bike Trail, FOVA.


49. Permit between War Assets Administration and the National Park Service, September 1, 1948, Box 291, file 901, NA San Bruno.

50. Memorandum, Louis Caywood to Director, Region Four, May 16, 1950, Box 291, file 620, NA San Bruno.

51. Memorandum, Raymond Hoyt to files, January 20, 1949, Box 290, file 602, NA San Bruno. See also Chapter Two for a more detailed discussion about the land transactions between 1948 and 1954.


56. Memorandum, C. Richard Neely, Assistant Regional Solicitor, to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, February 9, 1977, D18 Master Plan and Land Acquisition, FOVA.


60. The Columbian, March 18, 1949.

61. Fort Vancouver Restoration and Historical Society, promotional literature, about 1950, Box 291, file 871, NA San Bruno.

62. see Memorandum, Frank Hjort to Regional Director, May 7, 1952, file 871, Jerry Wagers notecards, FOVA.

63. Memorandum, Aubrey Neasham, Regional Historian, to Regional Director, May 9, 1952, file 871, Jerry Wagers notecards, FOVA.

64. Memorandum, Aubrey Neasham, Historian, Region Four, to Acting Director, Region Four, May 9, 1952, Box 291, file 871, NA San Bruno.


Endnotes

68. Memorandum, Superintendent, Mount Rainier National Park, to Frank Hjort, December 5, 1951, Box 291, file 871, Associations, NA San Bruno.

69. Memorandum, Superintendent, to Director, Region Four, November 28, 1952, Box 291, file 871, NA San Bruno.

70. Memorandum, Herbert Maier, Assistant Regional Director, to Frank Hjort, December 9, 1952, Box 291, file 871, NA San Bruno.

71. Memorandum, Frank Hjort to Regional Director, December 22, 1952, Box 291, file 871, Associations, NA San Bruno.

72. Memorandum, Assistant Director Lee to Regional Director, January 7, 1953, Box 291, file 871, Associations, NA San Bruno.

73. Memorandum, Robert Clark, Fort Vancouver Historian, to George Downs, Regional Publications Officer, February 22, 1966, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 3, A42, FRC Seattle. Robert Clark, Executive Secretary of the Association, reported that the loan was finally paid off in February 1966 though they only had about $40 in their checking account at that time.


Chapter Six: Pearson Airpark and The Development of Fort Vancouver

1. The Columbian, May 20, 1912 and June 11, 1912 in Carl Landerholm, Vancouver Area Chronology, 1784-1958, (Vancouver, Washington, 1960), p. 201. No one can seem to agree on a date for the initiation of aviation at Pearson Airfield. Many toss around the year 1905 when a zeppelin landed on the Vancouver Barracks’ parade ground, however 1912 is when airplane experimentation began. As to the claim that Pearson Airpark is the oldest continually operating airfield in the country, there seems to be
Endnotes

enough evidence to give Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton, Ohio, where the Wright Brothers began flying and training pilots in 1904, that distinction.

2. The Sunday Oregonian, August 2, 1964. The witness, Allan McCoy, was interviewed in 1964 for this article on the history of Pearson Airpark.

3. See United States, Army, Spruce Production Division, History of Spruce Production Division, (United States Army and United States Spruce Production Corporation, 1920?).


7. Von Hardesty, "Historical Overview of Pearson Airfield," for the National Park Service, March 15, 1992, p. 32; (Army?) aerial photograph 5029 VV DAS. MPD13OCT48 CRLW, dated October 13, 1948 and (Army?) aerial photograph 870 VV 162 PL 391 363RG 6JUNE48, dated June 6, 1948, FOVA. The second photograph shows the Columbia River at flood stage with the lower runway completely under water; see Quitclaim Deed, March 14, 1947, between the United States of America, acting by and through the War Assets Administrator, and the City of Vancouver, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 7, L38, FRC Seattle.


10. Administrative History Drafts Fort Vancouver, (Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, 1960?), pp. 6-7; Quitclaim Deed, March 14, 1947, between the United States of America, acting by and through the War Assets Administrator, and the City of Vancouver, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 7, L38, FRC Seattle; Landerholm, p. 339; The Columbian, March 13, 1947.
11. Memorandum, O.A. Tomlinson, Director, Region Four, to National Park Service Director, April 21, 1947, Jerry Wagers notecards, FOVA.


13. Letter, Mayor Anderson to Civil Aeronautics Administration, Seattle, April 1, 1948, 601 file, area files in Administrative History Drafts Fort Vancouver, p. 11.

14. Quitclaim Deed, March 14, 1947, between the United States of America, acting by and through the War Assets Administrator, and the City of Vancouver, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 7, L38, FRC Seattle; The Columbian, April 25, 1949; and Hori, Legislative History for Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, Vol. III, p. 411.

15. Letter, Paul L. Mather, Rear Admiral, U.S.N., Retired, Associate Administrator, War Assets Administration, to Julius A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, May 19, 1949, in Hori, Legislative History For Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, Vol. III; see also Letter, Harold S. Kern, Chairman of Vancouver Aeronautics Board to District Airport Engineer, January 25, 1949, Box 290, file 602, NA San Bruno.


Endnotes


24. Memorandum, Eliot Davis to the Director, September 20, 1967, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 7, L38, FRC Seattle.


29. Memorandum, Manuel Morris, Acting Regional Chief, Division of Land and Water Rights Western Region to Assistant Director, Operations, Western Region, June 1, 1965, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 3, A5427, FRC Seattle.

30. The Columbian, October 7, 1966; see also The Columbian, April 25, 1961.

31. Letter, Harold Kern to the Vancouver Mayor and City Council, April 17, 1967, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 7, L38, FRC Seattle.

32. Memorandum, Eliot Davis to Regional Director, April 4, 1967, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 7, L38, FRC Seattle.

33. Memorandum, Eliot Davis to the National Park Service Director, April 3, 1967, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 7, L38, FRC Seattle.

34. Memorandum, Frank Hjort to Director, Region Four, July 27, 1951, Box 290, file 503, NA San Bruno.


36. Letter, Robert D. Clute, Vancouver City Manager, to Representative Julia Butler Hansen, May 10, 1961, Julia Butler Hansen Papers, Box 6, Hansen Bills - National Parks and Monuments HR 3283, UW Manuscripts.

37. Letter, George Hartzog to Julia Butler Hansen, May 20, 1965, L1429, Land Records, FOVA.

38. Memorandum, Frank Hjort, Superintendent, to Director, Region Four, May 26, 1961, D22, Construction of Fort Vancouver thru 1960, FOVA.
Endnotes


40. Letter, Leland P. Hughey, Acting Area Manager, Federal Aviation Administration, to John W. Stratton, Acting Director, Western Region, December 15, 1965, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 7, L38, FRC Seattle.


42. Memorandum, Eliot Davis to Director, Western Region, July 19, 1965, L38 Pearson Airpark, 1964-66, FOVA.

43. Memorandum, Eliot Davis to Director, Western Region, January 18, 1966, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 7, L38, FRC Seattle.

44. Memorandum, Eliot Davis to Director, Western Region, January 18, 1966, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 7, L38, FRC Seattle; letter, Gus Norwood to Julia Butler Hansen, March 9, 1965, L38 Pearson Airpark, 1964-66, FOVA; and memorandum, Eliot Davis to Director, Western Region, May 5, 1965, L38, Pearson Airpark, 1964-66, FOVA.


46. Letter, J.E.N. Jensen, Assistant Director of the National Park Service, to Julia Butler Hansen, March 4, 1966, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 7, L38, FRC Seattle.

47. Memorandum, Edward Hummel to the National Park Service Director, July 8, 1966, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 7, L38, FRC Seattle.

48. Memorandum, Eliot Davis to the National Park Service Director, June 13, 1967, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 7, L38, FRC Seattle.


50. Letter, D. D. Thomas, Deputy Administrator, FAA, to Representative Stanley A. Cain, Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of Interior, August 28, 1967, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 7, L38, FRC Seattle.


52. The Columbian, April 2, 1968.
Endnotes

53. Federal Aviation Administration Aeronautical Study No. 68-SEA-38-NRF, Determination of Airspace Use, by Fred S. McKnight, February 14, 1969, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 7, L38, FRC Seattle.

54. Memorandum, John A. Rutter, Director, Western Region, to the National Park Service Director, May 8, 1967, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 7, L38, FRC Seattle.

55. Memorandum, R. B. Moore to the National Park Service Director, August 3, 1967, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 7, L38, FRC Seattle.


57. Memorandum, Eliot Davis to Director, Northwest District, December 30, 1969, Acc. no. 83-0005-10, Box 5, L38, FRC Seattle.


60. Letter, Alan N. Harvey, City Manager, to Eliot Davis, September 3, 1970, Acc. no. 83-0005-10, Box 5, L38, FRC Seattle.


68. Vancouver City Council Minutes, May 4, 1971, L38 Pearson Airpark, 1971, FOVA.

69. Memorandum, Robert Clark, Acting Superintendent, Fort Vancouver, to "Whom It May Concern", September 8, 1971, L38, Pearson Airpark 1971, FOVA; see also Vancouver City Council Minutes, May 4, 1971, L38 Pearson Airpark, 1971, FOVA.


77. Memorandum, Donald Gillespie to File, November 24, 1976, L38 Pearson Airpark, 1976-87, FOVA.

78. Memorandum, Alan N. Harvey to Mayor and City Council, March 7, 1977, L38 Pearson Airpark, 1976-87, FOVA.


80. Memorandum, James Thomson to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, March 26, 1981, L38 Pearson Airpark, 1976-87, FOVA.
Endnotes

81. Letter, Donald Gillespie to Ken Puttkamer, July 11, 1974, L38 Pearson Airpark, 1972-75, FOVA.


83. Memorandum, James M. Thomson to Regional Director, October 14, 1981, L38 Pearson Airpark, 1976-87, FOVA.


85. Letter, Jim Justin to Daniel Tobin, Director Pacific Northwest Region, February 24, 1982; and Vancouver City Council Resolution No. M-2301, L38 Pearson Airpark, 1976-87, FOVA.

86. Letter, Daniel J. Tobin, Jr., Regional Director, to Jim Justin, Mayor of Vancouver, March 9, 1982, L38 Pearson Airport, 1976-87, FOVA.

87. Memorandum, Donald Gillespie to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, November 19, 1976, L38 Pearson Airpark, 1976-87, FOVA.

88. Notes from telephone conversation between Sid Malbon?, Chief, Recreational Planning and Environmental Compliance and Tom Highland, Airport Manager, Pearson Airpark, May 19, 1982, Planning Division files, Pearson Correspondence prior to 1987, PNRO.


91. Letter, Daniel R. Keuhn, Acting Regional Director, to Paul Grattet, Vancouver City Manager, September 23, 1982, L38 Pearson Airpark, 1976-87, FOVA.


95. The Columbian, April 17 and 18, May 14, June 12, and July 6, 1986.

96. The Oregonian, June 24, 1986.


103. Memorandum, Richard Winters, Associate Director, Recreation Resources and Professional Services, Pacific Northwest Region, through Deputy Regional Director, to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, July 2, 1987, Planning Division files, Pearson Correspondence 1987 and 1988, PNRO; see also memorandum, Richard Winters, Associate Director, Recreation Resources and Professional Services, Pacific Northwest Region, to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, January 22, 1988, PNRO.

104. Memorandum, Richard Winters, Associate Director, Recreation Resources and Professional Services, Pacific Northwest Region, to The Record, May 3, 1988, Planning Division files, Pearson Correspondence 1987 and 1988, PNRO.


Endnotes


110. Letter, Charles H. Odegaard, Regional Director, to Bruce E. Hagensen and John P. Wulle, October 12, 1988, L38 Pearson Airpark, misc., FOVA.


112. The Columbian, February 27, 1989 and The Oregonian, February 25, 1989; letter, Representative Jolene Unsoeld to William Penn Mott, Jr., Director, National Park Service, February 24, 1989, L38 Pearson Airpark misc., FOVA.


114. The Oregonian, November 22, 1989.

115. Letter, David W. Sturdevant, Board of County Commissioners, to Dave Field, Federal Aviation Administration, February 9, 1990, Planning Division files, Pearson Correspondence 1990, PNRO; letter, David A. Field, Federal Aviation Administration, to Paul M. Grattet, Planning Division files, Proposed Vancouver NHR, correspondence, PNRO.


117. Memorandum, Stephanie Toothman, Chief, Cultural Resources Division, Pacific Northwest Region, to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, October 29, 1990, Planning Division files, Pearson Correspondence 1990, PNRO.

Chapter Seven: The Waterfront Property

1. Memorandum, Frank Hjort to E.B. Herron, Acting Chief, Assignment & Utilization Branch, Real Estate Division, GSA, October 21, 1954, Acc. no. 67A846, Box 1, L1417, Boundary Adjustment 1953 to 12-31-54 FOVA, FRC San Bruno.


10. Memorandum, Eliot Davis, FOVA Superintendent, to Regional Director, Western Region, May 24, 1966, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 6, L30, Land Use FOVA, FRC Seattle.

11. Memorandum, Eliot Davis to Regional Director, Western Region, July 5, 1966, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 6, L30, Land Use FOVA, FRC Seattle.

12. Letter, William C. Klein, City Attorney of Vancouver to General Services Administration, no date (July 1966?), Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 6, L1417, Boundary Adjustment, FRC Seattle.


15. "Assessment of the Environmental Impacts of the Waterfront Beautification at Fort Vancouver National Historic Site," May 14, 1975, Acc. no. 84-0007-6, Box 3, H30, Archeological and Historical Research FOVA [1-1-75 to 12-31-77], FRC Seattle.


Endnotes

18. Memorandum, Donald Gillespie to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, February 25, 1975, Acc. no. 84-0007-6, Box 3, H30, Archeological and Historical Research, FRC Seattle.


20. Memorandum, John Rutter, Regional Director, to Superintendent Donald Gillespie, March 27, 1975, Acc. no. 84-0007-6, Box 3, H30, Archeological and Historical Research FOVA, FRC Seattle.

21. Memorandum, J.J. Hoffman, Supervisory Archeologist, to Superintendent, FOVA, April 14, 1975, Acc. no. 84-0007-6, Box 3, H30, Archeological and Historical Research FOVA, FRC Seattle; see also memorandum, Superintendent to Regional Director, April 7, 1975, Acc. no. 84-0007-6, Box 3, H30, Archeological and Historical Research FOVA, FRC Seattle.

22. Memorandum, Acting Regional Director to files, May 14, 1975, Acc. no. 84-0007-6, Box 3, H30, Archeological and Historical Research FOVA, FRC Seattle.

23. Letter, Donald Gillespie, FOVA superintendent, to John Payne, Chief, Compliance Inspection Section, Army Corps of Engineers, D18 Waterfront Beautification 1981, FOVA.


33. Memorandum, Bob Appling to Dave Herrera, July 25, 1990, L30 Memo/Agreement - Waterfront, FOVA.

34. Memorandum, David P. Herrera, Superintendent, to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, August 6, 1990, L30 Memo/Agreement - Waterfront, FOVA.

35. Letter, Charles Odegaard to Mayor Bruce Hagensen, August 16, 1990, Planning Division, Pearson Correspondence 1990, PNRO.

Chapter Eight: Cultural Resource Management


5. Caywood, Excavations at Fort Vancouver 1948 Season, p. 4-5 and 11.


9. Memorandum, Frank Hjort, Superintendent, to Director, Region Four, August 20, 1952, Box 291, file 660-05 water system, NA San Bruno.


17. Memorandum, Eliot Davis to Regional Director, July 17, 1969, Acc. no. 83-0005-10, Box 1, H2215, FRC Seattle.


19. Letter, Susan Kardas to Julia Butler Hansen, July 23, 1969, Julia Butler Hansen Papers, Box 109, Park - Kanaka Village 1969, UW Manuscripts. According to Kardas, David Munsell came down to the site on July 10, 1969 and "addressed Mr. Larrabee, ignored me completely, and asked Mr. Larrabee several very pointed questions about my
dissertation. Throughout the conversation he completely ignored what was going on, made a few cracks about not having any use for women on a dig (we have five female students), and then, without looking at anything, left. Greengo had given him orders not to look at the dig if he wasn't specifically invited to do so; and since he seemed both rude and disinterested, we didn't ask him to, after which he told both Mr. Davis and Dr. Greengo that we had 'thrown him off the site.'


23. Memorandum, William L. Bowen, Director, Western Service Center, to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, June 9, 1970, Acc. no. 83-0005-10, Box 1, H2215, FRC Seattle.

24. Letter, Robert E. Greengo, Associate Professor of Archeology, to Julia Butler Hansen, July 15, 1970, Julia Butler Hansen Papers, Box 64, Park Service, FOVA 1971, UW Manuscripts.


27. Memorandum, William Bowen, Director Western Service Center, to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, July 23, 1970, Acc. no. 83-0005-10, Box 1, H2215, FRC Seattle.


31. Memorandum, Paul Schumacher to Director, Western Service Center, March 24, 1971, Acc. no. 83-0005-10, Box 1, H2215, FRC Seattle.

32. Memorandum, Eliot Davis, Superintendent, to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, May 11, 1971, Acc. no. 83-0005-10, Box 1, H2215, FRC Seattle.
Endnotes

33. Memorandum, Glenn O. Hendrix, Acting Director, Western Service Center, to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, May 27, 1971, Acc. no. 83-0005-10, Box 1, H2215, FRC Seattle; and memorandum, Eliot Davis to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, June 3, 1971, Acc. no. 83-0005-10, Box 1, H2215, FRC Seattle.

34. Memorandum, J. J. Hoffman to Chief, Archeological Investigations, Western Service Center, July 1, 1971, Acc. no. 83-0005-10, Box 1, H2215, FRC Seattle; and interview with Bryn Thomas, July 15, 1992.

35. Memorandum, J. J. Hoffman to Chief, Archeological Investigations, Western Service Center, October 1, 1971, Acc. no. 83-0005-10, Box 1, H2215, FRC Seattle.

36. Memorandum, Eliot Davis to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, October 19, 1971, Acc. no. 83-0005-10, Box 1, H2215, FRC Seattle; and interview with Bryn Thomas, July 15, 1992.

37. Memorandum, Jake Hoffman, project archeologist, to Archeologist, Pacific Northwest Region, July 3, 1972, Acc. no. 83-0005-10, Box 1, H2215, FRC Seattle; and "Historic Structure Report Architectural Data Section for Chief Factor's House, Kitchen, Wash House, Flag Pole, Bell Pole," Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, D52 A. Lewis Koue (Phase II) 1974, FOVA.


40. Memorandum, Charles F. Bohannon, Regional Archeologist, to Ben Gale, Associate Regional Director, June 7, 1974, Acc. no. 83-0005-10, Box 1, H2215, FRC Seattle; and memorandum, Jake Hoffman, to Regional Archeologist, July 1, 1974, Acc. no. 83-0005-10, Box 1, H2215, FRC Seattle.


43. David H. Chance, news item, September 1, 1975, Institute for Environmental Studies, University of Washington, Acc. no. 84-0007-6, Box 3, H2215, FRC Seattle.

44. David H. Chance and Jennifer V. Chance, Kanaka Village, Vancouver Barracks 1974, (Seattle, Washington: Office of Public Archaeology, University of Washington,
Endnotes


48. Memorandum, George A. Teague, Archeologist, Division of Internal Archeological Studies, to Chief, Division of Internal Archeological Studies, August 8, 1984, H22 Furnishings, General, FOVA.


50. Memorandum, Louis R. Caywood to Regional Director, April 4, 1949, Box 291, file 740-02, NA San Bruno; and memorandum, Caywood to Regional Director, July 5, 1949, Box 291, file 740-02, NA San Bruno.

51. Memorandum, Louis Caywood to Director, Region Four, September 6, 1949, Box 291, file 740-02, NA San Bruno.

52. Memorandum, Louis Caywood to Director, Region Four, October 6, 1949, Box 291, file 740-02, NA San Bruno.


54. Memorandum, Louis R. Caywood, Archeologist, to Director, Region Four, December 29, 1949, Box 291, file 620-46, NA San Bruno.


239
Endnotes

56. Memorandum, Frank Hjort, Superintendent, to Director, Region Four, November 26, 1952, Box 291, file 740-02, NA San Bruno.

57. Memorandum, Herbert Maier, Assistant Regional Director, to Superintendent, December 4, 1952, Box 291, file 740-02, NA San Bruno.

58. Memorandum, Herbert Maier, Acting Regional Director, Region Four, to Superintendent, February 5, 1953, Box 291, file 740-02 Archeology, NA San Bruno.

59. Memorandum, Louis Caywood to Director, Region Four, February 1, 1949, Box 291, file 620-46, NA San Bruno.

60. Memorandum, Herbert Maier, Acting Regional Director, to Archeologist, Fort Vancouver, March 1, 1949, Box 291, file 620-46, NA San Bruno.


62. Memorandum, Herbert Maier, Assistant Regional Director, to Superintendent, March 26, 1953, Box 291, file 620-46, NA San Bruno.

63. Memorandum, Herbert Maier to Superintendent, April 17, 1953, Box 291, file 620-46, NA San Bruno; and memorandum, Frank Hjort to Regional Director, April 9, 1953, Box 291, file 620-46, NA San Bruno.

64. The Columbian, August or September 1952, file of newspaper clippings, FOVA; and The Columbian April 23, 1954.

65. Memorandum, Bennett T. Gale, Acting Regional Director to Frank Hjort, Superintendent, December 22, 1960, in Fort Vancouver National Historic Site Museum Prospectus and Exhibit Plan: Administrative History.


67. Memorandum, Frank Hjort To Leland J. Abel, Museum Specialist, WML, April 10, 1961, in Fort Vancouver National Historic Site Museum Prospectus and Exhibit Plan.


69. Memorandum, Eliot Davis, to Regional Director, June 15, 1965, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 5, H2215, FRC Seattle.
70. Memorandum, Eliot Davis to Regional Director, Western Region, April 21, 1969, and Memorandum, Eliot Davis to Regional Director, March 4, 1968, Acc. no. 74-A207, Box 5, D6215, FRC Seattle.

71. Larrabee and Kardas, *Exploratory Excavations for the Kanaka Village*, p. 27.


73. Memorandum, Donald Gillespie to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, March 18, 1974, Acc. no. 83-0005-10, Box 2, H30, FRC Seattle.

74. Memorandum, Marc Sagan, Manager, Harpers Ferry Center, to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, August 30, 1974, Acc. no. 83-0005-10, Box 2, H30 Arch. and Hist. Structures, FOVA, FRC Seattle.

75. Interview with David Hansen, July 15, 1992; and "Situation Review, Fort Vancouver National Historic Site," February 8, 1979, p. 9, FOVA.

76. Memorandum, Robert W. Olsen, Staff Curator, to Chief, Division of Museum Services, September 3, 1975, Acc. no. 84-0007-6, Box 3, H2215, FRC Seattle.


80. Memorandum, David Hansen, COR, to Regional Director, December 12, 1988. D52 Curation and Cataloguing of Archeological Items, FOVA; Memoranda, David K. Hansen, COR, to Contracting Officer, Pacific Northwest Region, February 21, 1990 and February 27, 1990, D52 Computerize Catalogue Cards, CX-9000-0-PO11, FOVA.


82. Memorandum, Kent Bush, Regional Curator, to Associate Director, Recreation Resources and Professional Services, Pacific Northwest Region, July 26, 1989, D6215 Museum Exhibits (General), FOVA; and Collection Management Plan, Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, (Seattle, Washington: National Park Service, Pacific Northwest

83. Memorandum, Charles H. Odegaard, Regional Director, to Superintendent, December 4, 1987, D6215 Museum Exhibits (General), FOVA; Memorandum, Kent Bush, Regional Curator, to Superintendent, February 23, 1988, D6215 Museum Exhibits (General), FOVA.

84. The Columbian, October 13, 1947; and memorandum, Louis Caywood to Regional Director, Region Four, September 2, 1948, Box 291, file 740-02, NA San Bruno. See appendix for Annual Visitation figures.

85. Memorandum, Hillory A. Tolson to Director, Region Four, November 22, 1948, Box 290, file 504, NA San Bruno.

86. Memorandum, Louis Caywood to Regional Director, September 6, 1949, Box 291, file 740-02, NA San Bruno.

87. Memorandum, Dorr G. Yeager, Acting Assistant Director, Region Four, to National Park Service Director, December 21, 1951, Box 291, file 620-46, NA San Bruno.


89. Memorandum, Frank Hjort to Director, Region Four, September 24, 1954, Acc. no. 67A1085, Box 1, K1815, 5-1-53 to 12-31-64, FOVA, FRC San Bruno.

90. Memorandum, Dorr G. Yeager, Regional Chief of Interpretation, to Director, Region Four, February 25, 1955, Acc. no. 67A1085, Box 1, K1815, 5-1-53 to 12-31-64, FOVA, FRC San Bruno.

91. Memorandum, Superintendent to THE DIRECTOR, October 18, 1955, Acc. no. 67A1085, Box 1, K1815, 5-1-53 to 12-31-64, FOVA, FRC San Bruno.


98. Memorandum, Harold O. Edwards to Gunnar O. Fagerlund, Regional Chief Division of Interpretation and Visitor Service, July 8, 1964, Acc. no. 67A1085, Box 1, K1815, 5-1-53 to 12-31-64, FOVA, FRC San Bruno.


103. Memorandum, Louis Caywood to Regional Director, March 6, 1951, Box 291, file 740-02, NA San Bruno.


106. Memorandum, Director of Directorate, Field Directorate and WASO Division Chiefs, October 25, 1978, D52, Urban Initiative Program, FY 1979, FOVA.

107. Memorandum, James Thomson to Regional Director, November 30, 1978, D52, Urban Initiative Program, FY 79, FOVA.

109. Letter, James M. Thomson to Vancouver School district, February 1, 1984, K1815, Interpretive Activities and Services, FOVA.

110. Memorandum, John A. Rutter, Director Western Service Center, to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, June 16, 1971, K1817, Interpretive Prospectus, FOVA.


112. *Fort Vancouver National Historic Site: interpretive prospectus*, p. 13. It is interesting to read a letter from John Hussey of June 26, 1974 to Robert C. Amdor which comments on some of the scripts to be used for these background "audio vignettes." Hussey found the free-wheeling manner a little too loose with historical facts.


114. Superintendent Annual Report, 1972, Acc. no. 83-0005-10, Box 1, H2621 Superintendents Reports, FRC Seattle.


116. Memorandum, Donald Gillespie to Regional Director, November 27, 1974, D52 Contract Georgeson and Co., Inc., FY 74, FOVA.

117. Memorandum, Robert C. Amdor, Park Ranger, to Superintendent, January 20, 1975, D52 Contract Georgeson and Co., Inc. FY74, FOVA.


119. Memorandum, Donald Gillespie, Superintendent, to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, February 24, 1975, Acc. no. 84-0005-6, Box 6, D22, FRC Seattle.

120. Memorandum, Donald Gillespie to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, September 8, 1976, Acc. no. 84-0005-6, Box 6, D22, FRC Seattle.

122. Memorandum, Daniel R. Kuehn, Associate Regional Director, to Superintendent, July 27, 1981, H232, Furnishings, General, FOVA; and memorandum, Glenn Baker, Park Safety Officer, to Superintendent, May 28, 1987, K1815 Interpretive Activities and Services, FOVA.

123. Memorandum, James Thomson to Blacksmith Darrig and V.I.P. blacksmiths, July 22, 1987, A56, FOVA policy statements, FOVA.

124. "Situation Review Fort Vancouver National Historic Site," February 8, 1979, p. 4, A5427, PNRO.

125. Orchard Policy, James M. Thomson, Superintendent, Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, August 21, 1979, A56, Fova Policy Statements, FOVA.

126. Memorandum, James Thomson, Superintendent, to Associate Director, Operations, Pacific Northwest Region, November 13, 1987, K18, Interpretive Activities, FOVA.

127. Memorandum, David P. Herrera, Superintendent, to Regional Director, Attn: Office of Planning, October 1, 1990, A2615 Report PN Congressional Delegation, FOVA.


129. See, for example, Memorandum, Candlelight Tour Coordinators to candlelight tour participants, September 17, 1990, A82, Candlelight Tour, FOVA.


131. "Estimated Costs for Furnishings for Fur Store, FOVA," D22 Fur Store Folder #1, FOVA.

Chapter Nine: Park Staff and Administration

1. Confidential memorandum, John C. Preston to Director, Region Four, April 26, 1948, and memorandum, John C. Preston to Regional Director, March 13, 1950, Jerry Wagers notecards, FOVA.

2. Memorandum, O.A. Tomlinson, Regional Director, to the National Park Service Director, November 1, 1949, Box 290, file 602, NA San Bruno.
3. Memorandum, Louis R. Caywood, Archeologist, to Director, Region Four, July 28, 1948, Box 290, file 620, NA San Bruno.


5. Memorandum, Archeologist, Fort Vancouver, to Administrative Assistant, December 7, 1949, Box 289, file 201, NA San Bruno.

6. Memorandum, Regional Director to Region Four Office personnel, January 26, 1950, Box 289, file 201, NA San Bruno.

7. Memorandum, Regional Director to John C. Preston, Superintendent, Mount Rainier National Park, March 21, 1950, file 201, Jerry Wagers notecards, FOVA.


14. The Columbian, no date, newspaper clippings file, FOVA.


27. Memorandum, Eliot Davis, superintendent, to Director, Northwest District, July 14, 1969, Acc. no. 83-0002-6, Box 2, A 6435, FRC Seattle.


30. Memorandum, Charles K. Gadd, Acting Superintendent, to Regional Director, Western Region, September 2, 1969, Acc. no. 83-0002-6, Box 2, A6435, FRC Seattle.

31. Memorandum, Eliot Davis to Superintendent Schmidt, New York City National Park Service Group, November 17, 1969, Acc. no. 83-0002-6, Box 2, A6435, FRC Seattle.


33. Memorandum, Glen E. Henderson, Acting Superintendent, to Director, Pacific Northwest Region, July 17, 1972, Acc. no. 83-0002-6, Box 2, A6435, FRC Seattle.

34. Interview with Donald Gillespie, August 28, 1991.


41. Interview with Dave Herrera, July 15, 1992.

42. Interview with Dave Herrera, July 15, 1992.

43. Interview with Dave Herrera, July 15, 1992.
BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARCHIVAL SOURCES

Record Group 79, National Park Service Records, National Archives - Pacific Sierra Region, San Bruno, California [NA, San Bruno].

Record Group 79, National Park Service Records, Federal Record Center - Pacific Sierra Region, San Bruno, California [FRC, San Bruno].

Record Group 79, National Park Service Records, Federal Record Center - Pacific Northwest Region, Seattle, Washington [FRC, Seattle].

Washington State Historical Society, Tacoma, Washington [WSHS].

Central Classified Files, Photo Archives, and Jerry Wagers notecards, Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, Vancouver, Washington [FOVA].

Central Classified Files, Pacific Northwest Regional Office, Seattle, Washington [PNRO].

Julia Butler Hansen Papers, Accession No. 1501, Manuscripts and University Archives Division, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington [UW Manuscripts].

PUBLISHED SOURCES

Administrative History Drafts Fort Vancouver. Vancouver, Washington: Fort Vancouver National Historic Site, 1960?


Bibliography


250


Bibliography


Bibliography


NEWSPAPERS

The Clark County Review

The Columbian

The Oregonian

The Sun
### 10. Fort Vancouver National Historic Site

| Establishment as national monument; transfer of lands by War Assets Administration and Secretary of the Army to Secretary of the Interior authorized | Act of June 19, 1948 | 355 |
| Boundaries revised and monument redesignated "Fort Vancouver National Historic Site" | Act of June 30, 1961 | 350 |

An Act To provide for the establishment of the Fort Vancouver National Monument, in the State of Washington, to include the site of the old Hudson's Bay Company stockade, and for other purposes, approved June 19, 1948 (62 Stat 532)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of establishing a Federal area of national historical importance for the benefit of the people of the United States, to be known as the "Fort Vancouver National Monument", the Administrator of the War Assets Administration and the Secretary of the Army are authorized to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior, without exchange of funds, administrative jurisdiction over such federally owned lands and other property, real or personal, under their jurisdiction, including the site of the old Hudson's Bay Company stockade in the State of Washington, as they shall find to be surplus to the needs of their respective agencies, such properties to be selected, with their approval, by the Secretary of the Interior for inclusion within the national monument. (16 U.S.C. § 450ff.)

Sec. 2. The total area of the national monument as established or as enlarged by transfers pursuant to this Act shall not exceed ninety acres. Establishment of the monument shall be effective, upon publication in the Federal Register of notice of such establishment, following the transfer to the Secretary of the Interior of administrative jurisdiction over such lands as the Secretary of the Interior shall deem to be sufficient for purposes of establishing the national monument. Additional lands may be added to the monument in accordance with the procedure prescribed in section 1 hereof, governing surplus properties, or by donation, subject to the maximum acreage limitation prescribed by this Act, upon publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register. (16 U.S.C. § 450ff-1.)

Sec. 3. The administration, protection, and development of the aforesaid national monument shall be exercised under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior by the National Park Service, subject to the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", as amended. (16 U.S.C. § 450ff-2.)
An Act To revise the boundaries and to change the name of Fort Vancouver National Monument, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes, approved June 30, 1961 (75 Stat. 196)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of preserving certain historic properties associated with the Fort Vancouver National Monument, established pursuant to the Act of June 19, 1948, chapter 545 (62 Stat. 532; 16 U.S.C. 450ff-450ff-2), the Secretary of the Interior may revise the boundaries of the monument to include therein not more than one hundred and thirty additional acres of land adjacent to, contiguous to, or in the vicinity of the existing monument. (16 U.S.C. § 450ff-3.)

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior may acquire in such manner as he may consider to be in the public interest the non-Federal lands and interests in lands within the revised boundaries. (16 U.S.C. § 450ff-4.)

Sec. 3. The heads of executive departments may transfer to the Secretary of the Interior, without exchange of funds, administrative jurisdiction over such federally owned lands and other property under their administrative jurisdictions within the revised boundary as may become excess to the needs of their respective agencies for inclusion in the Fort Vancouver National Monument. (16 U.S.C. § 450ff-5.)

Sec. 4. Fort Vancouver National Monument is redesignated Fort Vancouver National Historic Site. (16 U.S.C. § 450ff-6.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Visitation</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Visitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>under 1,000</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>135,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>180,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>9,026</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>282,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>13,236</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>311,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>11,366</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>248,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>11,207</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>224,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>22,207</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>233,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>37,557</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>198,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>28,316</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>273,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>51,434</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>244,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>63,948</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>247,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>65,162</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>277,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>70,300</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>270,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>79,931</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>287,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>104,779</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>275,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>164,098</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>306,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>207,087</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>264,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>245,932</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>231,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>273,006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C - Fort Vancouver National Monument and Fort Vancouver National Historic Site Staff

Superintendent

Louis R. Caywood (Archeologist-in-charge): 1949 to January 1951
Frank Hjort: January 7, 1951 to February 1963
Harold O. Edwards: July 7, 1963 to November 21, 1964
Eliot Davis: February 1965 to June 30, 1972
Donald Gillespie: August 1972 to August 1978
James M. Thomson: August 1978 to December 30, 1989
Dave Herrera: February 1990 to present

Division of Interpretation and Resource Management

Jerry D. Wagers: August 1958 to September 1960
William R. Sampson: September 1960 to August 1963
Robert E.S. Clarke: 1965 to 1973
Robert Amdor: November 1973 to January 1976
Sam Vaughn: April 1976 to July 1978
Kent Taylor: March 1979 to October 1986
Robert Appling: November 1986 to 1993

Rangers

Ellis Richard: 1973 to 1975
Donald Dinsmore: February 1978 to August 1992
Stan Rooney: March 1979 to December 1989
Pam Kuyper Lemar: 1980 to 1987
Michael Darrig: March 1982 to present
Patty Sue Menard: December 1988 to April 1991
Rick Edwards: July 1991 to present
William De Berry: 1992 to present
Thomas Medema: May 1992 to present
Greg Fauth: June 1, 1993 to present

Curator

David Hansen: October 1974 to present

Museum Technician

Douglas Magedanz: February 1992 to present
Administrative Clerk

Lillian Crom: to May 1962
Rose M. McCarty: May 1962 to November 1966
Glennis Shute: November 1966 to ??
Marlys "Lee" Ford: November 1966 to May 18, 1993

Maintenance Foreman

D.C. Bush: 1976 to 1984
William Bohannon: October 1984 to September 1990
Gary Bickford: September 1991 to present

Maintenance Staff

Lauren Wright: January 1976 to present
Robert Burge: 1976 to present
Wes Kemp: 1972 to 1986
Ken Cheska: December 1986 to present
Jim Barber April 1992 to present
APPENDIX D: Personal Recollections of Park Curator David Hanson's, June 1993

Furnishing of the Chief Factor's House and Kitchen

The furnishing of the Chief Factor's House and Kitchen provided the National Park Service with an opportunity to furnish some of the first reconstructed historical buildings in the Pacific Northwest Region. Beginning in the Spring of 1976, the park curator completed reviewing the furnishings plans for the two buildings, and using the draft plan with its recommended furnishings section, contacted antique dealers in the Portland metropolitan area to begin the acquisition of the over 2000 furnishings for the Factor's House and Kitchen.

Mrs. Ruth Powers, an Oregon City historic preservationist and philanthropist with an avid interest in Fort Vancouver, donated approximately 100 objects as furnishings for the Factor's House and Kitchen. When the local antique market was exhausted in late 1976, the curator travelled to the Washington D.C. area and Victoria, British Columbia, to acquire the "hard to find" English objects.

Unfortunately, one of the problems associated with the furnishing of the Factor's House and Kitchen was that the furnishings plan itself had not been completed to the satisfaction of the park by the time the buildings were actually furnished and open to visitors. The plan required extensive revision because it had not adequately focused on evidence of original Hudson's Bay Company furnishings at Fort Vancouver or appropriate reproductions to be used in the buildings. By the time the revisions were made and the plan was reviewed and approved in September 1980, the furnishing of the Factor's House and Kitchen was complete.

Furnishing of the Indian Trade Shop and Blacksmith Shop

Even before the reconstruction of the Indian Trade Shop and Blacksmith Shop, the park curator began the task in the summer of 1980 of researching and writing the formal furnishings plans for the two buildings. These plans would identify furnishings that would have historically been found in the buildings and recommend furnishings to be acquired after the buildings were reconstructed. The furnishings plans were completed, reviewed and approved in 1980. Unfortunately, when funds were appropriated by Congress for the reconstruction of the Indian Trade Shop and Blacksmith Shop, no money was requested by the Park Service for the furnishings. It appeared at first, that the buildings would sit empty. In early 1982, the park was able to secure $23,000.00 from the Regional Office to begin the acquisition of the furnishings. However, this amount of money soon proved to be insufficient to complete the acquisition of the furnishings for the buildings. The funds were soon exhausted. The park curator located furnishings, including large numbers of apothecary bottles as well as other objects that were needed for the dispensary/hospital. He purchased these objects and donated them to the park as part of the furnishings.
Fort Vancouver NHS Parking Lot

Beginning in 1989-1990, the park, with the assistance and strong support of the Cultural Resources Division in the Pacific Northwest Regional Office, began planning for the removal of the parking lot at the reconstructed fort site. This lot had been located directly northeast of the reconstructed north palisade since 1966.

The removal of the lot was contemplated for two reasons: one, fort site traffic raised dust clouds during the summer months, which drifted into the reconstructed buildings. The dust and dirt had a serious impact on the furnishings in the buildings, causing deterioration and damage to the objects over time; two, the parking lot was a significant non-historic visual intrusion on a historic scene--automobiles certainly did not blend in with a reconstructed 19th century Hudson's Bay Company site.

Regional personnel, including the Chief of Cultural Resources Division, Stephanie Toothman; Regional Archeologist Jim Thomson; Richard Winters, Associate Regional Director, Recreational Resources and Professional Services; Mark Forbes, Regional Emergency Services Coordinator; and Dan Nordgren, Chief of Maintenance; visited the park in 1989-1990 to discuss with park staff the logistics of moving the parking lot and also where to relocate it. Mark Forbes indicated that Region would contribute $7000.00 from fee collection funds to assist the park in the collection of fees out of the former interim Indian Trade Shop, and at the same time, move the parking lot to an area immediately south of 5th Street and east of the entrance gate leading to the existing parking lot.

With the arrival of a new superintendent, Dave Herrera, in February 1990, the issue of moving the parking lot was revived. Further study of the issue was undertaken and a number of archeological and landscape design plans were resolved before the actual move occurred in July 1992.

Under the direction of Park Chief of Maintenance Gary Bickford, a contingent of U.S. Army Reserves and Marines with heavy construction equipment and operators, prepared the site of the new parking lot. Within 3 weeks, the lot was finished and open to visitor parking. The new lot allowed the moving of the fee collection station and provided a dramatic new visual orientation for visitors.