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FOREWORD

The Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt, Eleanor Roosevelt’s Val-Kill, and FDR’s retirement retreat Top Cottage are all extraordinary places that embrace a truly remarkable legacy of land stewardship. They embody FDR’s special relationship with his family estate, a fascinating story that helped set the stage for conservation programs he launched across the nation.

This Historic Resource Study tells that story fully for the first time. It will serve as the most important resource for our work going forward to restore and interpret these significant landscapes. I am grateful to the authors, John Sears and John Auwaerter, for bringing this information to light with such depth and skill. I also wish to recognize the many people who assisted with the development of the report, with special thanks to the National Park Service’s Olmsted Center for Landscape Preservation and to George W. Curry, Distinguished Teaching Professor at the State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry (SUNY ESF).

Certainly, one of the most satisfying outcomes of this project has been the reestablishment of FDR’s historic relationship with the New York State College of Forestry. Through that connection the project has also led us to Dr. Chris Nowak, SUNY ESF Associate Professor of Forest and Natural Resource Management, and his students who are finishing up forest and viewshed management plans for the historic sites.

FDR’s conservation legacy has particular significance to the National Park Service, which he greatly expanded and shaped into an agency that looks much like today’s National Park Service. Two bills passed during the New Deal era—the Reorganization of 1933 and the Historic Sites Act of 1935—had greater impact on the National Park System than any legislation since. By the end of the 1930s, FDR had also effected legislation setting aside his lifelong Home for the nation and creating the first presidential library on the property. They remain today among his many lasting legacies. Thanks to this report, visitors will be able to gain a deeper understanding of the breadth and depth of FDR’s imprint on the American landscape and the deep roots his landscape ethic had right here at his Hyde Park home.

Sarah Olson
Superintendent
Roosevelt-Vanderbilt National Historic Sites
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INTRODUCTION

Franklin D. Roosevelt, the thirty-second and longest-serving president of the United States, had a profound connection to his family’s Hyde Park estate, today preserved as the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site. It was at Hyde Park that FDR was born and raised, gained his love of nature and rural life, raised his family, conducted official business as New York State governor and president, practiced forestry, built his presidential library, and was buried. Throughout his life, FDR cared deeply about stewardship of the land and the rural communities that depended on it.

While the Roosevelt mansion known as Springwood is most often recognized as FDR’s home, so too was the surrounding estate that at its height encompassed more than 1,500 acres, with forests, hills, working farms, gardens, and views of the Hudson River (fig. 0.1). FDR, as Eleanor Roosevelt recalled one year after his death, ...always felt that this was his home and he loved the house and the view, the woods, special trees, the particular spots where he played as a child or where he had ridden his horse as a boy and a man, or later drove his car when he was not longer able to ride.... My husband’s spirit will live in this house, in the library, and in the quiet garden inside the hedge where he wished his body to lie. It is his life and his character and his personality which will live with us and which will endure and be imparted to those who come to see the surroundings in which he grew.... He would want them to enjoy themselves in these surroundings and to draw from them rest and peace and strength as he did all the days of his life.

The family estate also contained an adjoining mansion, known as the Red House, that belonged to FDR’s half brother, James Roosevelt Roosevelt, as well as five farms on the uplands to the east. The Roosevelt family kept their Hyde Park houses and surrounding landscape in the manner of traditional Hudson River country estates, with formal gardens, pleasure grounds, and farmland. FDR’s passion, especially later in life, was the working parts of the estate—the farms and woods. In his view, the land had not just natural, aesthetic, and recreational value, but was the foundation of rural society. During FDR’s lifetime, he watched the decline of rural communities as farmers abandoned their once-productive fields. Like many other estate owners and government agencies, FDR believed forestry—one of the primary conservation practices...
during the early twentieth century—held the answer to this plight. In theory, by reforestation of worn-out agricultural lands, farms were returned to productivity, soil and water quality was protected, and the rural economy was revived. FDR demonstrated this conservation theory on his Hyde Park estate by planting over a half million trees between 1912 and 1945, many of them on marginal farmland he purchased surrounding the family estate. His practical experience at Hyde Park foreshadowed much of his public policy in conservation and rural matters as governor and president.

**PROJECT SETTING**

The Roosevelt Estate is located in the Town of Hyde Park along the east bank of the Hudson River, approximately halfway between New York City and the state capital at Albany (fig. 0.2). Hyde Park, a suburban town with a population of approximately 21,000, is in Dutchess County north of Poughkeepsie, a small city with a population of 30,000. The main highway along the east bank of the Hudson, the Albany Post Road (U.S. Route 9), extends through Hyde Park, and a secondary highway, Violet Avenue (New York Route 9G), parallels it to the east. Both roads are lined by commercial and residential development, woods, and fields. Suburban housing tracts, most built in the 1950s and 1960s, are scattered throughout the town.

At its height in 1939, the Roosevelt Estate extended for nearly 2 miles from east to west, from the tidal banks of the Hudson River to Dutchess Hill at an elevation of 460 feet, the location of FDR’s retreat, Top Cottage (fig. 0.3). Between 1939 and 1943, FDR subdivided two parcels from the estate, one containing his presidential library that opened in 1940, and the other containing the Springwood house and surrounding grounds, designated as a national historic site but not yet open to the public. After FDR’s death in April 1945, the remainder of the estate was subdivided and sold, with the last estate parcel sold out of the family in 1970.

The historic Roosevelt Estate is today comprised of a mix of private and public property. The National Park Service preserves 928 acres of the original 1,522-acre family estate in two park units: the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site, established in 1944 and later enlarged; and Eleanor Roosevelt National Historic Site.
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(Val-Kill), established in 1977 (see fig. 0.3). Top Cottage, located east of Val-Kill, is part of the Home of FDR National Historic Site. Both parks are administered as Roosevelt-Vanderbilt National Historic Sites, which includes a third unit, Vanderbilt Mansion National Historic Site in Hyde Park. The Home of FDR also includes Bellefield, the former Newbold-Morgan Estate north of the Roosevelt Estate, which is used as park headquarters and is the site of the Henry A. Wallace Visitor and Education Center, opened in 2003.

The Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library and Museum is on a 16-acre tract that FDR subdivided from the estate. The property remains an integral part of the Home of FDR landscape, but is under separate federal jurisdiction of the National Archives and Records Administration. The library operates the visitor center at Bellefield in partnership with the National Park Service.

**PROJECT SCOPE, ORGANIZATION, AND METHODS**

This historic resource study provides a history of the Roosevelt Estate that establishes its relationship with FDR, describes its context within the American conservation movement, and details changes in ownership, use, and physical character. As defined by the National Park Service, a historic resource study provides an historical overview of a park and its associated resources, and identifies and evaluates a park’s cultural resources within historic contexts. It synthesizes all available cultural resource information from various disciplines in a narrative designed to serve managers, planners, interpreters, cultural resource specialists, and interested public as a reference for the history of the region and the resources within or associated with a park.
This historic resource study has been prepared to aid the National Park Service in planning, treatment, and interpretation of the two sites it administers within the limits of the historic Roosevelt Estate. The need for this report has arisen due to the lack of comprehensive and contextual documentation on the land-use and ownership history of the estate, and on FDR’s stewardship of the land in the context of conservation and his public policies as governor and president. The report was also needed to provide documentation to support land preservation in the context of ongoing development pressures within and adjoining the estate; to provide information necessary for a new park general management plan, which was completed in 2009; and to update National Register documentation for the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site.

The first part of the study, “FDR as Forester: Private Passion, Public Policy,” addresses the associative values of the Roosevelt Estate pertaining to FDR as a political figure and conservation practitioner. This part discusses FDR’s conservation legacy at Hyde Park; his public image as a farmer and forester; and the ways in which he promoted conservation through forestry at Hyde Park. Part 1 also explores the implications of FDR’s relationship to the land, with particular attention to the conservation-related public policy of the state and federal Roosevelt administrations.

The second part of the study, “Country Place and Tree Farm: Land-Use History of the Roosevelt Estate,” is a narrative of the ownership, use, and physical development of the estate within the context of forestry and Hudson River estates. It documents the relationship of residential, agricultural, silvicultural, recreational, and public uses of the property; chronicles property acquisition and sale; summarizes physical changes to the landscape; and describes FDR’s forestry practices within the context of forestry in New York State.

The land-use history is organized into six periods defined by changes in ownership or land use. Each period begins with an overview of the historic contexts in which the estate developed, and then focuses on the history of the Roosevelt Estate lands, emphasizing the years of Roosevelt family ownership between 1867 and 1970. The years before and after this time are also discussed to the extent that they inform understanding of the historic Roosevelt landscape and existing conditions. Each period includes a series of drawings that illustrate the setting, boundaries, and primary resources in the landscape. The final set in the epilogue (post-1970) are historical base maps that provide summary documentation identifying dates of construction for existing primary cultural resources and resources removed since FDR’s death in 1945. These also identify changes in ownership and physical changes that occurred after 1970, the period covered in the epilogue.
The report and drawings are organized by parcels that FDR used to manage the estate, with most identified by prior owners. These parcels fall into two groups: the western part of the estate, which with one exception (Rogers Land) was acquired by FDR’s father, James Roosevelt, between 1867 and 1886 as part of the original Springwood estate; and the farms and other parcels on the uplands in the eastern half of the estate acquired by FDR between 1911 and 1938. For the purposes of this report, these parcels are discussed in groups according to proximity or common historic use (fig. 0.4):

**Original Estate (Springwood)**

**Wheeler Place and Rogers Land**

The Wheeler Place, containing the Springwood house (FDR Home) and FDR Library, is the original estate parcel that was acquired by James Roosevelt in 1867. The Rogers Land is a parcel north of the Wheeler Place that FDR acquired from the Rogers Estate in 1935.

**Home Farm**

This is the Springwood farm east of the Post Road, consisting of the east half of the Boreel Place, acquired by FDR’s father in 1868, and the entire Bracken Place, acquired in 1871.

**J. R. Roosevelt Place**

This parcel is the country place of FDR’s half brother, James Roosevelt Roosevelt, consisting of the west half of the Boreel Place, acquired by FDR’s father in 1868, and the Kirchner Place, acquired in 1886.
Upland Farms

Bennett Farm and Tompkins Farm
The Bennett Farm was the first upland farm that FDR acquired, in 1911. The adjoining Tompkins Farm was FDR’s second farm, acquired in 1925.

Dumphy Farm, Hughson Farm, Wright and Jones Lands
FDR acquired the Dumphy Farm in two parcels in 1935 and 1937; the Hughson Farm in 1937; the Wright Land in 1937; and the Jones Land in 1938.

Rohan Farm, Lent and Briggs Wood Lots
FDR acquired the Briggs Wood Lot in 1935, the Rohan Farm in 1937, and majority interest in the Lent Wood Lot by 1938. It was on the boundary of the two woodlots and the Dumphy Farm that FDR built his retreat, Top Cottage, in 1938–39.

Research for this study was undertaken at an overall thorough level of investigation, defined by the National Park Service as research in selected published and documentary sources of known or presumed relevance that are readily accessible without extensive travel and that promise expeditious extraction of relevant data; interviewing all knowledgeable persons who are readily available; nondestructive site investigation using all appropriate technical means; and presenting findings in no greater detail than required by the task directive.7

This study builds on several park research reports, notably Charles Snell’s “Franklin D. Roosevelt and Forestry at Hyde Park, New York, 1911 to 1932” (1955), Louis Torres’s “Historic Resource Study, Eleanor Roosevelt National Historic Site” (1980), and Debra Buzzell’s “Historical Review of FDR and Conservation” (1982). Other park cultural resource reports provided documentation on parts of the estate or individual resources. Research in primary materials was conducted at the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, archives of the Roosevelt-Vanderbilt National Historic Sites, and the Hoverter Memorial Archives at the State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry. FDR’s published correspondence was also examined. Published primary sources, including annual reports of the New York State Conservation Department, forestry journals, and forestry treatises, served as primary sources of information on the history of forestry in New York State.
HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

BEFORE THE ROOSEVELTS, PRE-1867

Prior to European settlement of Hyde Park in the eighteenth century, the Roosevelt Estate was part of the homeland of the Wappinger Indians, who may have used the estate lands as hunting grounds and for agriculture. Following initial Dutch settlement in the Hudson Valley beginning in the seventeenth century, Europeans forced out the Native Americans and granted large tracts of land for settlement and speculation. The Roosevelt Estate was part of the Great Nine Partners Patent, issued to British land speculators in 1697. Two years later, the speculators subdivided the patent into long, rectangular parcels fronting on the Hudson River, known as water lots. Actual settlement on these lots within the Roosevelt Estate did not occur until ca. 1750, when the Crooke family built a house near the present Red House on the J. R. Roosevelt Place. Widow Everson built the second known house within the estate, the future Springwood house (FDR Home), on the Wheeler Place at some point between 1780 and 1793. The eastern parts of the water lots on the uplands above the Hudson River were settled later as farms in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

On the eve of James Roosevelt’s purchase of the Wheeler Place in 1867, the western part of the water lots, adjoining the Hudson, had become country estates of wealthy New Yorkers, with the mansions on the west side of the Post Road and the estate farms on the east side of the road. The old Everson house was owned by Josiah and Mary Wheeler, whose father-in-law, James Boorman, owned the adjoining estate, Bellefield. Wheeler also owned the Bellefield farm on the east side of the Post Road. To the south, the old Crooke property, containing the Red House built in ca. 1833 and the estate farm on the east side of the road, had become the country estate of Sarah and François Robert Boreel. To the east of the river estates, the uplands remained independently owned by yeoman farmers.

JAMES ROOSEVELT’S SPRINGWOOD, 1867–1900

James Roosevelt (1828–1900) purchased the portion of the Wheeler Place west of the Post Road in 1867, following a fire at the family’s prior country home, Mount Hope, located about a mile to the south. James and his first wife, Rebecca Howland Roosevelt (1831–1876), had a son, James Roosevelt Roosevelt (1854–1927), known as Rosy. The family moved into the Italianate Wheeler-Everson house, and renamed the estate Springwood. The following year, James Roosevelt purchased the adjoining Boreel Place including the house and farm, and three years later, in 1871, purchased the Bellefield farm on the east side of the Post Road from Timothy Bracken. Roosevelt maintained the Boreel farmhouse and barns, but removed the Bellefield farm buildings. He made few other changes to the
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estate, aside from addition of a boathouse, road to the river, staff quarters, and new stables near the Springwood house. In 1878, Rosy moved into the Red House on the Boreel Place with his wife, Helen.

Two years after Rebecca’s death in 1878, James was remarried to Sara Delano Roosevelt (1854–1941). Two years later, Franklin Delano Roosevelt (1882–1945) was born at Springwood. Over the course of the next two decades, James Roosevelt made few additional changes to the family estate, except for the acquisition of the Kirchner Place, a largely undeveloped tract south of the Boreel Place, in 1886. This property brought the total extent of the Roosevelt Estate to 624 acres.

Upon James Roosevelt’s death in 1900, he left the Wheeler Place and Home Farm to FDR, subject to the life estate of Sara, and the west half of the Boreel Place and the Kirchner Place to J. R. Roosevelt. His will stipulated the right to maintain the river view from the Springwood house across the Boreel and Kirchner Places.

**ESTATE IMPROVEMENTS AND AMATEUR FORESTRY, 1900-1928**

At the time of his father’s death, FDR was in his first year at Harvard, from where he graduated in 1904. The following year, he married Eleanor Roosevelt (1884–1962), and together they had six children: Anna (1906–1975), James (1907–1991), Franklin Jr. (1909–1909), Elliott (1910–1990), Franklin Jr. (1914–1988), and John (1916–1981). The family made the Springwood house, which they shared with Sara Roosevelt, their home.

In 1905, FDR began planning improvements to the Springwood estate, which included additions to the house, gardens, and farm, and a forestry program. However, it was not until 1911, when FDR entered the state senate and was appointed to the state Forest, Fish and Game Commission (precursor to the Conservation Department), that he began these improvements in earnest. That year, he developed a forest management plan, and purchased his own property, the 194-acre Bennett Farm, which he would rent to tenant farmers and use for forestry purposes. The next year, he set out his first forest plantations on old fields and gravel lots on the Wheeler Place, using tree stock ordered from the state nurseries that was planted by estate staff. By 1928, FDR had set out approximately sixteen plantations on the Wheeler Place, Home Farm, and Bennett Farm, totaling more than 42,000 trees.

Other improvements that FDR made to the estate during this period, working closely with his mother, included redesign of the Springwood gardens in ca. 1912, construction of a modern dairy building at the Home Farm in ca. 1915, and expansion of the Italianate Springwood house into a Colonial Revival–style mansion in 1915–16. Rosy undertook similar improvements to his place, including
expansion of the Red House and redesign of the gardens in ca. 1915. He also built a teardrop-shaped trotting course on the Kirchner Place.

In 1925, four years after contracting polio which left him without use of his legs, FDR purchased his second upland farm, the 192-acre Tompkins Farm. The property consisted of abandoned fields well suited to reforestation, and a farmhouse and barn at the corner of Violet Avenue and Creek Road. Around this same time, Eleanor Roosevelt and her friends Marion Dickerman and Nancy Cook built a retreat named Val-Kill at a favorite picnic spot along the banks of the Fall Kill at the east end of the Bennett Farm. With FDR’s support, the women built a swimming pool and Dutch Colonial–style house, known as Stone Cottage, that was completed in 1926. The women also developed Val-Kill into an experiment in rural industry, focusing initially on Nancy Cook’s expertise in furniture making. While construction of Stone Cottage was underway, a second building was constructed to house the furniture shops of Val-Kill Industries.

**PUBLIC LIFE AND PROFESSIONAL FOREST MANAGEMENT, 1928–1945**

FDR was elected as governor of New York State in 1928, and by the fall of the following year he was planning on expanding his forestry operation at Hyde Park with the help of the New York State College of Forestry at Syracuse University. He worked with forestry professor Nelson C. Brown to establish demonstration and experimental plantations on the Tompkins Farm along Creek Road and Violet Avenue. Between 1930 and 1933, the College of Forestry set out thirty-six plantations containing approximately 88,600 trees. After 1933, FDR continued to rely on professional assistance from the college’s forestry faculty, particularly Nelson Brown, who served as his unofficial and unpaid forest manager for the next twelve years. During this time, Brown helped FDR expand his forestry program, begin large-scale Christmas tree production, and acquire additional land for reforestation to the north and east of the Bennett Farm. These acquisitions included the 186-acre Dumphy Farm, adjoining the Bennett Farm, in 1935 and 1937; the 90-acre Hughson Farm, to the north of the Dumphy Farm, in 1937; and the 133-acre Rohan Farm, east of the Bennett Farm, in 1937. FDR also purchased several smaller properties between 1935 and 1938, including the Briggs and Lent Wood Lots, and portions of the Wright and Jones farms. These acquisitions increased the total extent of the Roosevelt family estate to 1,521 acres. FDR developed a network of woods roads to access his plantations and the far corners of his property.

FDR’s election as president in 1932 resulted in several changes to the estate over his four terms in office. In ca. 1933, the U.S. Secret Service erected a small building in the Springwood Home Garden. Following U.S. entry into World War II in December 1941, the Army implemented an extensive security system across the
estate to protect FDR while he was at home. This system included crash barriers, jeep roads, telephone lines, guard shacks, and electric security eyes.

FDR's other improvements to the estate during this period included construction of his own retreat, Top Cottage, in 1938–39. The Dutch Colonial–style house was located on the summit of Dutchess Hill east of Val-Kill, a site that straddled the boundary of the Dumphy Farm and Briggs and Lent Wood Lots. FDR's other major addition to the estate was his presidential library, which was built in 1939–40 on the North Avenue Lot field near the Springwood house and gardens. FDR gave the 16-acre library property to the federal government based on a joint resolution passed by Congress in 1939 that also allowed the government to receive, through donation, any part of the Roosevelt Estate. This legislation enabled FDR to give the Springwood house and surrounding 33 acres of the Wheeler Place to the federal government in December 1943, subject to the life estate of the Roosevelt family. In 1944, the National Park Service designated the property the Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site.

**SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT, 1945–1970**

Following FDR's death in 1945, the trustees of his legal estate executed his will by selling off all of the Roosevelt Estate land to maximize financial returns. The National Park Service, limited by legislation to acquiring estate lands only through donation, could not acquire property from the trustees. The sell-off included all of the estate except for the federally owned library and national historic site, and the J. R. Roosevelt Place. FDR had inherited the Boreel Place tract from J. R. Roosevelt, but the trustees could not sell the property because FDR’s niece, Helen Roosevelt Robinson, held a right to life estate. Helen also owned the adjoining Kirchner Place.

The trustees sold two parcels west of the Post Road, surrounding the national historic site, by 1952. These included the Rogers Land, which was sold to Mary Newbold Morgan, and the lower part of the Wheeler Place, which was sold to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Foundation. The foundation then gave the property to the National Park Service. Helen Roosevelt continued to reside at the J. R. Roosevelt Place until her death in 1962. The trustees then acquired the Kirchner Place from Helen’s estate, assumed ownership of the Boreel Place, and sold the combined parcel to developers who built the Hyde Park Mall there in ca. 1970.

The estate property east of the Post Road, encompassing the Home Farm and uplands farms including Val-Kill and Top Cottage, was acquired by Elliott Roosevelt in 1947–48. The trustees sold the Post Road frontage of the Home Farm to a corporation formed by Elliott, the Val-Kill Company. He subsequently leased and sold this property to developers, who erected commercial and residential development between 1948 and 1952 that included a drive-in theater, a gas station,
a gift shop, a Howard Johnson’s restaurant, an indoor movie theater, apartments, and single-family houses. On the property east of the Post Road frontage, Elliott, with the support of Eleanor Roosevelt, planned a large agricultural operation known as Val-Kill Farms. He attempted to keep FDR’s forestry program going, and expanded livestock operations at the Bennett and Rohan Farms. Elliott moved into Top Cottage, and Eleanor made the Val-Kill furniture factory her home.

Val-Kill Farms failed by 1951, and Elliott subsequently subdivided and sold off all of the property to developers, except for a 180-acre tract on the Bennett and Tompkins Farms that included Val-Kill. In 1952, John Roosevelt acquired the Val-Kill property from Elliott, and continued to own it following Eleanor’s death in 1962. In 1970, John sold the Val-Kill property to developers. Hundreds of houses were built on the Dumphy, Hughson, and Rohan Farms beginning in 1952. The land west of Violet Avenue, including parts of the Home Farm, Bennett Farm, and Tompkins Farm, was also acquired by a developer but never subdivided.

**EPILOGUE, POST-1970**

After the sale of the last Roosevelt estate parcel in 1970, there was increasing interest among the public and the Park Service in preserving the estate lands from development. No new major residential subdivisions were planned, but the developments begun prior to 1970 were completed, including the subdivisions on the Dumphy and Hughson Farms that were built-out by 1980, and the subdivisions on the Rohan Farm, completed during the 1980s. There was also new development along the Post Road, including a senior housing complex and strip shopping plaza at the Home Farm and a supermarket to the south of the estate.

In 1975, the Hyde Park Visual Environment Committee was formed to preserve the 180-acre Val-Kill property, which was slated for a retirement community, nursing home, and single-family homes. In 1977, the Congress passed legislation establishing Eleanor Roosevelt National Historic Site with funding for land acquisition and site development, and seven years later following extensive restoration and rehabilitation, the site opened to the public.

At the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site, the National Park Service continued to acquire remaining undeveloped estate lands, recognizing their historic significance in interpreting FDR’s interests and achievements, and preserving what remained of the rural setting of the site. In 1974, the park acquired the Rogers Land that FDR had purchased in 1935, and in the following year acquired Bellefield, which was not historically part of the Roosevelt Estate, to protect the setting of the national historic site and provide space for administrative functions. Between 1984 and 1989, the park acquired 29 acres surrounding the
Red House to preserve the front field that was in the immediate setting of the FDR Home.

In 1998, Congress passed legislation that allowed the Park Service to acquire by purchase or donation any lands within the historic limits of the family estate (the original 1939 legislation allowed for acquisition through donation only). Through this legislation, the park acquired Top Cottage and surrounding 40 acres in 2002; 35 acres of the Kirchner Place the same year; and 335 acres comprising most of the undeveloped estate land between the Post Road and Violet Avenue in 2007. This purchase allowed the park to finally reconnect Val-Kill and Top Cottage with Springwood. In 2010-11, the park acquired the Red House and nearly 50 acres of undeveloped land along the Post Road within the former Home Farm.

These property acquisitions over the past four decades have reestablished a large part of the Roosevelt Estate, although the historic rural character along the Post Road remains obscured by suburban development. Together with the acquisitions, the park has made a number of changes to enhance historic character, recreation, and park operations, including extension of trails, removal of a 1947 parking lot from the Home Garden, and construction of a new visitor center at Bellefield. The park is also planning to reestablish the river view from the Springwood house that was lost after 1945, and is developing a forest management plan that will perpetuate FDR’s conservation legacy at Hyde Park.

ENDNOTES

1 The Franklin D. Roosevelt Library and Museum (National Archives) and the Eleanor Roosevelt National Historic Site (National Park Service) are also within the historic boundary of the Roosevelt Estate.

2 Eleanor Roosevelt’s speech at the opening of the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site, April 12, 1946.


4 The study does not include an operational history of the Roosevelt Estate that documents how the Roosevelt family used the estate; the role of Sara Roosevelt in its management; the family’s relationship to estate employees, tenants, and townspeople; or how Hyde Park compared with other family residences in New York City, Warm Springs, Georgia, and Campobello, New Brunswick. This part of the estate’s history was addressed in a draft of the report that was not included in the final historic resource study.

5 National Park Service, Director’s Order 28.


7 NPS-28, Cultural Resource Management.
Unidentified person examining FDR's 1912 red pine plantation (Plot A) on the Wheeler Place, 1931. (Photograph 48-223837[19], Franklin D. Roosevelt Library and Museum.)

PART 1. FDR AND FORESTRY: PRIVATE PASSION, PUBLIC POLICY

JOHN F. SEARS, PH.D.
LAND, TREE GROWING, AND HYDE PARK

THE MEANING OF HOME

Perhaps no other American president, not even Washington or Jefferson, has been more rooted in a particular place than Franklin Roosevelt or drawn more of his substance as a leader from the land on which he was born and grew up. When FDR laid the cornerstone for the FDR Library in November 1939, his remarks revealed, in a humorous way, a lot about the intimate connection he maintained to the land of his Hyde Park home throughout his life (fig. 1.1):

Half a century ago a small boy took especial delight in climbing an old tree, now unhappily gone, to pick and eat ripe sickle pears. That was about one hundred feet to the west of where I am standing now. And just to the north he used to lie flat between the strawberry rows and eat sun-warmed strawberries—the best in the world. In the spring of the year, in hip rubber boots, he sailed his first toy boats in the surface water formed by the melting snow. In the summer with his dogs he dug into woodchuck holes in this same field, and some of you are standing on top of those holes at this minute. Indeed, the descendants of those same woodchucks still inhabit this field and I hope that, under the auspices of the National Archivist, they will continue to do so for all time.¹

As this passage reveals, FDR had a physical intimacy with the land; he experienced it in a tactile way. Although in 1939 he no longer stretched out on the ground to eat strawberries, he had a keen memory of that experience.

The land existed for FDR in time as well as in space. It had a history, and that history was organically connected to the present. The past was physically present in the land in the form of those woodchucks (which can still be seen today along the old entrance drive to the FDR Library).

FDR also had a strong sense of geography (that pear tree was “about one hundred feet to the west of where I am standing now”). His memories were located in space. He liked to know the relationship of one place to another. His interest in stamps may have been, in part, an international extension of his fascination with the geography of Hyde Park. During World War II, FDR’s military advisors were
impressed with his knowledge of the names and locations of remote places, a knowledge he had acquired through stamp collecting.

Because of his intimate connection to the land, its history, and its geography, it gave FDR great satisfaction, as he was laying the cornerstone of his library, that he was almost literally planting the records of his administration in a place that was bound up with his personal history.

But the land also had a much longer history that gave his act a universal meaning. He hoped, he said, that the library “will come to be an integral part of a country scene which the hand of man has not changed very greatly since the days of the Indians who dwelt here three hundred years ago. We know from simple deduction that these fields were cultivated by the first inhabitants of America—for the oak trees in these fields were striplings three centuries ago, and grew up in open fields as is proved to us by their wide spreading lower branches. Therefore, they grew in open spaces, and the only open spaces in Dutchess County were the cornfields of the Indians” (fig. 1.2).² Many of those oak trees are also still there today.

Another characteristic of FDR’s relationship to the land is that he liked to read the markers of human history embedded in it, those features which, to the informed eye, reveal how human activity and natural processes have together shaped the land.

FDR’s reference to the cornfields of the Indians and to the unchanging character and use of those fields over time suggests another point as well. Unlike the city, FDR believed, the countryside has stability, a continuity that America needed. The nation needed it especially in times of turmoil, such as the fall of 1939 when the world had just gone to war: “This is a peaceful countryside,” he said, “and it seems appropriate in this time of strife that we should dedicate this Library to the spirit of peace—peace for the United States and soon, we hope, peace for the world itself.”³

Hyde Park, then, was more than a source of personal identification for FDR; it was a model for the America he wanted, even for the world. The America he envisioned was above all democratic, composed of people like the country “neighbors and friends” to whom he addressed his dedication remarks. It was not a country in which the state and its leaders, whether fascist or communist, were supreme. For FDR the history of the United States was not just the history of great men and great events, but of ordinary people. He wanted Americans of the future
to come to the library to “gain a less superficial and more intimate and accurate view of the aspirations and purposes of all kinds of Americans.”

“Of the papers which will come to rest here,” he said, “I personally attach less importance to the documents of those who have occupied high public or private office, than I do to the spontaneous letters which have come to me and my family and my associates from men, from women, and from children in every part of the United States, telling me of their conditions and problems, and giving me their opinions.”

What could be more “grassroots” than this: documents recording the way ordinary people experienced the history of their time coming to rest in these ancient cornfields among the woodchucks whose lineage FDR traced to his childhood?

FDR’s passion for discovering or creating connections between the past and the present is evident in the way he literally built the past into some of the Dutch Colonial stone buildings whose design and construction he oversaw. Top Cottage, the hilltop retreat FDR built on the back of his Hyde Park estate in 1938, was constructed of fieldstone from the walls on his property, stone that the early settlers of the area had extracted from the soil as they cleared the land. The Rhinebeck, New York, Post Office, in the planning of which FDR was intimately involved, was a copy of the Beekman House on River Road in Rhinebeck that FDR remembered from his youth. The original house had burned down, but much of the stone from the old Dutch house was incorporated into the front walls of the new building. In dedicating the Rhinebeck Post Office in 1939, FDR noted that connecting buildings to the land and its history was part of a national effort being made by the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department in designing new post offices throughout the nation: “[W]e are trying to adapt the design to the historical background of the locality and to use, insofar as possible, the materials which are indigenous to the locality itself.”

FDR AS FARMER

FDR liked to call himself a farmer, and he had good reasons to do so. Although he did not engage in farm labor, FDR was intimately engaged in farm management both at Hyde Park and at the farm he purchased in Warm Springs, Georgia. Especially after he became governor and president, he often managed his farm properties from a distance by letter or through intermediaries, but his directions were still surprisingly detailed. FDR was also very knowledgeable about farming methods and liked to try out experimental techniques.

FDR’s special interest was in forestry. When he voted in Hyde Park, he always gave his occupation as “farmer,” but in 1943 he changed it to “tree grower” in
recognition of the fact that he grew many more trees than he did crops of any other kind. He began practicing scientific forestry in 1911 and set out his first plantations in 1912. By 1929, when he became governor of New York, he had planted 67,000 trees. He continued to acquire worn-out and abandoned farm properties adjacent to his own in order to accommodate his passion for forest planting and management. Beginning in 1929, FDR’s forestry activities grew more scientific and ambitious as he began working closely with Nelson Brown, a professor at the New York State College of Forestry at Syracuse University, first through an arrangement with the college and then, beginning in 1934, more directly with Brown. From 1929 to 1933, the College of Forestry planted demonstration plots on FDR’s land and documented this work in forestry journals. In 1931, Irving Isenberg, a recent graduate of the College of Forestry, drew up a forest management plan for FDR’s estate. Between 1930 and 1945, FDR planted 20,000 to 50,000 trees per year, including a large number of Christmas trees. In the end, FDR planted over half a million trees in approximately eighty-one plantations on his Hyde Park land (fig. 1.3).

In his efforts to practice scientific forestry, to experiment with the planting of different species, and to create a model tree farm for others to emulate, FDR was acting within a tradition of gentlemen farmers in America going back to the late eighteenth century, and beyond that to England, and under the influence of the forestry movement that had begun in the late nineteenth century and come to maturity during the first decades of the twentieth century. The decline of traditional farming, abandonment of agricultural lands, destructive logging practices, and a dwindling timber supply combined to make forest restoration and conservation a major economic, social, and political issue by the early twentieth century.

FDR’s personal interest in forestry and the ambitious forestry program he undertook on his Hyde Park estate, including the systematic acquisition of neighboring farmland largely for this purpose, dovetailed nicely with his political career. The fact that forest restoration and conservation were significant public policy issues appears to have intensifi ed FDR’s interest in the forestry projects he carried out on his Hyde Park estate and on his farm in Warm Springs, and the knowledge and experience he gained from those projects informed the programs he initiated or supported as state senator, governor, and president. FDR was not
1. FDR AND FORESTRY

a pioneer, but he was a leading practitioner of scientific forestry during the years after 1911. What makes FDR’s experiments with forestry different from those of other estate owners, such as his neighbor Archibald Rogers, is that they informed a political career that placed him in a position to have a significant impact on public policy both in New York State and the nation.

Although FDR regarded himself as a serious tree farmer (he corrected people who referred to his interest in forestry as a “hobby”), his forests provided a good part of his recreation when he was home in Hyde Park, particularly after he was paralyzed by polio in 1921. Although his paralysis prevented him from walking or riding horseback in the woods as he had as a boy, FDR creatively employed his open, hand-controlled Ford to get close to the trees and particular spots in the forest he loved (fig. 1.4). The car enabled him to pay attention to the details of managing his forests, as well as to get away from the pressures of politics. He employed a crew to build new wood roads and maintain and improve old ones, thus creating a network of roads that may have exceeded 20 miles in what might be called his handicapped-accessible forest. These roads were often very crude, just cleared tracks in the woods with steep grades, abrupt turns, and washouts caused by rainstorms. It took a rugged car, plus skill and daring to dodge trees, rocks, stumps, fallen logs, and sometimes mud holes along the way. FDR achieved an extraordinary degree of mobility and autonomy by pushing his car to its limits, sometimes even abandoning the roads altogether and driving across fields and over brush as high as the car.

Nelson Brown reports that when FDR was in Hyde Park, he usually went out driving twice a day. “We would often drive alone for from one to three hours or more, resting in a shady glade for 20 minutes or more to informally talk things over. Or sometimes we would just sit and rest.” Brown believed that in this environment, where FDR was “both figuratively and literally remote” from the cares and pressures of the White House, he could completely relax: “He loved to rest in his car in some peaceful shady nook in one of the far corners of his place, such as the little pond near the top of a hill above his cottage and swimming pool. Another was in the deep glades of the hemlock woods below his place. Still another was the oak forest below his hilltop cottage.” He could identify all the different trees on his place and also the shrubs, wildflowers, and birds. “[H]e knew the trees on his place as well as any forester,” Brown said. FDR and Brown would often discuss the history of the forests in the Hudson Valley from the time of the Indians to the present and the many uses to which trees had been put, providing lumber to build houses and
barns, posts, railings and stakes for fences, pilings for wharves along the river, cross ties for the New York Central Railroad, poles for telephone and telegraph lines.\textsuperscript{10} FDR himself sold logs for cross ties to the railroad and arranged with Central Hudson Gas & Electric to use hemlock poles cut on his own property to carry electric wires to Top Cottage.\textsuperscript{11}

**FDR AND HIS FARM NEIGHBORS**

FDR’s relationship to the land and to his forestry and other agricultural projects had a large social dimension, and that too had an impact on his political career and achievements. He loved to talk to Nelson Brown and to other foresters about his tree plantations, experimental plantings, and the economics of forestry. In both Hyde Park and Warm Springs, he enjoyed talking about farming and forestry with his tenants and farm neighbors. He often took visitors on tours of his forest and talked up the virtues of good forestry and erosion control.

As perceived by FDR, the relationships embodied in the land are fundamentally economic, but not abstract. They are ultimately human relationships: between farmers and the land, among farmers in a community, and between farmers and the city folk who buy their products. The land, the plants and animals that inhabit it, the people who own it, the people who work on it, the community in which it is located, the beneficiaries of the products it produces, are all bound together. The people living on the land are also a resource. As a resource, they too require good management, but not through force. FDR maintained an undeniably paternalistic attitude, but he expressed it as a desire to bring people together into a community—with himself, of course, as its leader.

One of FDR’s closest neighbors in Hyde Park was Moses Smith who lived at Woodlawns, one of the farm properties adjacent to the Roosevelt Estate that FDR acquired over the years. FDR bought Woodlawns in 1911, the first piece of land he owned independently of his mother, and in 1920 rented it to Smith who remained on the land as a tenant farmer until two years after FDR’s death. FDR liked to stop at Woodlawns to talk with Mose, as he was called, about farming. “FDR used to come over to talk about his tree farm,” Mose’s son, Clifford, remembered. “[H]e planted Norway spruce and Douglas fir all over what is now Val-Kill—and he and my father would talk about seeds, and thinning, and commiserate on good years and bad. [FDR] loved to feel he was using the land to good advantage.”\textsuperscript{12}

Nelson Brown reported that “Mose was probably the most frank and outspoken close personal friend of F.D.R. He had no hesitancy in using language to which he was accustomed—and this wasn’t always language that was commonly heard around official circles of the regular or summer White House.” FDR used to stop along the road to chat with neighbors from behind the wheel of his hand-controlled Ford. Brown remembers one such occasion when a large group had
gathered around FDR’s car along Violet Avenue. After a while, FDR asked if Mose was there. Mose came forward from the outside of the circle, took his hat off and his pipe out of his mouth, and asked deferentially if there was anything he could do for the president. FDR told a joke and “Gradually,” Brown reports, “the conversation became more friendly and intimate and soon Mose replaced his hat, put his big old pipe in his mouth and warmed up to the occasion. Finally, he fairly stuck his finger into FDR’s nose and said ‘Look here, young feller, I want you to tell me what you are going to do down there in Washington about this war business.’ Later, when FDR and Brown were alone in the woods, FDR said, “Say, did you see how far Mose got his finger into my nose?”

In an oral history interview conducted in 1948, Moses Smith recalled how FDR had responded when he learned the fate one winter of the elderly members of the Wilber family of Hyde Park: one brother froze to death between the barn and the house; one ended up in the poorhouse, and one in the asylum. “Moses,” FDR said, “this thing can’t go on, I’m going to plan some way or somehow to put over an old age security that the poorhouse in time will actually be done away with.” Smith believed that the idea of Social Security had its origins in Hyde Park. Although Social Security had other, more influential sources, FDR’s intimate knowledge of the lives and economic problems of his Hyde Park and Warm Springs neighbors no doubt shaped his belief in the importance of such programs.

When reminiscing for the Dutchess County Historical Society about the origin of the Fireside Chats, FDR said that in preparing them he tried to imagine himself talking to the average bank depositor. “Perhaps my thoughts went back to this land of individual citizen[s] whom I have known so well in Dutchess County all my life.” Moses Smith would probably have been prominent among those listeners he pictured in his mind.

In the late 1920s, when FDR lived in Warm Springs for extended periods, he spent many hours exploring the country roads in his hand-controlled car. When he saw a farmer, he would often stop by the side of the road to chat about crops and the weather. In 1926 and 1927, he bought farmland on Pine Mountain and began experimenting with alternatives to cotton, including cattle raising. He bought purebred bulls and crossed them with the scrub cattle the local farmers owned, in order to demonstrate that they could profitably raise beef cattle on the poor grazing lands available. He became knowledgeable about conditions in the rural South, a region that was already economically depressed before 1929. Charles Hurd, a White House correspondent, recounted how FDR would take reporters on tours of the countryside around Warm Springs in the 1930s (fig. 1.5). He would point out
the effects of erosion in the gully washes in the soft Georgia clay that sometimes
caved the roads into the ditches running beside them. Or, he would show the
reporters the scrawny, cross-bred cattle that he had produced. These jaunts
revealed FDR’s “absolute dedication to rural development.”16 He even wrote a
column on agriculture for a while for the Macon (Georgia) Telegraph. His first-
hand knowledge of the land enabled him to speak warmly, personally, humorously
to Southern audiences. “I have seen the denuding of your forests,” he said at the
Green Pastures Rally in Charlotte, North Carolina in 1936,

I have seen the washing away of your topsoil; I have slid into the ditch
from your red clay highways. I have taken part in your splendid efforts
to save your forests, to terrace your lands, to harness your streams and
to push hard-surfaced roads into every county in every State. I have
even assumed the amazing role of a columnist for a Georgia newspaper
in order that I might write powerful pieces against burning over the
farm woodlot and in favor of the cow, hog and hen program.17

In a memoir of his friendship with FDR, Rexford Tugwell recalled the intensity of
FDR’s concern for the problems of farmers: “About this one thing he had been
endlessly inquiring, endlessly urgent. Where had the emotional involvement come
from?” Tugwell thought most of it had come from FDR’s agricultural experiments
and contact with farmers in Georgia. FDR’s “farm” in Dutchess County, New
York, “was an estate,” he pointed out, “and he could not have learned much
there about farmers’ problems.”18 Tugwell clearly had little understanding of
FDR’s Hyde Park experience. While FDR no doubt did learn a great deal about
agricultural issues in Georgia, Nelson Brown’s account of FDR’s relationship with
Moses Smith indicates that FDR loved to discuss agricultural issues with his farm
neighbors in Hyde Park as much as he did with Otis Moore, his farm manager, and
other farmers in Warm Springs. In fact, it is very unlikely that he would have taken
an interest in the agricultural problems of Georgia at all had he not grown up on
an estate in which a working farm was an integral part, represented an agricultural
county in the New York State Senate, and been actively engaged in tree farming for
over a decade before he went to Warm Springs. He was thoroughly familiar with
rural life and agricultural issues before he set foot in Georgia.

Through his contacts with Dutchess County and Georgia farmers, FDR not only
gained an intimate knowledge of economic conditions and the lives of struggling
farmers in rural America, but also developed his ability to communicate with and
earn the trust of ordinary people.
FDR'S VISION OF CONSERVATION AND SUSTAINABILITY

The word “landscape” is rarely the right word to describe what FDR saw or thought when he spoke about the Hudson Valley or any other piece of countryside. He did not see a picture when he looked at the land, although picturesque scenes no doubt had an appeal for him. He saw, instead, a set of relationships among human beings and between them and the natural environment. Looking at a landscape as scenery places the viewer outside it, like a visitor looking at a painting in an art gallery. FDR was always a participant, not an observer. To him the countryside wasn’t scenery; it was land. Perhaps this was why FDR does not seem to have been strongly attracted to wilderness. He regarded land as something to be used—not exploited but put to the best economic purpose and managed in a responsible manner. In the case of his own property, he cared about its productive capacity, not its potential as a work of landscape art. The question was how to manage the land well, in what we would call today a sustainable way.

This view of the land placed FDR squarely in the Gifford Pinchot or wise-use rather than the John Muir or preservationist wing of the conservationist movement. Although he set aside a tract of forest between Springwood and the Hudson River that he believed was old-growth forest to be preserved in its natural state, and would act to preserve wilderness areas as president, particularly wildlife refuges, he was far more interested in programs to plant trees, improve forests, restore eroded land, or develop hydroelectric power sites.

FDR frequently cited European forestry practices as a model for the approach to conservation he wished to see implemented in the United States. “We are just beginning in this country to wake up to the fact that we need timber and that we need to think of the future,” he said in a radio address supporting the “reforestation amendment” to the New York State constitution in 1931. “For centuries European countries have been renewing and caring for their forests so as to get the maximum of benefit from them. They treat timber as a crop. We treat our timber resources as if they were a mine, from which the ore can be taken once and once only.”

Perhaps the most constant theme of FDR’s political career was his campaign to change that behavior and to make scientific, sustainable timber growing America’s national policy and practice.

FDR AND CONSERVATION POLICY

FDR’s efforts to scientifically manage his forests and to plant trees on marginal farmland on his Hyde Park estate were hardly unique. They were part of a national reforestation movement that began in the late nineteenth century and gained momentum in the first decades of the twentieth. The movement was
especially strong in New York State both at the governmental level and among private landowners. As a politician strongly influenced by the Progressive ideas of his distant cousin Theodore Roosevelt, FDR would no doubt have supported conservation measures whether he had pursued forestry activities on his own land or not. But the fact that he did invest an enormous amount of time and resources in acquiring old farmland, planning a reforestation program, and managing his forests and tree plantations meant that he brought to his public life a depth of knowledge about forestry and commitment to conservation that was unsurpassed by any other political leader of his time.

FDR AS NEW YORK STATE SENATOR

FDR’s political career and his activities as a tree farmer began in the same year. He was elected to the New York State Senate in 1910 and the following year was appointed chairman of the Forest, Fish and Game Committee. He would later attribute the beginnings of his reforestation efforts and the scientific management of his forests in Hyde Park to this appointment: “A good many of you know my personal interest in conservation because I came to Albany as a baby senator in 1911 and was made chairman of the Forest, Fish and Game Committee,” he told the New York State Forestry Association in 1929. “One of the first things I did was to discover that I had a lot of land at Hyde Park that needed reforesting, so between 5,000 and 10,000 trees were planted every year on that land, and forestry was further promoted by the clearing up of 500 acres of woodlot.” FDR certainly had an interest in forestry prior to this date and was prone to mythologize about himself, but this version of the origin of his forestry efforts in Hyde Park indicates that he came to see a close connection between his political career and his own forestry activities. His interest in forestry from 1911 forward was both political and personal, and his public and private conservation activities informed and invigorated each other.

As state senator and chairman of the Senate’s Forest, Fish and Game Committee, FDR introduced eight bills dealing with conservation, but most of them dealt with the regulation of fishing, hunting, and water power development rather than forestry. One bill, however, the Roosevelt-Jones Bill, was aimed at regulating the cutting of timber on private land. In order to help persuade his fellow legislators to support this measure, he invited Gifford Pinchot (fig. 1.6) to give a slide talk in the New York State Assembly chamber on forest conservation. He liked to cite this occasion in his later speeches as a watershed in his efforts to awaken his fellow New Yorkers to the need for conservation. Pinchot first showed a slide of a Chinese painting, ca. 1510, showing a lovely valley, a walled town which records showed held 300,000 people, a stream bordered by cultivated fields, and mountains covered with spruce and pine trees right to their summits. On one of
those mountains, if you looked carefully, you could see a logging chute, indicating that the Chinese had begun lumbering operations. Then Pinchot showed a second slide, a photograph taken 400 years later from the same location as the original painting, showing the mountains completely stripped of trees and even of grass. No soil remained, only rocks. The walled town lay in ruins, and the stream showed signs of regular flooding. Only a few people still lived in the valley. “Well, that picture,” FDR reported in a speech in 1935 on the fiftieth anniversary of conservation in New York, “sold conservation and forestry to the Legislature of the State of New York. And, as a result, we were enabled to get through the first important legislation for conservation.”

The Roosevelt-Jones Bill was aimed not at preventing logging, but rather at promoting throughout New York State the kind of scientific forest management FDR was practicing in Hyde Park on private lands. He argued, as he did in talking about his own forests, that such practices would ensure that forests would remain continuously productive, and thus more profitable in the long term, and that the community’s interest in the conservation of natural resources for future use overrode the interests of the individual. Lumber interests managed to get the provision of the Roosevelt-Jones Bill regulating the harvesting of timber on private land struck from the bill, but FDR would continue to espouse the principles behind that provision for the rest of his political career. In fact, in the 1935 speech in which he described Pinchot’s dramatic demonstration of environmental devastation in China, he went on to stress the importance not only of continuing state and federal conservation efforts, but of convincing private landowners, from woodlot owners to large logging operators, of the wisdom of managing trees as an annual crop from which a “sustained yield” could be maintained forever.

Eleanor Roosevelt would later attribute both FDR’s intense commitment to conservation and his Hyde Park forestry activities to Pinchot’s presentation: “[M]y husband was tremendously impressed and he began at once to replant trees on his own land in Dutchess County, New York. He began to look wherever he went for soil erosion and he taught me to be conscious of this wasting of our land too.”

**FROM ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY TO GOVERNOR**

In 1913, FDR left the New York State Senate to accept an appointment as assistant secretary of the Navy in the administration of President Woodrow Wilson, a position he held until 1920. During this period, he continued to pursue his forestry activities in Hyde Park by laying out new plantations and managing the existing forests. His work as assistant secretary of the Navy provided little opportunity to influence public conservation policy, but his interest in the issues did not wane. As a member of the New York State Forestry Association, to which
he was elected vice president in 1914, he kept in touch with others who shared an interest in forestry.

World War I, his unsuccessful campaign for vice president in 1920, and his paralysis by polio in 1921 interrupted both FDR’s political career and his forestry projects in Hyde Park. He did not lay out any new tree plantations between 1917 and 1923. FDR’s struggle to regain the use of his legs after his attack of polio in 1921 would severely limit his engagement in politics until 1928, but his forestry plantations in Hyde Park, his correspondence with friends and neighbors about cooperative forestry projects and about conservation issues, his engagement in developing a conservation program for the Boy Scouts, his membership in the New York State Forestry Association, and his establishment of an experimental farm in Warm Springs, Georgia, in 1926–27, all provided ways in which he could pursue his interest in conservation and scientific forestry management. As he struggled to recover from polio, he devoted more time to his forestry activities in Hyde Park and proposed a number of forestry projects to others.

One of the inspirations for FDR’s forestry plans in Hyde Park was the European forests that had been continuously productive for many years. As a boy in 1891, FDR came across an extensive municipal forest in Bad Hauheim, Germany, during a bicycle trip. He learned that the forest had been successfully managed for the town’s benefit for over 200 years. Apparently this made a tremendous impression on the nine-year-old boy. “The interesting thing to me, as a boy even,” he said in a speech on conservation in 1944, “was that the people in the town didn’t have to pay taxes. They were supported by their own forest.” The managed forests of Europe became a model for proposals FDR made in the 1920s for collaborative forestry projects with other private individuals and for community forests, as well as one of the foundations of his arguments in favor of government programs to improve both public and private forests.

In 1922, he wrote to George D. Pratt: “You are, of course, familiar with the splendid system of state-owned and privately owned forests in Germany, Austria, France, etc., and as many of these forests have been in what might be called continuous operation for several hundred years the fact has been established that they are very worth while from the financial, i.e., money-making point of view, as well as from the national economic point of view. In this country no such forest exists.” Since he thought it unlikely that either the federal or the New York State government would establish “a permanent, annual, dividend-paying investment like the Black Forest” in Germany, he proposed the organization of a company to buy 10,000 or 15,000 acres of land within 100 miles of New York City to be planted and managed for timber production on a business basis. Although he calculated that no dividends would be paid for at least twenty-five years, he believed that proving the long-term value of such an investment would be of great value to the nation and the state, as well as to the children of those investing in
Nothing came of this proposal, but FDR continued to promote the idea of forestry as a worthwhile investment and to encourage cooperative tree-planting projects. In December 1923, he wrote to the Hyde Park Grange and Chapel Corner’s Grange noting that he was placing an order for seedlings to be delivered and planted in April with the State Conservation Commission and inviting members of the grange to place orders at the same time in order to save on shipping costs. “I am firmly convinced that it pays to plant these trees,” he wrote. Even planting an acre of “rocky or otherwise unsuitable land” to trees would increase the value of a farm.26

FDR’s conservationist views were inseparable from his vision of rural life (fig. 1.7). FDR viewed rural life as fundamentally superior to urban life and the moral and economic cornerstone of the nation. It was easier, he believed, for people to live healthy, self-supporting lives in the country; moving to the country could be a solution to urban problems. One way in which FDR expressed his conviction that rural life could be a cure to urban ills, such as crime, was through his involvement in the Boy Scouts. As Neil Maher has demonstrated, FDR’s experience with the Scouting movement was a significant influence on his conception of the program he devised as governor to put unemployed young men to work planting trees and, ultimately, on the idea of the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC).

Like many leaders of the Progressive era, the founders of the Boy Scouts of America believed that the environment in which children grew up shaped human character and behavior. Urban environments were physically unhealthy and morally corrupting. Summers were a particular problem because many urban boys were unemployed and their idleness exposed them to the temptations of violence and petty crime. The countryside offered a cure to these ills, and the Boy Scouts began building summer camps where city boys could spend part of the summer engaged in healthy, outdoor, character-building activities. FDR shared this vision of the benefits of the rural environment. The early Scouting movement did not, however, practice natural resource conservation. In fact, the Scouts who spent summers in camps in upstate New York indiscriminately cut trees for firewood, stripped bark from birch trees, and indulged in other destructive practices. When FDR accepted the presidency of the Boy Scout Foundation of Greater New York in 1922, it offered him an opportunity to use the knowledge he was gaining from his forestry experiments in Hyde Park and to promote the philosophy of
conservation to a new constituency. It seems likely that he chose the position partly for this reason.

On becoming president of the Boy Scout Foundation, FDR declared: “I shall do everything possible to expand what might be called the better understanding of nature by these city-bred boys.” He proposed that forestry become a more important component of the educational programs at Scout camps, and he secured a tract of land from the Palisades Interstate Park Commission where the boys could practice scientific forestry. In 1923 FDR helped set up additional Scout camps that were especially devoted to training the boys in good forestry and conservation practices. These became known as the “Franklin D. Roosevelt Conservation Camps.” The boys at these camps learned to create firebreaks, fight fires, and plant trees. In 1929 FDR and the Boy Scout Foundation made forestry management a central component of the Scouting program they initiated in the camps they established in the 10,600-acre tract of land they had purchased in Sullivan County, New York. By 1930, the forestry programs FDR had initiated in New York were beginning to be adopted by the Boy Scouts nationwide.

**FDR AS GOVERNOR**

The close connection between FDR’s forestry operations on his land in Hyde Park and his political activities is expressed in several themes that run through his private correspondence and public statements on forestry beginning at least as early as 1922:

- Most forestland and most marginal farmland that could be usefully planted with trees are in private hands.
- Planting trees on a crop basis on private land can be made to pay.
- Wealthy landowners can help encourage farmers and other private landowners to plant trees by creating model tree plantations and practicing scientific forestry.
- The health of the nation’s forests, whether public or private, is a matter of public interest. Therefore, the private landowner has an obligation to manage his forests for future generations and the common good and the state has an obligation to promote the best possible forest practices on private land.
- Local, state, and federal governments should encourage tree planting and scientific forestry on private lands by publicizing the need and benefits both to the nation and to the private land owner of good forestry practices, providing technical advice, furnishing low cost seedlings from state nurseries, and collaborating with private landowners in preventing forest fires and combating insects and disease.
- The goal of government policy should be to insure that timber harvesting on private lands can be continuously sustained.29
FDR was convinced that planting trees could be profitable. He wanted his Hyde Park plantations to demonstrate that proposition, and he frequently promoted the idea. When FDR became governor of New York in 1928, he gained the power to initiate and implement public policies that reflected his private conviction that planting marginal land to trees was both a profitable enterprise and a great public good. On February 27, 1929, soon after becoming governor, FDR addressed the New York State Forestry Association annual meeting. The speech is a good example of the way he sought to draw authority from his experience with practical forestry in Hyde Park in order to promote the planting of trees as a cash crop and define a role for government in encouraging private landowners to plant trees. He began by saying that he was speaking to them not as governor, but as an officer and a member of the Forestry Association. In his speech he urged the Forestry Association to emphasize “that the planting of trees is a crop proposition and can be made to pay.” He suggested that the Forestry Association encourage “the richer business citizens to take up forestry on a large scale, with two purposes in view—(1) education of the people to the needs of adequate forest areas, and (2) education of the people to the truth that support of this work is not a charity but an investment.” FDR assured the members of the Forestry Association that the state would do whatever it could to support such educational efforts.

As governor, FDR himself played a leading role in educating the public to the need and benefits of forestry. In a radio address, delivered on March 31, 1930 to observe the beginning of Conservation Week and entitled “Conservation of Natural Resources as a Function of State Government,” FDR traced the beginnings of forest conservation in New York State and noted his own personal role in those efforts: “I am a firm believer in reforestation as a profitable means of utilizing idle, non-agricultural land and have planted from 8,000 to 10,000 trees a year since 1912 on my farm at Hyde Park.” He said that there were thousands of people in the state who owned land that was unsuitable for raising other crops but could be profitably planted to trees, and he encouraged such landowners to do so. Finally, he cited the many benefits of forests in addition to supplying timber: protecting the headwaters of rivers and streams, slowing the runoff of rain and melting snow, restoring soil fertility, preventing the pollution of drinking water, and providing habitat for wildlife.30

The synergy that developed when he was a state senator between FDR’s public and private efforts to promote the cause of forestry continued through his governorship and into his presidency. The New York and New England Sections of the Society of American Foresters decided to hold their annual meeting in Hyde Park in September 1931. There were other good reasons for this organization to meet in Hyde Park—the organizers planned to spend one day on the Rogers Estate and possibly part of another day on the Charles F. Dietrich Estate near Millbrook where there were tree plantations older than FDR’s—but it no doubt occurred
to the organizers of the conference that it would be politically desirable to hold their meeting on the governor’s home turf and to pay respects to his private contributions to the cause of good forestry. “Because of the very constructive work which you have under way on the Roosevelt Estate at Hyde Park, both in the way of forest plantations and thinnings of second growth hardwood,” wrote Hugh Baker, Dean of the New York State College of Forestry, on April 13, 1931, “I am convinced that it would be very worth while for the foresters attending the meetings on September 3 and 4 to go over your old white pine plantations, the more recent plantings in which we have had a part, the improvement thinnings which you have made in second growth hardwood, etc.” He also proposed the production of a pamphlet on the history of FDR’s forest and tree plantations, similar to the one being prepared on the Rogers Estate (fig. 1.8). 31

At the same time, FDR was discussing with Baker and Nelson Brown the possibility of establishing a cooperative forestry project involving several properties in the Hyde Park area that would employ a forester to manage 3,000 to 5,000 acres of forestland and possibly have its own portable mill. “There is no reason why your place, by cooperation with the adjoining woodlands, could not be made a demonstration of the workability as well as the profitability of forestry in the Hudson River Valley Section...,” Brown wrote to FDR in August 1931. Brown drafted a letter proposing such a cooperative forestry project that FDR sent to Helen Elizabeth Crosby and other neighbors. When the foresters gathered in Hyde Park for their conference, FDR urged them to “work out some constructive plan by which wood lot owners over a given territory could pool their wood lot land in units of 10 or 15 or 20 thousand acres and place the management jointly under a Forester for the purpose of proper development, planting, and cutting.” Like FDR’s earlier proposal to form a timberland investment company, nothing came of his proposal to establish forestry cooperatives, but the College of Forestry did establish demonstration tree plantations on FDR’s land.

One of the most important conservation accomplishments of FDR’s term as governor was the passage of the Hewitt Amendment or “reforestation amendment” to the state constitution. The amendment authorized an ambitious reforestation program based on the recommendations of the New York State Reforestation Commission, which had been established in 1928 before FDR became governor. The amendment extended the program to every county in the state in which unused agricultural land existed, and its goal was to buy and reforest over a million acres of abandoned farmland. State Senator Charles Hewitt, a conservative Republican, introduced the bill in 1931, with strong backing from FDR, and FDR recruited Gifford Pinchot to help him promote its adoption. The
Hewitt Amendment provided on a statewide basis for the kind of reforestation work that FDR had begun on his own estate in Hyde Park in 1911 and which he had promoted publicly and privately ever since. The Hewitt Amendment, he said in a speech on February 13, 1931 to a group of farmers at the New York State College of Agriculture at Cornell during Farm and Home Week, “is the basis for all the work that should be done in getting these abandoned farm lands out of agriculture and put to the use for which they are best adapted—raising crops of trees.”

On October 26, 1931, in a radio address to the voters of New York State expressing his personal views on the six amendments on which they were being asked to vote that year, FDR explained the reforestation amendment in the sort of simple, direct language—understandable and appealing to his farm neighbors in Hyde Park—that he would later use in his Fireside Chats: “So there is the situation. We have plenty of abandoned farm land on which timber can be grown profitably. We need the timber and will need it more urgently as time passes. Shall we not put this idle land to use to produce it? And incidentally shall we not give employment to many people in the work of planting and caring for these young trees?”

“And incidentally” was a great understatement. In fact, the coincidence of high unemployment during the Depression and the problem of marginal farmland and environmental devastation caused by floods and dust storms in the American West played a central role in shaping FDR’s public policies as governor and president. FDR already had a keen interest in the employment problem in rural areas. He had observed it first hand in the 1920s both in Dutchess County and in Georgia. Eleanor Roosevelt and her friends, Marion Dickerman and Nancy Cook, had started Val-Kill Industries in 1925, in part to provide training and employment to unemployed farm laborers, and FDR encouraged the experiment. After he became governor, he recognized that a state-sponsored forestry program could be a way of solving both the environmental problem of abandoned farmland and the human problem of unemployment.

As Neil Maher has pointed out, the “Franklin D. Roosevelt Conservation Camps” that FDR helped establish as president of the Boy Scout Foundation provided a model for the programs he initiated as governor. Soon after the stock market crash of September 1929, even before the Depression set in deeply, FDR sought funds from the state legislature for a tree-planting program as a way to put unemployed men to work. In August 1931 he set up the Temporary Emergency Relief Administration (TERA), under whose auspices many men would be employed in conservation work. Beginning in 1932, TERA put over ten thousand men to work creating fire roads and controlling erosion in New York State’s forests and planting trees on the marginal farmland purchased under the Hewitt Amendment. This highly successful program would, in turn, become the model for the CCC.
Just as his appointment in 1911 to the chairmanship of the Forest, Fish and Game Committee may have stimulated his initial forestry efforts in Hyde Park, FDR’s active role in conservation policy as governor of New York in the late 1920s and early ’30s may have helped inspire the more ambitious forestry program that he undertook on his own land at that time. His public and private forestry initiatives certainly fitted each other hand and glove. As he worked with Nelson Brown to expand and improve his own forests, FDR drew on his knowledge and passion for forestry to institute forestry programs on the state level.

**THE CONSERVATION PRESIDENT**

FDR’s program to simultaneously ease unemployment while addressing the problem of abandoned farmland by putting thousands of young men to work planting trees and doing soil conservation work became a centerpiece of his campaign for president and of New Deal planning. In his acceptance speech after he was nominated for the presidency in 1932, FDR noted that he favored public works as an emergency employment measure and gave forestry as an example: “[W]e know that a very hopeful and immediate means of relief, both for the unemployed and for agriculture, will come from a wide plan of the converting of many millions of acres of marginal and unused land into timberland through reforestation.” He believed that such a public works program could not only employ a million men, but also be self-sustaining, “and therefore capable of being financed by the issuance of bonds which are made secure by the fact that the growth of tremendous crops will provide adequate security for the investment.”

The forestry programs of the New Deal were not financed by bonds, nor did they turn out to be self-sustaining, but FDR’s assertion here that they would be is another indication of how deeply his public vision was colored by his conviction, encouraged by his Hyde Park forestry operations, that planting trees could be made profitable.

By the time FDR was president, he was acutely aware of the problems of impoverished people and impoverished land in rural areas, both from personal experience in Hyde Park and Warm Springs and through his efforts to address such problems as governor. Several of the New Deal programs in which FDR took the keenest interest, including the CCC and the Resettlement Administration, exploited the coincidence of high unemployment and a growing supply of abandoned farms, devastated forests, and acres of land scarred by floods and dust storms. Rexford Tugwell, a member of FDR’s “Brain Trust” who was intimately involved in the development of the CCC and other New Deal programs just before and during the early days of FDR’s presidency, recalled later: “It was not new, of course, to suggest that [poor people and poor land] went together. It was, however, novel to suggest that the rehabilitation of both ought to be undertaken jointly in a Federal program.”
FDR began eagerly planning the CCC with Nelson Brown’s help in December 1932 even before he took office as president. The establishment of the CCC in March 1933 was one of the first acts of his new administration, and it became one of the most popular and successful of the New Deal programs. Over the nine years of its existence it employed more than 3 million men in conservation work (fig. 1.9). The results of their work are still evident in the American landscape today all over the country, particularly in national and state parks. It is easy to find red and white pine plantations, planted by the CCC “boys,” that look very much like the red and white pine plantations still extant on Roosevelt’s Hyde Park land.

Other New Deal programs, strongly promoted by FDR, also embodied the vision of conservation that had guided him since he began his public and private forestry activities in 1911. Of particular note are: (1) the Soil Conservation Service, created in 1933, which provided expertise and resources to private landowners in order to encourage forest plantings and improvement and other measures to control soil erosion; (2) the Tennessee Valley Authority, which built power dams, but also strongly encouraged and supported good forestry and soil conservation practices; (3) the Flood Control Act of 1936 which gave the federal government a significant role in protecting watersheds; (4) the Norris Doxey Farm Forestry Act of 1937 that made the expertise of foresters available to farmers; and (5) the “shelterbelt” or Prairie States Forestry Project, as it was officially called, an ambitious program initiated in 1934 to plant trees within a 200-mile-wide belt reaching 1,000 miles from the Texas Panhandle to North Dakota in order to protect croplands against prevailing winds and drought. Over 222 million trees were planted under the shelterbelt program over eight years between 1935 and 1942.

FDR also led the effort to expand the National Forest System and increase forestry research.

Nelson Brown himself was a vital link between FDR’s Hyde Park forestry operations and his New Deal conservation programs. Brown not only served as FDR’s forester in Hyde Park during his presidency and kept the president’s Hyde Park forestry projects before the public in a series of articles, but also occasionally advised the president on national forest policy. He was not afraid to be frank with him. At the end of a letter of December 3, 1941, for example, in which he reports on various matters related to FDR’s tree plantations in Hyde Park, Brown told the president: “The Forest Service is reaching a low mark in morale under the Acting Chief. Some unfortunate appointments have been made. If you transfer them lock,
stock and barrel to the Interior Department and could get someone like Silcox, with something of his attractive personality, enterprise, vision and enthusiasm, the Forest Service would move forward. They have been entirely too active politically in steering their own destiny. I hope you can find an able successor to Silcox to clear up an unfortunate situation.”

FDR’s leadership in conservation involved not only specific programs but the idea of national economic, and especially natural resource, planning. In the end, he was not able to overcome strong resistance in Congress to the concept. But his interest ensured that planning was part of the public debate, and it stimulated important long-range studies within government departments, such as the preparation in 1933 of “A National Plan for American Forestry” by the U.S. Forest Service.

FDR’s passion for planning seems in part rooted in his personal interest in forestry and his vision of conservation. Forestry requires a long view. Trees are not an annual crop. Even Christmas trees take about eight years to reach saleable size and trees for timber much longer. “Of course, one thing that we have to face,” FDR told the New York State Forestry Association in 1929, “is that we people with gray hair who start in to plant trees now will be under the ground a good many years, in all probability, before those trees are grown to maturity or to marketable size. But on the other hand, the same thing has been going on for centuries in other countries, and they realize that what they plant now is bound to bring back a great many dividends for their children and grandchildren.”

As FDR often pointed out, Americans were used to thinking that their nation’s natural resources were inexhaustible. Part of the role he assumed as governor and president was to help educate Americans to the long view. He himself seemed to relish the long-range thinking that went into acquiring land, laying out tree plantations, managing the forest, and beginning the process of selective cutting that would, if sustained, go on forever. It is impossible to say how much his personal experience with long-range economic activity in Hyde Park and Warm Springs shaped the public policies he pursued as governor and president, but the enthusiasm for economic planning that he expressed as a political leader seems of a piece with the zeal he displayed in plotting the future of his forest properties, especially since the planning he proposed often involved the nation’s natural resources.

When traveling about the country during his campaign for the vice presidency in 1920, FDR recalled in a speech in 1934, he became impressed with how the country “had grown up like Topsy without any particular planning.” He realized that the era of “limitless opportunity” was over. It was time to start preparing carefully for the future. As governor of New York he had been able to put this conviction into action. Realizing that “every acre ought to be used for some definite purpose and that it ought not to be used for a wrong purpose,” he
persuaded the legislature to finance a survey of every acre in the state to determine its best use. This determination to manage natural resources in the most effective way is identical to the practical, long-range approach FDR took to his own land in Hyde Park. Brown remembered that “He wanted to know if certain trees were planted, when they would reach a certain size, what they would be worth at that time, whether to plant trees for such products as Christmas trees, pulpwood, posts, poles, cross ties, fuelwood, or other important products.”

In “The President Suggests a Comprehensive Study of the Forest Land Problem of the United States,” a message he delivered to Congress on March 14, 1938, FDR proposed a joint Congressional committee to study the forest land problem in the United States and draw up a plan of action for addressing it. The committee’s report would then serve as a guide to legislation during the next session of the Congress in 1939. This message is among FDR’s most vigorous statements of the importance of forests to the nation’s welfare, the danger of continuing destructive cutting practices, and the urgent need for coordinated federal and state action to deal with the situation. The message rings with conviction. It is impossible to determine how much of it was written by FDR himself, but when he begins by stating, “Forests are intimately tied into our whole social and economic life,” it may remind us that in the microcosm of Hyde Park, FDR knew intimately how his forestry operations were connected to the economy of the community in which he lived and to the lives of the people who depended on him for employment. FDR hoped that the proposed study would pay special attention to the role of the federal and state governments in making sure that the public interest in the good management of private forest lands was well protected. Congress did form a Joint Committee on Forestry, which proposed a sixteen-point program for the protection and rehabilitation of the nation’s forests, including expanded federal and state regulation of forestry practices on privately owned land.

**FDR’s Advocacy of Conservation**

FDR loved to educate others about good forest management, planting trees on marginal land, soil erosion control, and forest fire prevention—to spread the “gospel of conservation.” Nelson Brown, who thought that FDR contributed more to American forest conservation than Gifford Pinchot, Theodore Roosevelt, and the other pioneers of the movement, believed that FDR’s greatest contribution was in making the idea of larger and better-managed forests familiar to the average person. He accomplished this in a wide variety of ways: through his personal correspondence with his neighbors in the Hudson Valley, through conversations with farmers in Hyde Park and Warm Springs, through the establishment of demonstration tree plantations on his Hyde Park estate, through
the tours of his plantations and managed forests he gave to visitors to Hyde Park, and in numerous speeches, radio addresses, and press conferences.

FDR’s urge to proselytize on behalf of tree planting and forest management extended to members of Congress, the diplomatic corps, heads of state, and royalty. When he met King Ibn Saud on the way back from Yalta in 1945, FDR proposed that planting trees could reclaim parts of the desert in Saudi Arabia. As important as any of the specific programs that he championed, was his ability to explain the importance of these programs and of national forest management to the public at large. Because of the intimate knowledge and love of forests that he had acquired through years of experience on his land in Hyde Park and as a result of the hours he had spent discussing tree farming with neighbors and other foresters, he spoke with great conviction about the principles of good forestry and the importance of forests to the national welfare.44

From 1934 until 1941, the front lawn of Moses Smith’s house on the Roosevelt Estate was the site of an annual “Homecoming” organized by the Roosevelt Home Club around Labor Day (fig. 1.10). The Home Club was a non-partisan organization created in 1929 to provide political support for FDR.45 When FDR spoke at the first “Homecoming” in 1934, he had just returned from a cross-country tour seeing first hand the conditions in the Depression-ridden nation and the results of measures that his administration had undertaken to confront them. He noted particularly the problems in the West created by the settlers from the East and Middle West who had put a great deal of land into cultivation “that ought never to have been cultivated.” Characteristically, he suggested to his audience that they were closely related to these Western farmers through kinship, the intertwining of ethnic origins, experience, and common history. As a boy, he remembered hearing about an area around Browns Pond north of the Town of Clinton in Dutchess County that people called “Kansas.” FDR and other local historians wondered about the origin of this name. They concluded that it dated back to 1850 when a railroad agent persuaded six or eight families in that area, probably on marginal land, to get on board an emigrant train in Poughkeepsie and move out to Kansas territory. In his travels west of the Mississippi, FDR said, people with relatives back in Dutchess County often approached him. “It rather thrills me to think of how this country all ties in together in that we, and when you come right down
to it everyone of us has, proudly, an enormous number of cousins—they may be distant cousins—living in all sort[s] of places in the United States....” This web of cousinship unifying the nation was reinforced in FDR’s mind by the blending of ethnic strains. Unlike Europe where nations struggled with each other, in the United States, he noted, “we have, most of us, got half a dozen different racial strains in us and yet here we are, all Americans.” Finally, FDR cited Lord Brice’s observation that Americans have a “trying-out system through the different States.” They can experiment with solutions to an economic problem in one part of the country, see if it works, compare it to experiments in other parts of the country, and eventually work out a solution.46 This, of course, was the method FDR was applying through the programs of the New Deal. It was also the approach FDR had been using on his farmland in Hyde Park.

Having built up this vision of interconnection between the different parts of the nation and of the nation as a large economic laboratory, FDR came to the lesson he had prepared his Hyde Park neighbors to understand. On the surface, Dutchess County looked fairly prosperous (“no drought, pretty good crops”), but he hoped that the Home Club would have more meetings to which they would invite speakers to come and “tell the truth about conditions and about the methods that are being used to try to solve those conditions. The more we do that,” he said, “the more we will realize that if a farm family is on the verge of starvation in North Dakota, we people in the Town of Hyde Park are helping to pay to keep that family from actual starvation; if we have made mistakes in the settling of the country in the past, we in the Town of Hyde Park have got to pay to correct those mistakes. In other words, that we have a definite stake, not merely the spiritual side of it, or the social side of it, or the patriotic side, but the actual financial side of it.”47 So, like Hyde Park—FDR’s model for American democracy—the United States was a network of neighbors tied together by the land, economic and family relationships, and a common experience with deep roots in the past. Kansas and North Dakota were not far-off places of no concern to the residents of Hyde Park; “Kansas” was in Dutchess County.

In this and other speeches, FDR expressed a deeply organic sense of the relationships between the land and the people dependent on it for a living and between the past, present, and future. In his address to the Green Pastures Rally in Charlotte, North Carolina, in 1936, FDR remarked that a writer had recently said of him that he “reverts to terms of land and water in his approach to any great public problem.” He had to admit that this was true, and in his Green Pastures speech he not only did so, but also demonstrated how deeply embedded such imagery is in the Western literary tradition. The speech was a sermon on economics, and his text, inspired by the name of the rally, was the two resonant lines from the Twenty-third Psalm: “He maketh me to lie down in green pastures;/ He leadeth me beside the still waters.” These lines, he said, convey an “idealized
security of the body and the mind.” But FDR gave them a concrete meaning by contrasting the images they evoke with the economic and environmental disasters taking place in the American West during the Depression:

Green pastures! Millions of our fellow Americans, with whom I have been associating in the past two weeks, out on the Great Plains of America, live with prayers and hopes for the fulfillment of what those words imply. Still waters! Millions of other Americans, with whom I also have associated of late, live with prayers and hopes either that the floods may be stilled—floods that bring with them destruction and disaster to fields and flocks, to homesteads and cities—or else they look for the Heaven-sent rains that will fill their wells, their ponds and their peaceful streams.48

FDR saw the restoration of the land—the prevention of dust bowls and floods through soil conservation practices, the rotation of crops, the planting of trees—as intimately bound up with restoring the livelihoods of the people living on the land: “[L]ong before I went to Washington, I was convinced that the long road that leads to green pastures and still waters had to begin with reasonable prosperity. It seemed axiomatic to me that a cotton farmer who could get only five cents a pound for his crop could not be in a position properly to fertilize his land, or to terrace it, or to rotate his crops....”49 The well-being of people and land were inseparable; without the restoration of America’s rural economy the restoration and conservation of its natural resources could not be successful. FDR would understand perfectly the current dilemma of trying to persuade the people of developing nations to fully protect their environments before they have achieved economic well-being.

FDR’s ability to conceptualize great national problems through images of water and land brought those problems and the solutions he proposed down to earth. For example, FDR skillfully wove together the themes of forest conservation and preparedness for war in his speech dedicating the Great Smoky Mountains National Park on September 2, 1940 (fig. 1.11). To him and his audience the dangers of American involvement in World War II must have been of far greater concern than the preservation of new parklands. But by making the two concerns one, FDR greatly strengthened his case for both. The speech represented a shift in rhetoric from earlier speeches dealing with public parks and forests, but he sought, as he often did before, to discover or create organic connections between the history of the American land and the history of its people. He began by comparing the situation of the American people in 1940 to the situation of American frontiersmen who struggled to clear the forest while facing the danger of Indian attack. The danger today, he argued, was as close and more deadly than it was then. To meet these dangers, he and the Congress were establishing “the obligation inherent in our
citizenship to serve our forces for defense through training in many capacities.”
We must, he said, prepare in every possible way. Although he did not use
the word “draft” or refer very specifically to the bill establishing a draft then
before Congress, the speech was really an argument in favor of the bill. Despite
opposition from the isolationists, the bill passed on September 14, two weeks after
he delivered these remarks.

In this speech FDR moved back and forth between the effort to preserve the land
and the immediate need to preserve liberty until the two were woven together:
“It is good and right that we should conserve these mountain heights of the
old frontier for the benefit of the American people. But in this hour we have to
safeguard a greater thing: the right of the people of this country to live as free men.
Our vital task of conservation is to preserve the freedom that our forefathers won
in this land....”

He noted that Americans had realized that in taking advantage of a bountiful
nature, they “committed excesses which we are today seeking to atone for.”
Characteristically, just as he conceived of the CCC as a program to meet
both the environmental problem of deforestation and the human problem of
unemployment, he saw the problem not just in terms of natural resources but of
human resources as well: “We used or destroyed much of our natural heritage
just because that heritage was bountiful. We slashed our forests, we used our
soils, we encouraged floods, we overconcentrated our wealth, we disregarded
our unemployed....” In recent years, he said—in other words, during the New
Deal years—Americans had been “conserving the bounties of nature, thinking
in terms of the whole of nature. We are trying our best to attain employment for
all who would work and can work, and to provide a greater assurance of security
throughout the life of the family.” FDR went on to argue that America didn’t have
to abandon these efforts to preserve and extend democracy at home in order
to defend itself. Preparing to meet the external threat was an extension of these
efforts to conserve liberty.

For FDR, preserving the Great Smoky Mountains was symbolically preserving the
liberty of the frontiersmen, but also correcting their excesses of individualism. It
was learning from the past and thinking of the future; it was considering the whole
of nature and all the people, not just the privileged few in the present. The Great
Smoky dedication speech was a skillful formulation of the American ideal of e
pluribus unum: a dynamic balance between the liberty of individuals and the need
for unity and self-sacrifice to preserve that liberty.

In his efforts to spread the gospel of conservation, FDR liked to draw on his own
experience with forestry, to show how private forestry efforts contributed to the
public good and how government conservation programs could, in turn, increase
the productivity of private farms. In a speech at Clarksburg, West Virginia, in
October 1944, FDR said that as he looked around at the hills of West Virginia, “I don’t see the trees I ought to see.” Then he reviewed together his own lifetime engagement with forestry and the increasing public interest in conservation. They were for him one story. He told his audience about his visit as a boy to the forest in Germany whose production of timber supported the town it grew in. He told of being appointed to the “Conservation Committee” when he became a state senator and how, at the same time, he started planting trees on his land in Hyde Park as an experiment. He also cleared out the “no-account trees” in the existing forest, and a quarter of a century later he was able to harvest “some perfectly splendid trees.” He reminded them of the shelterbelt program in the West to protect the soil from drying winds, “one of those ‘crackpot’ things, for which I have been criticized” but which turned out to be a success: “Not much ran downhill and the farmers are getting more crops and better crops out there on the prairies in the lea of these rows of trees.” When toward the end of the speech he delivered what might be called his conservation mantra—“Forestry pays from the practical point of view. I have proved that.”—he meant that he had demonstrated the point both in his private forestry efforts and in the public programs he had initiated. Someday, he said, he hoped to come back to West Virginia and find that people heard what he said and began planting trees all over the state.

**FDR’s Conservationist Image**

FDR had a reputation as a tree farmer among conservationists and foresters in New York State by the 1920s. When he ran for president in 1932, he received the endorsement of the Society of American Foresters, which proclaimed, “Franklin D. Roosevelt has made full use of his home forestry experiments and experiences.” Under his leadership, New York State had “the largest and most constructive forestry plan yet adopted by any state.”51 When president, FDR’s personal interest in and knowledge of forestry, and his conservation achievements as governor of New York, were well known. In a 1936 article in the popular magazine, *The Saturday Evening Post*, Albert Atwood wrote: “[W]hen Mr. Roosevelt became President he carried to Washington a great belief in the principle of conservation; he had been an outdoor man; he had practiced forestry on his own 1,200-acre estate, and, as governor of New York, he had advocated and helped carry out a great land-buying and tree-planting program.”52 Although Atwood questioned whether the New Deal had done as much for conservation as some claimed, the press was generally positive about the conservation policies of the Roosevelt administration, and they received widespread coverage from 1933 until 1942 when the war effort took over center stage.53

Foresters took a special interest in FDR’s conservation practices. His association with the New York State College of Forestry at Syracuse University, beginning
in 1928, and his subsequent close working relationship with forestry professor Nelson Brown, helped bring him into national prominence in the field at the same time that he was achieving high political office (fig. 1.12). In 1933, forestry students dedicated their yearbook, *Empire Forester*, to FDR as the leading proponent of conservation in the nation. Brown himself wrote four articles between 1931 and 1943 on various aspects of FDR’s forestry operations for *American Forests*, *Journal of Forestry*, and *Southern Lumberman*. Ray F. Bower, a colleague of Brown’s at the College of Forestry, also wrote an article on FDR’s trees for *American Forests*. Brown helped arrange the college’s publication of the six-panel flyer in 1931 entitled “Forestry Practice on the Roosevelt Farm.” In 1934, FDR became the first person to receive the Schlich Memorial Medal from the Society of American Foresters for his outstanding work in the field of conservation.54 These relationships, publications, and achievements held up FDR’s forestry practices as a model and spread the news of his extensive tree planting and forest management activities in the profession. Brown also published articles on FDR’s trees in the *New York Times* in 1933 and *LIFE* magazine in 1942, thus informing the general public about FDR’s forestry operations. An article by Arthur C. Bartlett on FDR’s tree-farming operations appeared in April 1933 in *Country Home*.

The number and content of these articles suggest that FDR knew the value of getting the story of his tree plantations out there and of demonstrating that his conservation policies were rooted in his own practical experience. When he was supervising the cutting of oak on FDR’s land in the early 1940s, Brown wrote the president that he was planning to write some articles about the operations: “I think they should be stimulating in showing farmers and other small woodland owners how forestry may be made a profitable operation as well as serving in the defense program and observing the best principles of conservation.”55 All of the articles stress that FDR was not a “hobby farmer” but a serious timber grower interested in making a profit. “He realizes that aesthetics are in order about his home, but out in the forest, it plays a very small, in fact negligible, part.”56

Brown’s articles, which FDR encouraged, seem to have been aimed not only at holding up FDR’s tree plantations and forestry management practices as a model for other landowners, but to secure political support for him among forest owners and professional foresters. “As long as we have men like Governor Roosevelt in our state capitals,” Brown wrote in *American Forests* in 1931, “we can rest assured...
that our conservation interests are not only being defended and protected but still more important are being developed and extended.”57 Brown’s *New York Times* article was headed by an editor’s note that read: “The Civilian Conservation Corps, made up of unemployed young men who are now about to improve our national and State forests, might be said to have had its genesis on President Roosevelt’s estate at Hyde Park.” In the body of the article, Brown described the worn-out and marginal land on which FDR had been planting trees for almost twenty years and said that it was just this type of land on which the state of New York was carrying out its reforestation program and on which the CCC would soon be planting trees throughout the nation. He also emphasized FDR’s “strong interest in the experimental approach to problems” that expressed itself in the plantings he made in order to see which trees grew best under which conditions. “As Chief Executive of our national government, Mr. Roosevelt is now in a position to apply on a wider scale the lessons he has learned in his forestry work at Hyde Park. He realizes as well as any one the value of well-cared forests to the nation that owns them.”58

Arthur Bartlett’s article in *Country Home*, “The Magazine of Farm, Garden and Home,” which appears to have been aimed at a fairly well-off rural audience of farmers and part-time farmers and gardeners, is particularly interesting because it provides some insight both into how FDR’s tree-farming activities in Hyde Park were perceived by his Dutchess County neighbors and by an outside journalist, and how FDR sought to draw lessons from his Hyde Park experiments that could be applied nationally. Bartlett began by recounting the response he got from a barber in Poughkeepsie when he asked him if FDR was a farmer. Not in the sense that you would find him raking hay or digging potatoes, the barber said, but his place in Hyde Park “is more than just a big house with a tennis court. He’s got a lot of land up there, and he works it—gets about all there is to be had out of it.... ‘Course, most of his land he’s put into raising trees. I don’t know whether you’d say that makes him a farmer or not; but, after all, he’s making his land work for him.” Bartlett himself noted that FDR, like Thomas Jefferson, was a man of multiple talents and occupations and came away convinced that “When his mind is intent on farming he is a farmer.” What convinced him was FDR’s detailed knowledge of the many different forestry projects he showed Bartlett on their tour of the Roosevelt estate. “Only one who was definitely a part of the land could have been so intimate with every acre of it; only one who was himself using the land could have been so alive to all the land was doing.”59

The forestry experiment that especially excited FDR at this time, and which he explained in great detail both to Bartlett and to Ray Bower who reported on it in *American Forests*, was his scheme to drain “Tamarack Swamp,” clear it of the red maples growing there, and replant it with several different species to see what, if anything, could be profitably grown there (fig. 1.13). The project was entirely his...
idea and met with a good deal of skepticism from foresters (including, presumably, Brown). In the version of the story FDR told Bartlett, he turned his experiment into a parable for the nation. FDR told him that he had planned out the project in his mind but had been too busy as governor of New York to carry it out. In the fall of 1931, with unemployment rising and winter approaching, he was spending hours trying to devise an effective state relief program, believing all the time that the best relief would be providing people with work that needed doing. “Coming home to Krum Elbow for a weekend he got in to his car and drove out over his property. He came to the soft maple swamp. There it was—a job that needed doing!” FDR hired eight unemployed men to drain the swamp with ditches and cut the soft maples up for cordwood. He sold the cordwood over the summer for a net profit of $300, then reinvested the $300 in replanting the swamp as a long-term investment. “Thus, at no cost to himself, Mr. Roosevelt had given eight men employment throughout the winter and had converted his swamp into a piece of land with great potential value. A good piece of husbandry!” And a wonderful piece of political storytelling! One suspects that insight and action did not fall together quite so neatly and that the economics did not work out quite so favorably. Nevertheless, this is another excellent example of how FDR connected in his mind the forest experiments he was conducting on his private land and the policies he was pursuing in his public life. What is interesting here is that he was not just holding up his efforts in Hyde Park as an example of how marginal lands could be turned to profit through planting trees, but of how the problem of unemployment could be relieved in part by private landowners making forestry investments at no cost to themselves.61

One of FDR’s Hyde Park forestry projects, which received national publicity, gave him particular pleasure because it illustrated how good forestry practices could yield both profit to the private landowner and good to the nation. In 1942, after American entry into World War II, FDR arranged to sell red and white oak on his property for use in building patrol boats and other craft for the Navy. FDR must have been thrilled to be able to contribute personally in this way to strengthening America’s defenses for the war. Each stage of the process—from marking, cutting, skidding, trucking, and milling the logs to building the boats—was recorded by a photographer for a photo essay on the project that appeared in LIFE magazine (fig 1.14). FDR benefited economically from the sale of these trees, but this transaction meant much more to him than that. In his speech at Clarksburg, West
Virginia, in 1944, in which he advocated planting trees on the state’s deforested hillsides, he proudly referred to his sale of oaks both as an example of the economic benefits of forestry and as a contribution to the war effort: “And in this war, back home, I cut last year—and this is not very Christian—over four thousand dollars’ worth net of oak trees, to make into submarine chasers and landing craft and other implements of war. And I am doing it again this year.” In harvesting these oaks, he was once more rooting his vision of America literally and symbolically in the land of Hyde Park, creating a vital connection between local resources and national strength, and incorporating the products of the land into things of service to the nation. Just as his forestry experiments became a model for some of his programs to combat the human and environmental problems of the Great Depression, the sale of his oak trees became an instrument to combat foreign foes.

A CONSERVATION LEGACY AT HYDE PARK

The scale, multiplicity, and visibility of the conservation projects carried on during the New Deal period went far beyond anything attempted before. They involved many different federal and state government agencies and affected large numbers of private citizens, including farmers and other landowners, unemployed men and in some cases women who were set to work on CCC and WPA projects, and people who enjoyed the expanded recreational facilities in national and state parks. As A. L. Riesch Owen wrote in Conservation Under FDR, soil erosion control, water conservation, the preservation of wildlife, and other conservation activities, though not originated by the Roosevelt administration, “did, for the first time, become a part of the everyday thought and action of a greatly increased proportion of citizens. The magnitude of the work itself was new and itself inspiring. What is certain is that many new concepts were introduced in the planning for the wise use of natural resources: the planned development of a whole river basin; a multipurpose approach to the conservation of water; large-scale government supervision and, indeed, competition in the field of public utilities; national planning for the coordinated use of natural resources and the coordinated action of diverse governmental agencies in conservation work; and finally the concept of development by the people for the people...”
through decentralized planning. All of these were largely new ideas.\textsuperscript{64} Although these ideas were developed and promoted by many different individuals within the administration, in Congress, and by private organizations and individuals, FDR was the leading public voice in their support, explaining them in language the press and public could understand and pointing out the long-range economic benefits for the nation. In doing so he often referred to his own practical experience in Hyde Park and Warm Springs, as well as to his personal observations of conditions around the country that were sharpened by his knowledge of forestry and farming. His knowledge of and personal engagement in conservation practices gave his statements on the subject authority. And his confident assertion from the beginning of his experiments in Hyde Park that planting and harvesting trees was profitable served him well politically. Scientific forestry built wealth for the individual and for the nation, while at the same time preventing erosion and protecting watersheds.

The vision of the relationship between the land and the American people which FDR brought to the presidency and with which he imbued his conservation speeches, such as the ones at the Green Pastures Rally and the Great Smoky Mountains National Park dedication, can be traced back to the experiences in Hyde Park that shaped his thinking, not just in his youth, but throughout his life. Today most of us don’t live in or even come from communities resembling the Hyde Park of FDR’s day. As a result, the nature and meaning of FDR’s relationship to the people and land of Hyde Park may be lost on us. To tourists, Hyde Park is a set of house museums and a presidential history museum in a scenic setting. To the residents of Hyde Park, it is bedroom community or a business community serving its residents and visitors. For neither the tourists nor the residents is it the farming community it was in FDR’s time, much less the living, organic set of human, economic, and historical relationships with the land that were continuous with FDR’s sense of who he was and what America was or could be. For FDR, Hyde Park had a history, a vital present in which he as Franklin D. Roosevelt, “tree grower,” had an important role to play quite aside from his role as president, and it had a future. He had a deep knowledge of the town’s history, acquired not only through reading, but through exploration on foot and horseback and later, by car, through reading the markers of the past in the land, and through long chats with his neighbors. That history was rich with many personal threads. The future of Hyde Park was also personal, something he intended to help shape and graft on the past. Nothing thrilled him more than to be a shaper of the land and its human history. He took this consciousness with him into his presidency and wove its lessons into his policies and its themes into his speeches. FDR’s strength as a leader grew, in part, out of his ability to extend his economic, social, and emotional connection to the land in Hyde Park to the nation as a whole.
Although the fabric of land and community that existed in FDR’s day can never be restored, there still remain some significant remnants of FDR’s tree plantations and native hardwoods that could be useful in educating visitors about FDR’s intense engagement in scientific forest management and the role it played in his political career. Two of the most accessible and significant of these are the large mature white pine plantation that lies across the pond to the north and east of Val-Kill (Plot D), and the hardwood forest below the Top Cottage porch which contains beautiful specimens of red and white oak (figs. 1.15, 1.16). The first of these was planted by FDR in 1914; the second represents the kind of hardwood forest from which FDR selectively harvested oak trees in the 1940s for use in building patrol boats for the Navy, although the trees he cut came largely from land farther to the west. There are also numerous plantations of white pine, red pine, and Norway spruce between the Post Road and Violet Avenue, planted by FDR between 1912 and 1934—these include his amateur plantations on the Home Farm and those planted by the College of Forestry on the Tompkins Farm. Although they are not visible from any of these highways, they lie along the Hyde Park Trail (Roosevelt Farm Lane) that connects Springwood with Val-Kill. A small grove of white pine followed by a small grove of tulip-poplar lie near the top of the River Road above the ice pond, although these were probably never intended for harvest. The walking trails below
Springwood, between the Post Road and Violet Avenue, and between Val-Kill and Top Cottage, are remnants of the network of roads that enabled FDR to reach his various tree plantations and native hardwoods forest. Although FDR’s practices of scientific forest management and timber harvesting have not been sustained, these forests and roads provide living documentation of FDR’s relationship to the land. They are the mature crops that he envisioned would be managed and harvested in a sustainable way forever. And, since FDR’s conifer plantations mirror the conifer plantations planted by the CCC that can be found in national and state parks, they also represent his vision for the nation.
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PART 2. COUNTRY PLACE AND TREE FARM: LAND-USE HISTORY OF THE ROOSEVELT ESTATE

JOHN E. AUWAERTER
Franklin D. Roosevelt—American president, New York State governor, and progressive conservationist—left a lasting and significant imprint on his family’s Hudson River estate. To him, this place where he was born in 1883 and buried in 1945 was both an intricate part of the Hudson Valley’s heritage and a place to invest in its future. Together with his mother, Sara Delano Roosevelt, FDR directed improvements to the original part of the estate, Springwood, purchased by his father in 1867. With a deep appreciation for nature and history, and concerned over the increasing loss of agricultural land that was undermining Hyde Park and other rural communities, FDR began to acquire adjoining farms in 1911 to demonstrate good stewardship through conservation. By 1938, he had enlarged the family estate from 624 acres at the time of his father’s death in 1900, to over 1,500 acres that he managed in large part for productive use through farming and forestry.

Today, the former Roosevelt Estate is a complex landscape shaped by a century of changing values toward the land. It is not a single or elaborate country place such as the Vanderbilt Mansion, but rather a collection of properties that include two Hudson River estates, Springwood and the adjoining J. R. Roosevelt Place (Red House) of FDR’s half brother; five farms on the adjoining uplands; and two country retreats, Val-Kill and Top Cottage. It also incorporates a presidential library and national historic site established by FDR as part of his vision of public stewardship of the property, as well as suburban residential and commercial development that resulted from Roosevelt family management and changes in regional land use in post–World War II America.

BEFORE THE ROOSEVELTS, PRE-1867

The scenic and bountiful Hudson Valley was home to Native Americans for centuries before the arrival of Europeans. By the late seventeenth century, land speculators were establishing property boundaries, and with settlement came roads, buildings, and clearing of the forest for agriculture. European settlement patterns were based in large part on the underlying natural landforms and patterns of property subdivision. The development of the landscape during this early period established the spatial organization and circulation patterns of the landscape that would persist through the years of Roosevelt family ownership after 1867.
THE NATURAL SETTING

The landscape of the Roosevelt Estate owes much to the natural systems that shaped it over millions of years prior to its use as a farm and country home. The natural setting consists of two primary physiographic regions: the Hudson Lowlands that form most of the estate from the banks of the Hudson River to Val-Kill, composed of fertile terraces separated by rough land of extensive rock outcroppings; and to the east, the Low Taconics, foothills to the Taconic Mountains (fig. 2.1). The highest point of the estate, Dutchess Hill where FDR built Top Cottage, is more than 400 feet above the level of the Hudson River.1 Across the valley, visible now and always, are the Catskill and Shawangunk Mountains.

Most of the bedrock within the estate, a tan bluish-gray, brown-weathering sedimentary rock known as the Austin Glen Formation, was formed in ancient seas during the Cambrian and Ordovician epochs between 543 and 443 million years ago. This rock contains two components: graywackes (grayish sandstone containing much clay, feldspar, and angular rock fragments) and shale (thin-bedded rock composed of very fine clay or clay-sized material). East of Val-Kill, about half of the bedrock is classified as Snake Hill shale and Walloomsac slate, composed of thin and discontinuous limestone and conglomerate. Due to the collision of tectonic plates, the bedrock was uplifted as part of the Alleghanian
mountain-building event about 250 million years ago, deforming the once horizontal sedimentary rock into vertical strata. This uplifted rock is visible in the many jagged ridges that trend in a northeast–southwest direction to the west of Springwood and in the land between the Post Road and Violet Avenue.

Continental glaciers have had a major impact on the geology of the Hudson Valley, giving it much of its present topographic character. The last glacier, the Laurentide Ice Sheet that began spreading south into the northern United States approximately 95,000 years ago, was of such great weight and force that it depressed the earth, ground down mountains into rounded hills, and broadened valleys. As the glacier made its final retreat from the Hudson Valley approximately 12,500 years ago, it left behind debris formerly bound in the ice, primarily glacial till composed of pebbles, clay, sand, and silt. The meltwaters collected to form Lake Albany, a large waterbody that covered much of the Hudson Lowlands, and then retreated after 4,000 to 5,000 years to the present banks of the Hudson River. As the meltwaters subsided, the Hudson River deposited glacial outwash along its banks, eroding the earlier lake sediments and revealing underlying rock. The erosion caused by Lake Albany and the primeval Hudson River in part formed two broad terraces, called “the Flatts” in the eighteenth century and known by FDR as “plateaus.” Within the present-day Roosevelt Estate, there are two main terraces: the lower terrace along the Post Road, and the upper terrace along Creek Road and Violet Avenue. The lower terrace quickly drops off at the south end of the estate, a topographic feature FDR knew as “Teller’s Hill” (see fig. 2.1).

The terrace soils are deep and well drained, and have historically been among the most agriculturally productive in Dutchess County. The soils on the rockier terrain along the outcroppings on the eroded edges of the terraces, such as above the Hudson River west of the FDR Home and between the Post Road and Violet Avenue, are also derived from glacial outwash, but are shallow and generally not good for cultivation, though adequate for pasture (fig. 2.2). This terrain was described in an 1842 gazetteer of New York State as being “...somewhat hilly, soil,
gravelly loam and clay underlaid by slate, which breaks through the surface in some places, forming high and rugged ridges.”

During the thousands of years since the retreat of the last glacier, the topography of Hudson Valley has also been shaped by the ongoing force of water erosion, especially along the creeks that cross the estate in a generally southwesterly direction (see fig. 2.1). The largest, the Fall Kill (kill meaning “creek” in Dutch), drains the uplands of the Low Taconics and runs through the eastern third of the estate at Val-Kill, where it follows a sluggish course along the upper terrace. It was known by Native Americans as the Winnakee, meaning “leap-stream.” The Maritje Kill (also called Mosities Kill, meaning unknown) drains the northern reaches of the upper terrace and flows through the rocky terrain of the estate between the Post Road and Violet Avenue, where it has several small tributaries. The third major creek, located between the Hudson River and FDR Home, is unnamed. It drains the northern reaches of the lower terrace near Hyde Park village and runs through the ice pond on the Wheeler Place, terminating at a cove in the Hudson River that today is enclosed by the railroad causeway. These creeks have eroded the soils along their courses, often revealing glacial till and bedrock, except in low-lying, level areas where they have deposited sediments in swamps and marshes. The most extensive wetland within the estate lands is where the Fall Kill crosses the upper terrace at Val-Kill.

Forest cover spread across the land in the wake of the glacier through seeds and nuts carried in from the south by wind and animals. By about 10,000 years ago, a beech-maple forest had taken hold on mid-elevation, cool, moist regions. This forest was dominated by sugar maple and beech, with lesser numbers of basswood, American elm, white ash, yellow birch, eastern hop hornbeam, red maple, and hemlock. A drought and a warm period about 6,000 years ago allowed an oak-chestnut forest to dominate, characterized by American chestnut, chestnut oak, red oak, white oak, black oak, and red maple. With the return of colder conditions roughly 4,500 years ago, the beech-maple forest regained dominance on cool, moist elevations, but the oak-chestnut forest remained dominant on warm, well-drained acidic sites. The Hudson Valley remained a transitional zone between the oak forests to the south and the northern hardwoods forest such as the maple-beech to the north. Minor forest communities included northern white-cedar (American arborvitae) with hop hornbeam and red pine, which typically formed on moist, calcareous soils, and red cedar forest on rocky, dry upland ridges with shallow soils.

WAPPINGER HOMELAND

At the time of European contact in the seventeenth century, the Roosevelt Estate was part of the homeland of the Algonquian-speaking Wappinger Indians,
who represented a largely continuous sequence of human occupation in the Hudson Valley dating back thousands of years. At the time of contact, the Wappingers were small in population, perhaps between 600 and 800 individuals, and inhabited the general area north of the Hudson Highlands that constitutes much of present-day Dutchess County. The main north–south trail paralleled the Hudson River, presumably on or near the present alignment of the Post Road. The Wappingers are considered to have been agriculturalists who also gathered and hunted. They typically planted corn on alluvial soils adjoining major streams, and lived in structures of both the longhouse and wigwam (small, domed) types. Their principal villages were probably in the southern part of the county near Wappingers Falls, but smaller seasonal camps and hunting grounds were spread throughout, linked by foot trails.9

**EUROPEAN SETTLEMENT**

Henry Hudson, on his exploration of the valley in 1609, may have encountered the Wappingers when he landed along the banks of the river in what became Dutchess County. With the European settlement, trade, and development that followed Hudson’s visit, the Wappingers soon either assimilated or dispersed.10 Hudson’s voyage marked the beginnings of European trade and settlement in the Hudson Valley that led to the establishment of the Dutch colony of New Netherlands. Despite English takeover of the colony in 1664, Dutch culture would persist in the Hudson Valley for centuries. By the time European settlement began in Dutchess County in the late seventeenth century, the region had long been under British rule. Many of the early settlers were Dutch and British, with small numbers of German Palatines, French Huguenots, and Belgian Walloons.11

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Dutchess County, as with most of the Hudson Valley, was divided up into large parcels given through crown grants or patents to land speculators, a process that was intended to speed settlement. The Roosevelt Estate occupies territory that was first purchased by nine British land speculators through a patent issued in 1697, fourteen years after Dutchess County was chartered in 1683 (fig. 2.3). Known as the Great Nine Partners Patent, this land stretched from the Hudson River east to near the Connecticut state line, occupying nearly one-third of the present county. In 1699, the partners subdivided the patent into thirty-six large lots in anticipation of selling and settling the land. At this time, the valuable single lot that fronted the Hudson River was subdivided into nine smaller lots, one for each partner to have access to the river, which was the primary means of transportation. These were called the “water lots” and were numbered one through nine from south to north; each contained 1,980 feet of river frontage and extended 4½ miles inland, containing approximately 1,000 acres each.12
Despite the early purchase and subdivision of the Great Nine Partners Patent, Europeans did not begin to settle there until the end of the seventeenth century, and the county overall remained sparsely populated through the middle of the eighteenth century. In general, settlement in the county began along the Hudson River and spread inland. At Hyde Park, initial settlement began in the 1730s near the Hudson River along a creek the Dutch named Crum Elboogh, after the Indian chief Cromel Bow, whose village was along the creek. The name, which was corrupted to Kromelbooge, Crum Elbow (also spelled Krum or Krom Elbow), and Crooked Elbow, was also given to the area around the creek, to the later village of Hyde Park, and in the twentieth century, to a nearby bend and point in the Hudson River. Settlement quickened with extension of the Albany Post Road through Dutchess County in 1722, most likely following a main Indian trail. Along Crum Elbow Creek, settlers built a village with a river landing, houses, grain mills, and other business based on trade with the surrounding farms. Originally called Stoutenburgh after the original settler, the village became known during the late eighteenth century as Hyde Park after the name of the adjoining estate of Dr. John Bard, now Vanderbuilt Mansion National Historic Site. The village also thrived on the stagecoach business due to its halfway point on the Post Road between New York City and Albany. Originally part of the Town of Clinton, Hyde Park was divided off as a separate town in 1821, at which time it had a population of 2,300.

Settlement in Hyde Park was predominantly rural rather than urban, based on individual, self-sufficient farms spread widely apart. Unlike the European homeland and in older parts of New England where farmers traditionally lived in urban villages and farmed in outlying areas, the American settlers followed a rural pattern of settlement due to individual land ownership or leasing. FDR wrote about this pattern in an introduction to a book published in 1929 on early Dutch houses of the Hudson Valley:

I have been impressed also by a thought that comes from consideration of the sites of these houses. In the choice of their locations the houses seem to
represent a point of view on the part of their builders unlike that held in some other parts of the country, one with less of the community and village influence that is evident in New England, and more of individual independence; for so often these house of the Hudson valley are found in cozy places, back from the highway, down below a hill, far from a neighbor, snuggling as it were into a perfect landscape-setting and happy in their isolation.16

The earliest settlers established farms on the rich soils typical of valleys and river terraces. Farmsteads, composed of the farmhouse, main barn, and smaller outbuildings, typically followed two dominant patterns. The first was that the farmhouse faced the road with the barn either to the side of it or behind it. The second pattern was that farmhouse stood on one side of the road and the barns on the other, with the outbuildings placed according to their domestic or agricultural use. A small percentage of farmsteads followed a third pattern where the farmhouse and barns were located together at a distance back from the main road. Typical outbuildings included a smokehouse, woodshed, well house, outhouse, corncrib, granary, and wagon shed.17 Although the earliest houses reflected Dutch traditions characterized by stone construction, steep gable roofs, and end chimneys, the predominant style of architecture in Hyde Park by the close of the late eighteenth century and first half of the nineteenth century followed English building traditions: a three- or five-bay, center-entrance plan with a side-gable roof and end chimneys; and a three-bay, side-entrance plan with a side-gable roof and side chimney.18 Barns were typically of the English type, known as a three-bay barn, a simple, rectangular frame structure with a gable roof and double doors on the side rather than the gable end. English barns were most often sided with vertical boards and typically had small attic windows in the gable wall.19

The farms in and around Hyde Park often followed property lines along the original east–west boundaries of the water lots, encompassing from 100 to 200 acres. The earliest and most prosperous farms were generally closer to the river, while poorer farmers settled on the more marginal uplands to the east. The productive soils on the terraces were typically used to grow crops, while the rough terrain on the rocky edges of the terraces and in the hills of the Low Taconics was used for woodlots and pastures. Fields and property boundaries were often demarked by hedgerows that grew up along stone fences (walls) built from the abundant shale outcroppings and from glacial rocks collected during field clearing. The amount of open land varied over time; during initial settlement forests predominated and clearings were mostly limited to the most fertile land. As livestock farming and the need for wood increased through the early nineteenth century, most all of the native forest was cleared and much of the landscape was open fields, broken mainly by hedgerows and scattered small woodlots.20

Early Dutchess County farmers practiced subsistence agriculture, producing enough to supply their own families. By the late eighteenth century, demand grew for agricultural products as urban areas expanded. In response to the demand,
many farmers began to market their products, with those in the western part of the county specializing in wheat. From the time of the War for Independence through the first quarter of the nineteenth century, Dutchess County farmers became major suppliers of grain, livestock, vegetables, and orchard crops for the New York City market due to ready transportation on the Hudson River. An 1813 gazetteer of the state described Dutchess as “...one of the most opulent farming counties in the state. In agriculture, no county exceeds this in the style of improvement, and none has a greater respectability of character, engaged in practical farming.... The hills are feasible to their summits, and afford the best of pasture; much less steep and rugged on the western than eastern declivities.”21 By 1813, the population of the county had reached 51,412, rising from 32,636 at the end of the war in 1783. A later state gazetteer published in 1842 noted that Dutchess “...is a rich and thriving agricultural county, annually sending a large amount of produce and live stock to the New-York market.”22 The bounty of the harvests, however, was coming at the cost of soil depletion. In subsequent decades, agricultural productivity would gradually decline.

Agriculture in Dutchess County was beginning to undergo tumultuous economic change during the second quarter of the century, brought on largely by improvements in transportation. The Erie Canal, opened in 1825 and linked to New York City via the Hudson River, brought the fertile and larger farms of western New York and the Midwest into competition with Dutchess County’s smaller and less fertile farms. Far more productive in raising grain, the western competition forced Dutchess County farmers to turn to livestock production, notably to sheep and beef cattle.23 Increased livestock production in turn led to the expansion of agricultural land largely through the conversion of forested marginal land on poor soils and steep slopes to pasture during the 1830s and 1840s.

**RIVERFRONT FARMS AND COUNTRY PLACES**

During the eighteenth century, riverfront property in Dutchess County was prized primarily for its good agricultural soils and ready access to the river and Post Road. The farms were initially purchased by wealthy patent owners and New York City merchants, most of whom sold or leased to families who established subsistence farms of modest size and style. Despite the utilitarian uses, some of the first-generation landowners in the area around Hyde Park appear to have appreciated aesthetic values in the landscape. As far back as 1740, according to FDR, the riverfront families “...conceived the idea of making the original road [Post Road] a very beautiful, wide avenue. They...planted trees practically the whole way from the Poughkeepsie city line to the village of Staatsburg—a distance of about eight miles.”24
Compared to less prosperous farms on the uplands to the east, the riverfront farms had larger houses, often of the two-story, five-bay, center-entrance type. Later houses along the riverfront, still facing the road, were positioned farther west toward the edge of the river terrace, perhaps to avoid building in the middle of the rich farmland or to take in picturesque river views. These houses, typically accessed from the Post Road by a straight lane down the center of the property, were surrounded by vegetable gardens, fields, and pastures. Each water lot had another road that led down to the river. The landscapes of the riverfront farms, particularly between the house and the road, generally had an orthogonal pattern that reflected not only the rectangular boundaries of the original water lots, but also the Colonial favor for axis and symmetry. These patterns disappeared in the rough terrain between the house and river.

By the time of the Civil War, many of the riverfront farms were occupied as seasonal country residences by wealthy people from New York City. Already in 1842, a gazetteer published that the Town of Hyde Park featured “...much good land, along the bank of the Hudson, which bounds it in the west, where are situated a number of delightful residences, overlooking the river.” The old yeoman farmers often relocated to farms on the uplands. In his 1853 book, *Letters from Idlewild*, Nathaniel Parker told of such a story upon meeting a Hudson Valley farmer who was in transit to his new farm:

I inquired into his movements with some interest. He was going (to use his own phrase) “twenty miles farther back, where a man could afford to farm, at the price of the land.” His cornfield on the banks of the Hudson had risen in value, as probable sites for ornamental residences, and with the difference (between two hundred dollars the fancy acre, and sixty dollar the farming acre) in his pocket, he was transferring his labor and his associations to a new soil and neighborhood. With the market for his produce quite as handy by railroad, he was some four or five thousand dollars richer in capital, and only a loser in scenery and local attachments....

Despite conversion to seasonal leisure use, working farms remained standard components of the riverfront estates during the nineteenth century. As gentlemen’s farms—farms where the owner did not have to farm for a living—the riverfront estates relied on hired hands and tenant farmers to work the land. These estate farms provided food for the family, and the tenant or staff farmers typically cared for the estate year-round. Unlike earlier patterns, the estate farmhouse and barns were located on the east side of the public road away from the mansion and its surrounding pleasure grounds, a pattern evident as early as the late eighteenth century at the Bard Estate, Hyde Park (Vanderbilt Mansion). Beginning in 1797, Samuel Bard, the son of the original owner, transformed the portion of his father’s farm on the west side of the Post Road into residential pleasure grounds in the tradition of English country houses, leaving the original farm buildings on the east side of the road.
The natural beauty of the river estates, with their rural settings and views across the Hudson River to the Shawangunk and Catskill Mountains, was the primary attraction to city dwellers, who were in easy reach by river or road, and after the 1830s, by railroad. The picturesque attractions of the region were popularized in American culture during the early nineteenth century by the landscape paintings of the Hudson River School artists, who often depicted rural landscapes not unlike that of England, but set against the wild character of forests and mountains that they considered uniquely American. The combination of the two picturesque qualities—the softness of the rural countryside and the roughness of the forested mountains—became a hallmark of landscape design during the mid-nineteenth century. One of the most renowned examples was the Bard Estate, the present Vanderbilt Mansion National Historic Site, as it was redesigned between 1828 and 1835 by the Belgian landscape gardener Andre Parmentier. Andrew Jackson Downing, the country’s foremost landscape designer of the time and a Hudson Valley native from nearby Newburgh, popularized this and other picturesque landscapes in his 1841 book, *A Treatise on the Theory and Practice of Landscape Gardening* (fig. 2.4). Downing extolled the virtues of the Hudson Valley, with its natural scenery and growing number of country residences:

There is no part of the Union where the taste in Landscape Gardening is so far advanced, as on the middle portion of the Hudson. The natural scenery is of the finest character, and places but a mile or two apart often possess, from the constantly varying forms of the water, shores, and distant hills, widely different kinds of home landscape and distant view. Standing in the grounds of some of the finest of these seats, the eye beholds only the soft foreground of smooth lawn, the rich groups of trees shutting out all neighboring tracts, the lake-like expanse of water, and, closing the distance, a fine range of wooded mountain. A residence here of but a hundred acres, so fortunately are these disposed by nature, seems to appropriate the whole scenery round, and to be a thousand in extent.... At the present time, our handsome villa residences are becoming every day more numerous....

In the decade following Downing’s treatise, most of the early farm landscapes bordering the Hudson River were rebuilt into fashionable country places set in picturesque landscapes organized around Italianate and Gothic Revival–style mansions. In Dutchess County, the mansions and pleasure grounds were typically on the west or river side of the road, the part of the estate often called the park, while the farm component was most often on the upland or east side of the road. Despite the conversion to country places, vestiges of the old rural landscape characterized by orthogonal lanes, boundaries, and field patterns often remained.
THE ROOSEVELT ESTATE, PRE-1867

Before the arrival of Europeans, the land within the future limits of the Roosevelt Estate had been used by people for thousands of years. A potsherd unearthed near the Red House suggests people were present during the Middle Woodland period (1,950–950 years before present), while during the Late Woodland period (950–300 years before present) the Wappingers most likely used the land on the terraces and along streams for agriculture, hunting, gathering, and seasonal camps.  

FDR traced the history of the estate back to Native American agriculture, writing that the fields along the Post Road “...were cultivated by the Wappinger tribe of Indians before the white man came.” In the history of the estate that he was writing just prior to his death, FDR cited some physical evidence to support the tradition of these Indian fields:

Speaking of trees, the fields in front of my house [Springwood] and his [J. R. Roosevelt’s] house [Red House] prove that an Indian encampment existed here before the white man came. The old oak tree in front of the Library and on the lot south of the Avenue must, of course, have grown up under field conditions and this existed only where Indians had cleared the land and cultivated it. About 1920 one of these trees got so old, I had to take it down. And the rings at the base proved that it dated from about 1690. Furthermore, a good many arrowheads have been found in plowing. Probably this Indian cultivation is not true of the east side of the Post Road because I can remember no similar very old trees. There were, of course, no white men here in 1690.

Early European Settlement

The granting of the Great Nine Partners Patent in 1697 began the history of property ownership—a concept unknown to Native Americans—on the Roosevelt Estate lands, which occupied much of Water Lots Five and Six, and smaller portions of Water Lots Four and Seven that were created with the subdivision of the patent in 1699 (fig. 2.5). All of the lots were traversed on the lower terrace by the Post Road that was built through Dutchess County by ca. 1722. At Teller’s Hill at the south end of the estate lands, the Post Road probably turned west from its present alignment and ran closer to the river. In ca. 1807, the road was rebuilt as the Highland Turnpike along a new, straight alignment south of Teller’s Hill. By the end of the eighteenth century, two other north–south roads crossed the estate lands: Creek Road on the upper terrace (also known as the Road to Union Corners and later as Violet Avenue and Route 9G); and Cream Street, earlier known as the Road from William Stoutenburgh Mills to Poughkeepsie, along the western edge of the Low Taconics foothills at the eastern end of the estate lands (fig. 2.6).

During the early eighteenth century, the water lots were sold, subdivided, and inherited numerous times prior to actual settlement. Although the Roosevelt Estate lands covered portions of four different water lots, the core of the estate...
Roosevelt Estate Historic Resource Study traces its history through the purchase and settlement of Water Lots Five and Six, later location of the Boreel Place (Red House), Wheeler Place (Springwood), and Bellefield. This property was settled and developed by the Crooke and Everson families during the middle and late eighteenth century.

The first owners of Water Lots Five and Six were John Aertson and William Creed, respectively, followed by several other owners through the early eighteenth century who never settled the property. The north half of Water Lot Five, the present site of the Red House, was the first parcel to be settled within the Roosevelt Estate lands. It was purchased in 1748 by Charles Crooke, a merchant of New York City, who soon thereafter arranged to have his son, Charles Crooke (II), settle on the land. In ca. 1750, the Crookes built a stone house on the west or river side of the Post Road, just south of the eighty-sixth milestone from New York City, between the present location of the Red House and the Post Road. The Crooke house was known as the Mansion House, a name that reflected its early origin and prominence. Soon after the mansion was built, the Crookes most likely erected a farmhouse and barn on the opposite side of the road for use by their hired hands or slaves. Charles Crooke expanded his acreage in 1751 by purchasing the non-contiguous north half of Water Lot Six, where Bellefield house today stands (see fig. 2.6). Crooke reserved a portion of this property on the west side of the Post Road, referred to as the Old House Lot (the ground presently occupied by Bellefield), but the Crookes

---

Figure 2.5. A map of the water lots illustrating relationship to the later boundaries of the Roosevelt Estate and current development (light gray). The map shows original lot ownership by each of the nine partners. (R. Edsall Map of the Great Nine Partners Patent, 1734, Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, and Dutchess County Real Property records, 2002, annotated by SUNY ESF.)

Figure 2.6. Diagram of land ownership and dates of purchase by the Crooke and Everson families within the future Roosevelt Estate. (SUNY ESF, based on 1793 survey of Widow Everson’s Land.)
apparently never built a house, although they did locate their family burial ground there. Upon the death of Charles Crooke (I) in 1763, the younger Crooke inherited the property, described in his father’s will as being “…at a place called by the name of Krom or Crooked Elbow.”

Charles Crooke (II) died in 1772, and in 1793 his Krom (Crum) Elbow property was divided between his two surviving adult children, Ann Crooke, known as Nancy, and John Crooke (fig. 2.7). John Crooke received the portion of Krom Elbow with the Old House Lot and burial ground on the north half of Water Lot Six (Bellefield), amounting to 454 acres. In 1793, he sold the west half of the property out of the family, and apparently soon thereafter sold the east half as well. Nancy Crooke, who married William Barber, received the north half of Water Lot Five (Boreel Place). The Barbers divided their property into eastern and western parts, as John Crooke had with his property. Nancy Crooke Barber retained title to the western part containing the Mansion House and approximately 234 acres extending east beyond the Maritje Kill, the stream running between the Post Road and Creek Road (Violet Avenue). Title to the eastern undeveloped lot was conveyed to the Barbers’ young daughter, Jane Ann. The Barbers apparently soon sold the east lot but retained the west lot, where Nancy Crooke Barber continued to live at the Mansion House through the death of her husband in 1798 and remarriage in 1801 to William Broom. Following Broom’s death in 1830, the property passed to Jacob Mancius, the husband of Jane Ann Barber, but he soon sold the property, marking the end of Crooke family ownership on Water Lot Five.

Situated between the two Crooke family parcels on the south half of Water Lot Six was property acquired in 1734 by John Everson of New York City (see fig. 2.6). For several decades, Everson did not settle the property, which he left to his widow
following his death in 1772. At some point between 1780, when Widow Everson recorded the first deed to the property, and 1793, when she gave the property to her nephews John and Cornelius Ray, a tenant farmhouse and outbuildings were built on the river side of the Post Road. This house, shown on a 1793 survey, is the core of the big house at Springwood (see fig. 2.7). FDR believed the frame building was originally built as a “square Hudson River type house,” with two stories and a five-bay, center-entrance façade.47

Following the initial development along the Post Road by the Crooke and Everson families, Water Lots Five and Six were subdivided into riverside and upland lots, roughly corresponding to either side of the Maritje Kill halfway between the Post Road and Creek Road. During the late eighteenth century and first half of the nineteenth century, the eastern, upland portions of Water Lots Five and Six that were sold off by John Crooke and Ann Crooke Barber in the 1790s were purchased by yeoman farmers who cleared the land, built houses and barns, and constructed stone walls.

The River Estates

Following broader changes along the east bank of the Hudson Valley, the riverfront farms established by the Crooke and Everson families became country places for wealthy New Yorkers during the first half of the nineteenth century. Within the future Roosevelt Estate, there were two country places: the Boorman-Wheeler Place (Springwood and Bellefield on the old John Crooke and Widow Everson land) on Water Lot Six, and the Boreel Place (Red House) on the former Nancy Crooke land on the north half of Water Lot Five (figs. 2.8, 2.9). The southwestern part of the estate lands on Water Lot Four also incorporated portions of the adjoining country place of John Teller, who had built a house

---

Figure 2.8. Map made by FDR in 1923 based on the 1850 Sidney map of Dutchess County showing water lots in relation to riverfront estates and upland farms. (Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, annotated by SUNY ESF.)
The Boorman-Wheeler Place

The history of the Boorman-Wheeler Place following initial ownership began in 1793, when John Crooke, grandson of the first Charles Crooke, sold the north family tract on Water Lot Six (including present-day Bellefield) to Jacob Bush. This property consisted of 175 acres between the Hudson River and the Maritje Kill including the Crooke burial ground on the so-called Old House Lot. Two years later, Bush sold the property to John Johnston, a local judge and gentleman farmer, who named the property Bellefield. In 1795–96, Johnston built the first known house on the land (the current core of Bellefield house), east of the Crooke family burial ground. Typical of earlier houses and similar to old Crooke Mansion House, Bellefield overlooked the Post Road rather than the river from its site 400 feet back from the road (see fig. 2.8). The Federal-style house was two stories with a center entrance and two symmetrical wings. It was accessed by a loop drive with a center walk. The property’s river road, later known as the Stone Cottage Road, was north of the house. Johnston also expanded his property by acquiring the adjoining south half of Water Lot Six, formerly owned by Widow Everson, in two separate transactions in 1799 and 1811. This property increased the size of Bellefield to 332 acres, occupying all of Water Lot Six from the Maritje along the Post Road on Teller’s Hill. This house burned in 1831, and the land subsequently became a series of small farms owned or occupied by the Broom, Teed, and Taylor families. By the late 1850s, James Boorman had purchased some of this land, and by 1867 the property had been acquired by J. D. Barnet, who incorporated the property into his country estate located to the south, outside of the Roosevelt estate lands, apparently removing the earlier farm buildings that may have existed. This land was later purchased by the Kirchner family. Unlike the Boorman-Wheeler Place and the Boreel Place, the Kirchner Place by 1867 was primarily fields and woods without a country house or other major building.
Kill west to the Hudson River. Johnston built a complex of farm buildings east of the Post Road, along the old Everson property line approximately 700 feet east of the Post Road (near present Roosevelt Farm Lane). The location of this farmstead mirrored the pattern of the Crooke estate (Boreel Place) to the south, with its farm on the east side of the road and house on the west.

In 1820, John Johnston sold the Bellefield estate, which, despite its two houses (Springwood and Bellefield), remained under common or related ownership through 1867. Subsequent owners included William Henderson of New York City through 1826 and Ephraim Holbrook through 1843. Holbrook, a New York City merchant but a full-time Hyde Park resident, added property east of the Post Road on Water Lot Seven that had been owned by the Allen family (later Bracken Place, present site of the Hyde Park drive-in), bringing the total size of the estate to 405 acres. In 1843, James Boorman, a successful businessman and partner in the Hudson River Railroad, purchased the Bellefield estate and soon began to improve it into his family’s country place. Two years later in 1845, Boorman conveyed the south part of the property containing 94 acres west of the Post Road, including the Everson house (Springwood), to his daughter and son-in-law, Mary and Josiah W. Wheeler, for one dollar (fig. 2.10). The Wheelers made the property into their country place, which they named Brierstone. James Boorman also transferred ownership of the Bellefield farm property, 180 acres east of the Post Road with the estate farmhouse and barns, to the Wheelers. The family relationship between the Boorman and Wheeler properties was reflected in the landscape. The two properties were connected by an interior road (Estates Road, which may have been built as early as 1811 when the two places first came under common ownership), both shared the same river road, and both presumably shared the same farm on the east side of the Post Road. The two families kept the estate intact over the years, except for the sale in 1851 of 2 acres along the river to make way for the Hudson River Railroad.
In the late 1840s, the Boormans remodeled Bellefield house, adding Italianate-style porches and other details in keeping with the “bracketed” or Italian style of rural architecture promoted by Andrew Jackson Downing as appropriate to the picturesque landscape of the Hudson Valley. To the rear of the house were gardens, a greenhouse, and a barn, which may have served as stables or supplemented the main barn on the east side of the Post Road (see fig. 2.10). Below the gardens at the edge of the terrace, the Boormans built a Gothic Revival–style gardener’s cottage, not unlike picturesque houses that Downing promoted in his treatise. The land west of the house down to the river was characteristically rough with numerous rock outcroppings, but did contain level areas bordering the river road (Stone Cottage Road) that may have been used for cultivation.

The Wheelers made similar changes to their country place around the same time beginning in the late 1840s. They remodeled the Everson house in the Italianate style, but made more extensive changes that took advantage of the house’s picturesque location overlooking the Hudson River. New features included an Italian Villa–style, three-story tower, cross gables, prominent chimneys, bracketed cornices, arched windows, and a wrap-around porch. They added a garden enclosed by a hemlock hedge and a greenhouse to the north of the house (see fig. 2.10). Farther to the north was another garden that the Wheelers probably used as their kitchen garden. At the west side of this garden, at the edge of the terrace, the Wheelers also built a Gothic Revival–style gardener’s cottage. Below the main house at the base of the terrace was a barn and other outbuildings, most likely dating to the late eighteenth century when the property was not associated with Bellefield and its farm across the Post Road. The Wheelers probably used the barn as a stable, and rode horses on a trotting course on the front field. West of the Wheeler house on the rough terrain leading down to the Hudson River, the land was a mixture of woodlots and small pastures bordered by stone walls. Although cleared by the early settlers, much of this land had begun to revert to oak and hemlock forest as early as 1810. The Wheelers did not have their own river road, but instead used the one at Bellefield.

The farm component of the Boorman-Wheeler Place on the east side of the Post Road consisted of the house and barns that had probably been erected by John Johnston in the 1790s as part of his Bellefield estate. The farmstead was located down a straight lane (present Roosevelt Farm Lane), across the Post Road from the Bellefield house (see fig. 2.10). Surrounding the farmstead were fields and pastures bordered by stone fences. The rougher terrain to the east was probably used for pasture, and the eastern end of the property close to the Marijke Kill contained woodlots on former pasture that had begun to reforest in the 1850s.
The Boreel Place

The history of the Boreel Place following ownership by the Crooke family began in 1830, when Jacob Mancius, the last of the Crooke family owners (through marriage to Jane Ann Barber), sold the 234-acre west end of the north half of Water Lot Five in 1830 to a series of New York merchants. Edward Giraud of New York City purchased the property in 1830 and sold it to his brother, Joseph Giraud, in 1833. Giraud purportedly found the old Crooke Mansion House in poor repair, and so demolished it and built a new house (present Red House) close to the edge of the terrace with views of the Hudson River, perhaps using portions of the old house (see fig. 2.8).似 Similar in overall massing to the Wheeler (Everson) house, the new house was a late Federal–style building, two stories tall and five bays wide with four side chimneys, six-over-six double-hung sash windows, a low-pitched gable roof, a center entrance with sidelights, and clapboard siding—“typical Hudson River architecture,” according to FDR.似 It was accessed by a straight, 1,500-foot-long drive. In 1835, soon after building the new house, Giraud sold the property to Henry Kneeland, who owned it for the next decade until conveying it to his daughter, Mrs. Dudley B. Fuller, in 1846.

Following their sale of 1.17 acres to the Hudson River Railroad in 1849, the Fullers sold the property in 1852 to Mrs. Walter Langdon, owner of the Hyde Park Estate (Vanderbilt Mansion). She gave the Fuller Place to her daughter, Sarah Astor Langdon, who had married François Robert Boreel. The Boreels spent much time abroad and thus made little use of the estate.

Unlike their neighbors to the north, the Boreels made few significant changes to the place, with its vernacular rural character consisting of the main house surrounded by agricultural fields. South of the house, there was a garden, possibly with a greenhouse (see fig. 2.10).似 To the north of the house was a large Dutch-style barn, with a broad gable facing south, possibly dating to Crooke-family ownership in the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century. This barn was later used as stables.似 West of the house, the rough land extending down to the Hudson River began to take on a more wild character by mid-century. Except for the sloping land near the house, this land had reverted to forest beginning in the 1830s.似 While most of the forest near the river had evidence of being cleared at one time, a stand of hemlocks, along a west-facing bank overlooking the so-called Big Cove in the Hudson River, had apparently never been cut.似 The estate’s river road, which FDR called the “South River Road,” ran along the south boundary of the property to the Big Cove.

On the east side of the Post Road directly across from the Boreel house (Red House) was the estate farm that had been developed during Crooke ownership (see fig. 2.10). The farmstead contained a large frame barn and a one-and-one-half-story, three-bay, center-entrance farmhouse, which according to FDR dated to 1770.似 Surrounding the buildings were fields and pastures, many of which were
bordered by stone fences. As at Bellefield, the most productive fields bordered the Post Road. East of the farmhouse and barn, on the rough land extending beyond the Maritje Kill, were pastures and woodlots, some of which had grown up from pasture beginning in the 1850s.\(^{72}\)

**The Upland Farms**

At the time the Roosevelts arrived in Hyde Park in 1867, the lands east of the Boorman-Wheeler and Boreel Places within the future Roosevelt estate consisted of yeoman farms owned by individual families. All except one of these farms were clustered along the main north-south roads. As later named by FDR, these included the Bennett, Tompkins, and Dumphy Farms on Creek Road (Violet Avenue), and the Rohan Farm on Cream Street (see figs. 2.8, 2.9). The exception was the Hughson Farm, located north of the Dumphy Farm off Van Wagner (Haviland) Road, a side road off Creek Road. The estate lands would also encompass woodlots and sections of adjoining farms later belonging to the Wright, Jones, Briggs, and Lent families.

The once prosperous landscape of these farms was being transformed by the mid-nineteenth century due to competition from Midwestern farms and decreased productivity of the marginal soils. As grain, sheep, and beef farming were declining, many farmers turned to dairy for a new source of income. Despite this, the most productive and profitable years of the farms were over by the time of the Civil War. During the late nineteenth century and on into the twentieth, the farms would see few improvements. The landscape of these farms also became less expansive as worn-out pastures on the steep slopes of Dutchess Hill and rocky terrain bordering the Maritje Kill were left to regenerate as native oak-chestnut forest.

**Bennett Farm**

Due east of the Boreel Place on Water Lot Five was the Bennett Farm (see figs. 2.8, 2.9). In 1793, this farm was part of the east lot of the north half of Water Lot Five that belonged to Jane Ann Barber, the young daughter of Ann Crooke Barber.\(^{73}\) By 1808, the east lot had been divided in half, with the Bennett Farm on the west half occupying 191 acres and the east half later forming the Rohan Farm. At this time, the Bennett Farm was owned by Mrs. Maria Whiley. The property was sold to John and Rebecca Cooper in 1835, who leased the farm to Abraham DeGroff. The 191-acre property then passed to Richard and Catherine Pudney in 1846, to Thomas Hadden in 1849, to Homer and Helen Nelson in 1865, and finally to Willet G. Bennett in 1868.\(^{74}\) FDR discovered that in a Poughkeepsie newspaper of 1841, the farm was mentioned as growing the largest amount of corn per acre in Dutchess County.\(^{75}\)
The Bennett Farm was centered on the west side of Creek Road (Violet Avenue) where the farmhouse and barns were located approximately 150 feet back from the road (fig. 2.11). The farmhouse, known at one time as Woodlawns, was located on the north side of the farm road, which formed a Y intersection at Creek Road and terminated at the barn. The frame house was similar in plan to the Dumphy farmhouse, with a two-story, three-bay, side-entrance plan. Probably built about 1840, possibly around the core of an earlier structure built as early as 1808, the house had six-over-six windows, a front porch, clapboard siding, and a one-story rear kitchen wing. To the rear of the house were two frame barns. The land to the north and west of the house was hilly and therefore used for pasture, with an oak woodlot at the far western end of the farm bordering the Boreel Place near the Maritje Kill. The farm’s prime land was on the rich soils of the upper terrace, east of Violet Avenue extending to the Fall Kill. Around mid-century, a small tenant farmhouse was built in the middle of the fields north of the farm road that crossed the property from east to west. This road crossed the Fall Kill to reach two stone wall–enclosed pastures occupying the rougher land at the east end of the farm at the foot of Dutchess Hill. The easternmost pasture, probably the roughest, was abandoned in ca. 1860 and began to revert to an oak forest. Pastures lined the lowlands bordering the Fall Kill.

Tompkins Farm

To the south of the Bennett Farm was the Tompkins Farm, occupying the south half of Water Lot Five and a portion of Water Lot Four (see figs. 2.8, 2.9). Part of the lands belonging to the assigns of Leonard Lespinard in 1793, the property came into Tompkins family ownership soon after this time. The farm initially consisted of 248 acres forming a rectangular boundary, except for a portion of the eastern boundary that followed the Fall Kill. By the 1840s,
portions of this farm were partitioned off to family members or sold, creating an irregular boundary along the south side.\textsuperscript{82}

The Tompkins farmstead was at the intersection of Creek Road and Violet Avenue, which branched off Creek Road at a triangular intersection, heading southwest toward Poughkeepsie. The Tompkins farmhouse was on the west side of Creek Road just north of Violet Avenue, with the barns across the road, close to the north property line with the Bennett Farm (see fig. 2.11). The one-and-one-half-story frame farmhouse, built in ca. 1795, had a five-bay, center-entrance plan. At some point in the mid-nineteenth century, the house was updated with a Gothic-style front gable and pointed-arch window, two-over-two double-hung window sash, a bay window, and a front porch. The main barn was probably an English type, built at the same time as the house.\textsuperscript{83}

To the rear or west of the farmhouse was a large pasture, enclosed by stone walls. A road ran along the north side of the wall, along the property boundary. At the far western end of the farm was a swamp, which was partitioned off from the pasture by a stone wall.\textsuperscript{84} South of the farmstead, between Creek Road and Violet Avenue, was a large wetland that had originally been forested with tamarack. The Tompkins family harvested the tamaracks and ditched the land to drain it, and probably used the land for cultivation.\textsuperscript{85} East of Creek Road on the upper terrace, the Tompkins Farm contained fertile fields that stretched toward the swampy banks of the Fall Kill. East of the creek, on the slopes of Dutchess Hill, there were pastures with scattered trees and woodlots of oak and hickory.\textsuperscript{86}

**Dumphy Farm**

Adjoining the east end of the Bellefield farm (later Bracken Place) on the south half of Water Lot Six was the Dumphy Farm (see figs. 2.8, 2.9). Part of Widow Everson’s land in 1793, the Dumphy Farm was a rectangular parcel that extended from the Maritje Kill east to the summit of Dutchess Hill, occupying approximately 184 acres. The farm was sold by Cornelius Ray, nephew of Widow Everson, to Charles and Elizabeth Manning in 1807, and then to David Barnes in two parcels (112 and 72 acres) in 1824 and 1826. In 1831, Barnes sold the farm to Johanna Bill in 1831, to Charlotte Ear in 1843, and to Margaret and W. Henry Hinchman in ca. 1849 and 1855. James Dumphy purchased the farm as two parcels in 1867 and 1868.\textsuperscript{87}

The Dumphy Farm was centered on Creek Road (Violet Avenue) with the farmhouse on the east side of the road and the barns on the opposite side (see fig. 2.11). The farmhouse, situated close to the road behind a stone wall, had a typical early-nineteenth-century two-story, three-bay, side-entrance plan with a side-gable roof, twelve-over-eight windows, and clapboard siding. Probably built by the Barnes family in the 1820s, the house was updated in the 1850s with
Italianate-style balcony windows on the first floor and a bracketed front porch. To the east of the house were fields, and east of the Fall Kill were rougher pastures and woodlots extending up Dutchess Hill. Across Violet Avenue from the house was an English-style barn situated immediately along the road, west of which were small fields that were divided roughly in half by the farm road extending on axis with the farmhouse. This road led to the rough land at the west end of the property bordering the Maritje Kill, known as the “back farm,” which was probably kept as woodlots and pastures.

Hughson Farm

To the northeast of the Dumphy Farm was the Hughson Farm, an irregularly shaped tract of 90 acres located on the northern half of Water Lot Six and a portion of Water Lot Seven (see figs. 2.8, 2.9). The property was probably first developed as a farm by the Pells family, the first sale of the 90-acre parcel being from Leonard S. Pells to Peter K. Pells in 1848. Peter Pells then sold in May 1854 to Lemuel Ackerly, and in 1867 the property was sold to John Clark. The Hughson family did not acquire the property until after 1867.

The farm was accessed by a road that led southeast off Van Wagner (Haviland) Road and crossed the Fall Kill to reach the farmhouse and barn, situated at the west end of the property (see fig. 2.11). Constructed in ca. 1850, the farmhouse faced northwest toward the Fall Kill and was a vernacular Greek Revival–style one-and-one-half-story, five-bay, center-entrance frame building. The house featured end chimneys, small six-over-six sash windows with three-light eaves windows on the front, an entry porch, and small attic gable windows to either side of the chimneys. The barn was located to the south of the house, across the entrance road. Fields extended to the rear (east) of the house.

Rohan Farm

Due east of the Bennett Farm was the 133-acre Rohan Farm, also known by FDR as the Gregg Farm (see figs. 2.8, 2.9). The farm was located on a plateau east of Dutchess Hill, and in 1793 was part of the east lot of the north half of Water Lot Five that belonged to Jane Ann Barber. This east lot was partitioned in 1808 into a 140-acre eastern half that was purchased by Richard and Maria Whiley (the west half became the Bennett Farm). The rectangular parcel was crossed from north to south by Cream Street, which turned east at the intersection with Dutchess Hill Road. The Whileys sold the farm as two parcels—a 122-acre lot and an 18-acre strip along the north boundary used as a woodlot—to Simeon Wood in January 1816. During this same year, Wood subdivided the 18-acre woodlot, selling 7 acres at the west end to Abraham Conklin, a parcel later known as the Briggs Wood Lot. In 1849, Simeon Wood conveyed the farm and the remaining 11-acre woodlot
to James H. Wood, probably his son, and the property remained in the family through the 1860s.93

During the Wood family ownership, the Rohan Farm consisted of a farmstead situated at the intersection of Cream Street and Dutchess Hill Road (see fig. 2.11). The farmhouse, on the west side of Cream Street, had a typical two-story, side-gable, three-bay, side-entrance form similar to the Dumphy and Bennett farmhouses. While it may have contained the core of an earlier building, possibly built as early as 1808, the house was substantially remodeled in a vernacular Italianate style in ca. 1865 with two-over-two double-hung sash windows, a front porch, and bracketed eaves. The main barn, located across the street from the house, was an English type with the gable facing Cream Street.94 Despite its location on the Low Taconics foothills, the farm contained relatively fertile soils due to its location on a plateau.95 At the west end of the farm, the land became more marginal as it sloped down Dutchess Hill.

**SUMMARY, PRE-1867**

By 1867, the lands within the future Roosevelt Estate were characterized by two property types: river estates (the Boorman-Wheeler and Boreel Places), and upland farms (Bennett, Tompkins, Dumphy, Hughson, and Rohan Farms). The settlement and development of these properties followed the subdivision patterns established through the Great Nine Partners Patent and roads that paralleled the Hudson River. The Post Road, probably once a Native American trail, became the main route along the east side of the Hudson River between New York and Albany, improved in the eighteenth century with the addition of roadside trees and in the nineteenth century as the Highland Turnpike. To the east, on the upper river terrace, Creek Road (Violet Avenue) created the spine of settlement, while Cream Street served a similar purpose on the plateau east of Dutchess Hill. The development of the river estates and upland farms prior to 1867 established spatial and circulation patterns that would endure throughout later ownership by the Roosevelts. For the river estates, this pattern consisted of agricultural fields and the main house, gardens, and pleasure grounds on the west or river side of the Post Road, and the estate farm on the east side. For the upland farms, the patterns consisted of a farmhouse and barns clustered along the public road, with cultivated fields on the level land and woodlots and pastures on rough and hilly areas. Due to soil depletion and shifts in the rural economy by the mid-nineteenth century, the open rural landscape was beginning to change as marginal pastures were abandoned to natural succession, allowing the native oak-chestnut forest to regenerate.

In the years after 1867, James Roosevelt, FDR’s father, would assemble two river estates and a portion of a third as his country place, but do little to alter the overall
patterns and uses of the landscape. James Roosevelt did not extend his estate to the upland farms, which would continue to operate as small market farms into the early twentieth century.
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Two years after the end of the Civil War, James Roosevelt moved with his wife of fourteen years, Rebecca Brien Howland, and their thirteen-year-old son, James Roosevelt Roosevelt, to Brierstone, the former Wheeler country place.¹ Within several years, James Roosevelt acquired the adjoining Boreel country place and farm, and the Bellefield farm east of the Post Road. The Roosevelts renamed the estate Springwood, presumably a reference to the numerous springs that surfaced along the edge of the river terrace near the house.² With James Roosevelt’s purchase of the Kirchner Place in 1886, the estate reached its maximum extent during this period, stretching for a mile along the Hudson River and over a mile to the east beyond the Maritje Kill. The Bellefield house and its surrounding grounds west of the Post Road remained a separate estate, while the yeoman farms on the adjoining uplands, including the Bennett, Tompkins, Dumphy, Hughson, and Rohan Farms, were independently owned throughout this period.

James Roosevelt was a wealthy man, deeply involved in corporate ventures of post–Civil War America. He was a lawyer with the firm of Benjamin Silliman of New York, a co-director of the Consolidated Coal Company of Maryland, and a board member of several other large corporations, including the Delaware and Hudson, a major canal and railroad company in New York.³ He considered Hyde Park his primary home, as he later wrote: “I have always lived at Hyde Park on the Hudson, where I have an estate of 500 acres and am devoted to country life.”⁴ His first wife, Rebecca, died following a massive heart attack in August 1877, and three years later on October 7, 1880, he was remarried to Sara Delano, the daughter of wealthy capitalist Warren Delano. After a ten-month trip to Europe, the couple returned to Springwood in September 1881, and four months later on January 30, 1882, Franklin Delano Roosevelt was born in a second-floor bedroom in the Springwood house. He would be the couple’s only child.

The Springwood landscape included two main houses overlooking the Hudson River and the estate farm complex east of the Post Road that the Roosevelts called the Home Farm. While James Roosevelt’s expansion of the Wheeler Place reflected the growing extent of country places in the Hudson Valley following the Civil War, he did little to alter the vernacular rural character of the landscape and continued to operate it as a traditional gentleman’s farm. Compared with some of the neighboring country places at the turn of the twentieth century, such as the Crumwold Farms (Rogers Estate) or Hyde Park (Vanderbilt Estate), Springwood remained a modest Hudson River estate.
MARKET AND GENTLEMEN’S FARMS

In contrast to the expansion of the riverfront country places during this period, the adjoining upland farms to the east were experiencing a slow but steady decline that had generally begun prior to the Civil War. This decline stemmed from improvements in canal and rail transportation that brought increasing competition in the county’s traditional New York City market from Midwestern granaries and far Western livestock ranges. At the same time, the productivity of Dutchess County farms, which had once been the breadbasket of New York City, was declining due to soil depletion from overuse and erosion. In response to these market and environmental changes, more and more farmers by the late nineteenth century had turned from raising grain, sheep, and beef cattle to specializing in dairy production, primarily fluid milk products. The Hudson River Railroad, extended through Hyde Park between 1849 and 1851 and one of a number of rail lines that crossed the county, allowed the swift shipment of perishable milk products to the New York City market. The dairy market was not susceptible to competition from Western farmers because milk at the time could not be shipped far distances prior to the introduction of refrigerated railcars in the early twentieth century. In addition, the small, hilly pastures typical of Dutchess County proved well suited to pasturing dairy cattle. By 1860 on the eve of the Roosevelts’ arrival in Hyde Park, dairy farming was beginning to flourish in Dutchess County.5 Although farming remained the leading branch of industry in Dutchess County into the early twentieth century and dairying brought a new source of income to many farmers, by 1880 there was sufficient overall decline to appear in a state report which noted that “…the prestige this county once had, by reason of its nearness to New York, has passed away with the improvements in transportation and the constant drain upon its fertility, incident to the kind of farming necessary to produce profitable results.”6

The changes in Dutchess County agriculture began to affect the farm landscape in subtle ways by the late nineteenth century. In Hyde Park, for example, the amount of improved land dropped from 18,988 acres in 1820 to 17,145 acres in 1875; meanwhile, the amount of improved farmland in the state did not peak until 1880.7 In the landscape, this change translated into less acreage in pasture and cultivated fields and more old-field succession and regeneration of native oak-chestnut forests. The rough and steep lands, such as on the rocky ridges below the river terraces and the steep slopes of the Taconic foothills, were first to be abandoned. There were also landscape changes as farmers converted to dairy, such as creation of cow pastures enclosed by post-and-barbed-wire fences, and renovation of the barns for dairy cows, including the appearance of silos beginning in the 1870s to house winter silage. Despite the relative success of dairy farming, few farmers in Hyde Park made sufficient profits to remodel their
farmhouses as previous generations had, although some were able to erect new dairy barns.  

In contrast to the upland farms, agriculture practiced by gentlemen farmers on the riverfront estates was little affected by changes in the agricultural market, since the wealthy did not generally farm for profit, but rather to supply their estates and maintain the landscape’s rural character, with excess sold at market. As Munsey’s Magazine reported in an 1899 article on these estate farms: “We read much of the poultry, the eggs, the milk which come to the market from the ‘farm sides’ of some of these estates along the Hudson. In spite of these sales, the gentleman farmer generally finds that his agricultural operations are on the wrong side of the ledger. Next to maintaining a first class steam yacht the most expensive pursuit is conducting a country seat.”

Model farming practices followed a tradition of rural improvement among gentlemen farmers that dated back to the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in the countryside surrounding major Northeastern cities. Similar to the European landed elite, American gentlemen farmers often considered their estates models of enlightened husbandry for the surrounding rural population. Here, they introduced such advances as horticultural experimentation, improvements in livestock breeding, and use of fertilizers. During the mid- and late-nineteenth century with advances in scientific agriculture juxtaposed by the decline of the neighboring yeoman farms, many gentlemen farmers sought to impart methods of efficiency, science, and profitability. The didactic impact, however, was often limited. Model farms instead tended to provide a source of employment for impoverished farm families, and also lent the appearance of a thriving farm economy to an otherwise declining agricultural region.

Most of the grand country places that were established during the mid- and late nineteenth century in the vicinity of the Roosevelt’s Hyde Park estate included farms, and some strove to be models of agricultural improvement. The Dinsmore Estate, The Locusts, near Staatsburg just north of Hyde Park, featured a model farm of over 1,000 acres by the late 1870s. The farm contained 200 head of prized Jersey dairy cattle that were pastured on 300 acres. In cultivation of 75 acres devoted to corn, oats, rye, potatoes, and carrots, the Dinsmores practiced scientific methods of soil conservation by rotating their fields, allowing them to revert to pasture every third year. The farm also contained 100 acres of woodland, and featured model farm architecture. In neighboring Rhinebeck, the Astor Place, Ferncliff, also featured a model farm. A history of Dutchess County published in 1880 noted that “...Ferncliff is not only a gentleman’s country-seat, but a carefully managed and productive farm.”

Neighboring the Roosevelts was Crumwold Farms, another large riverside estate with a substantial farm component that served as a model of agriculture. Owned
by the Butler family during the mid-nineteenth century, the property was purchased by Archibald Rogers in 1884. In typical Dutchess County fashion, the main house was located on the west or river side of the Post Road, while the estate farm was located on the east side. Surrounding the house extending down to the Hudson River was wooded land that served as a park, crisscrossed by carriage roads and bridle trails. Bordering the Roosevelts at the south end of the estate, within and bordering land that would later be purchased by FDR, there were oak woods, a stone cottage overlooking the Hudson River at the end of Bellefield’s river road (Stone Cottage Road), and a fish pond. By 1886, the estate farm contained a large barn with multiple wings, a wood house, farmhouse, two dairy houses, a corn crib, and an engine house (figs. 2.12, 2.13). Between 1886 and 1901, Rogers greatly expanded the estate to the east of the Post Road by purchasing six parcels of cultivated fields, old fields, and oak forest. On this property as well as on the lands west of the Post Road, Rogers scientifically managed the woodlands as an agricultural resource for the production of wood and as a model for area farmers and estate owners.

THE COUNTRY PLACE ERA AND THE IDEALIZED RURAL LANDSCAPE

While many estates along the Hudson River predated the Civil War, the decades afterward witnessed the establishment of many more, and often on a grander scale. This occurred not just in the Hudson River valley, but throughout the country in scenic rural areas near major industrial cities. This was the beginning of the so-called Country Place Era, a period when estate design dominated the growing profession of landscape architecture. This era also became known as the Gilded Age for the amassing of wealth by industrial magnates. Country residences, such as Newport cottages, Adirondack Great Camps, and Hudson Valley estates, became showcases of wealth and culture. Unlike the burgeoning
and fast-changing cities, wealthy industrialists idealized their country residences as places of retreat and stability, based in large part on the model of British aristocracy. Life in the country conjured up powerful associations including a strong work ethic, simplicity, thrift, and retirement from the chaos of urban life.\textsuperscript{16}

In Dutchess County during the decades following the Civil War, the last of the remaining tenant and yeoman farms along the Hudson River were converted or absorbed into country places, while pre-existing country places were often enlarged and updated in a more opulent manner. By 1865, the number of country places more than doubled, and by the late nineteenth century, each was on average between 300 and 500 acres, with some approaching 1,000 acres.\textsuperscript{17} This trend toward larger estates affected the stretch of the Hudson adjoining the Roosevelt Estate. An 1867 map of Dutchess County showed nine estates occupying the old water lots to either side of the Post Road (fig. 2.14). From the Poughkeepsie line to Hyde Park village, these included the John Aspinwall Roosevelt (brother of James Roosevelt) Estate, Rosedale; the Stuyvesant Estate, Edgewood; the Barnet Estate, Sunnybrook; the Taylor-Dietrich Estate; the Boreel Place (presumably not named); the Wheelers’ Brierstone (Springwood); the Boorman-Johnston Estate, Bellefield; and the Butler Estate, Crumwold. By 1891, these had been consolidated into five
larger estates. From the south, these were the J. A. Roosevelt Estate, Rosedale; the Stuyvesant Estate; the Webendorfer Estate; the James Roosevelt Estate, Springwood; and the Rogers Estate, Crumwold Farms (fig. 2.15). Some riverfront estates were subdivided into smaller properties without adjoining farms, such as Bellefield, a portion of which was purchased by state senator Thomas Newbold.

Most country places in Hyde Park in the late nineteenth century tended to follow the pattern of house and pleasure grounds, known as the “park,” on the west side of the road closest to the river, and the utilitarian farm on the west side of the road. As Munsey’s Magazine described in its 1899 article about the estates, “Most of the properties along the Hudson are divided into a ‘park side’ and a ‘farm side.’ The division is generally made by a country road...”18 Nearly every riverside mansion house in Dutchess County was remodeled during this period, many to the design of prominent architects such as Alexander Jackson Davis, Calvert Vaux, Frederick Withers, Richard Upjohn, and Richard Morris Hunt.19 Continuing the stylistic trends that appeared prior to the Civil War, architecture became eclectic, drawing on a number of historic motifs that were most often produced in a dark, foreboding manner. The Italianate, Stick, and Second Empire architectural styles were fashionable during the 1870s, while Queen Anne became dominant in the 1880s.

In complement to the architecture, landscape design at the river estates continued to take inspiration from the picturesque setting of the Hudson Valley, with its farmland, rustic woods, and distant views. An 1880 account of the Dinsmore Estate near Staatsburg north of Hyde Park described it as “...one of the most charming of the many fine residences which line the banks of the Hudson, [which] contribute by their aesthetic surroundings to the attractiveness of the landscape, whose natural beauty has ever elicited the admiration of the tourist or traveler of cultivated tastes.”20 Views of the Hudson River and mountains to the west, made famous at the Bard Estate (Vanderbilt Mansion), served as the defining feature for most estates.

Most estate owners enhanced the natural setting by designing landscapes in the picturesque style, which Andrew Jackson Downing had popularized prior to the Civil War.21 The Natural style, or what Downing also referred to as “the Beautiful,” was based on the idealized rural character of eighteenth-century landscape gardens at English country estates, with their sweeping lawns, naturalistic groupings of trees, curving drives, and framed views of the surrounding rural countryside. In the Hudson Valley, estate owners also often improved the adjoining public roads, which became reminiscent of the English countryside with refined stone walls, roadside trees, gateways, and ornamental agriculture, including orchards and well-shorn meadows.22 In contrast to this rural character, the sublime picturesque or Downing’s “Irregular” style was often used in the estates’ wooded and rustic pleasure grounds, to evoke the wild side of
nature. Typical sublime features included rustic twig summerhouses and benches, evergreen trees, woodlands, and rock outcroppings that echoed the mountain wilderness across the Hudson River. During the late nineteenth century, most estate landscapes also included flower gardens located near the main house. These ranged from stylized Victorian carpet beds of brightly colored annuals in geometric patterns, to more utilitarian cutting gardens. Domestic gardens for raising fruits and vegetables were also part of the landscape, as were working farm complexes, located away from the main house.

THE ROOSEVELTS’ RIVERFRONT NEIGHBORS

The estates to the north of Springwood remained an integral part of the Springwood landscape during this period, a legacy of the Wheeler-Boorman ownership of Brierstone and Bellefield prior to 1867. James Roosevelt’s neighbor to the north for much of this period was Archibald Rogers, whose Crumwold Farms estate incorporated several old farms and smaller country places, including Bellefield, into a sprawling estate of more than 600 acres by 1886. Bellefield had changed hands in 1866 with the death of James Boorman, the owner since 1843. He left the 131-acre property to his daughter, Mary Boorman Wheeler, who together with her husband Josiah owned Brierstone (Springwood). Ten months later, just prior to the sale of Brierstone to James Roosevelt, Mary Wheeler sold Bellefield house and the surrounding 131 acres west of the Post Road to Francis U. Johnston, the grandson of the man who built Bellefield house in 1795–96. Johnston did not acquire the Bellefield farm across the Post Road that the Wheelers also owned, perhaps because the Wheelers had already sold it to Timothy Bracken. Johnston owned Bellefield until 1871, when he sold the same 131-acre parcel to Henry G. and Elizabeth A. Coggershall of New York City. By 1879, the Coggershalls were forced to sell the estate at public auction, and it was acquired by Anne Livingston. She in turn sold it in 1883 to Archibald Rogers, who had just acquired the Butler Estate, Crumwold, north of Bellefield. Rogers at the time was expanding Crumwold by acquiring the Johnson-Knevels Farm on the east side of the Post Road after 1891, as well as several other properties. Rogers also subdivided a small portion of the estate. In 1885, he sold a 16-acre parcel containing Bellefield house to Senator Thomas Newbold, including the Bellefield house (fig. 2.16, see also fig. 2.15). During his first two decades of ownership, Newbold made few changes to the Bellefield landscape, which was visible from Springwood through a tree line along the property boundary. The Federal-period house, with its Italianate and wrought-iron...
porches added during the Boorman ownership, was surrounded by mature trees. From the rear gardens there was a view across the river valley. Here along the edge of the river terrace, Newbold purchased an additional 4 acres from Rogers in 1890.26 Unlike the large river estates, Newbold’s much-reduced Bellefield estate did not extend down to the Hudson because this land remained part of the Rogers Estate. For the first two decades of his ownership, Thomas Newbold did not have a separate farm component to his country place, as the former Bellefield farm had been acquired by James Roosevelt.27

The river estates and other property to the south of Springwood were also parts of the larger estate landscape. By the time James Roosevelt acquired the Kirchner Place in 1886, his neighbor to the south was Henry J. Webendorfer, whose estate extended east from the Hudson River and straddled both sides of the Post Road. The estate had been assembled by 1891 out of a number of smaller country places and farms west of the Post Road, including the Barnet place known as Sunnybrook, and the west half of the Taylor farm. On the east side of the Post Road, the Novitiate of Saint Andrew had purchased the east half of the Taylor farm by 1891 as the beginning of its Hyde Park campus (see fig. 2.16).28 This Jesuit institution, part of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of New York, was a place to discern whether to enter the religious order, prior to formal study in a seminary.29

THE ROOSEVELT ESTATE, 1867–1900

Land Acquisition

While James Roosevelt was traveling abroad in 1865, his country home along the Post Road in Poughkeepsie, known as Mount Hope and later site of a state psychiatric hospital, burned. Roosevelt decided not to rebuild, and two years after the fire he purchased a new country place: the west half of Josiah and Mary Wheeler’s Brierstone estate, located just over 2 miles to the north in Hyde Park. On May 16, 1867, the deed of sale was executed for the 110-acre tract at a cost of $40,000 (fig. 2.17).30 According to family tradition, James Roosevelt was interested in the Wheeler Place, which he later renamed “Springwood,” because it had pastureland, a horse track, and a stable that he needed to raise trotting horses.31 The landscape also contained the natural attributes most favored for country places in the Hudson Valley, notably its river and mountain views and its rural setting. The Italianate-style main house, although renovated nearly two decades earlier, was still fashionable, and the wooded land leading down to the Hudson River provided ample opportunity for development of a rustic pleasure ground.

James Roosevelt’s new 110-acre country place did not, however, include a river road (this was on the separately owned Bellefield property to the north), nor did it have its own farm component. The Wheelers had presumably sold their estate
farm across the Post Road, originally the Bellefield farm, to someone else by the
time James Roosevelt made his purchase in May 1867. The lack of these two
estate features soon led Roosevelt to acquire additional land for Springwood. On
February 14, 1868, he purchased the 234-acre estate immediately to the south
belonging to Robert and Sarah Boreel for $30,300, nearly $10,000 less than he
paid for the 110-acre Wheeler Place (see fig. 2.17).32 The property consisted of
the main house, later known as the Red House, on the west side of the Post Road,
and the farmhouse and barns directly opposite it on the east side of the road.

Acquisition of the estate gave Roosevelt ready access to the river that was not
possible through the rough terrain on the Wheeler Place, as well as land in the
viewshed from the Springwood house, which was positioned just 100 feet north of
the Boreel property boundary.

The Boreel land east of the Post Road became the core of the Springwood farm,
which the family called the Home Farm. Three years after acquiring the Boreel
Place, James Roosevelt enlarged the Home Farm by purchasing the adjoining 183-
acre former Bellefield farm owned at the time by the estate of Timothy Bracken,
who had presumably acquired the property from the Wheelers in ca. 1867 (see fig.
2.17). Bracken died in ca. 1871, and the executors of his estate—Thomas E. Parker,
George W. McLean, and Patrick J. Flynn—sold the property to James Roosevelt
for $13,000 on September 1, 1871.33 This property, which FDR called the Bracken
Place, included fertile fields along the Post Road and the former Bellefield
farmhouse-barn complex across from the Wheeler Place.34
Nearly two decades after acquiring the Boreel Place, James Roosevelt purchased a 98-acre tract to the south, known as the Kirchner Place, as his last addition to the Springwood estate (see fig. 2.17). Roosevelt purchased the property on October 16, 1886 for $11,000 from Charles and Caroline Kirchner (also spelled Kirschner) of Poughkeepsie, who had acquired it in 1879, but apparently did not reside there. The Kirchners had purchased the property as part of a contested sale on behalf of the estate of James B. Taylor. At the time, the Taylor estate was subdivided to either side of the Post Road. The estate had included a farmhouse on the east side of the road, and the main house and greenhouses on the west side, formerly owned by Aaron Teed. The 98-acre parcel that the Kirchners purchased was north and west of the main house and greenhouses, which became part of the estate of Henry J. Webendorfer.

James Roosevelt may have purchased the Kirchner Place to acquire additional agricultural land, but more importantly, he may have wanted to protect the setting of Springwood and the Red House, since the river views from both houses looked over the western part of the Kirchner Place. The property also contained most of the Big Cove shoreline. With purchase of the Kirchner Place, James Roosevelt owned all of the land surrounding this body of water, where his boathouse was located.

**Wheeler Place (Drawing 2.1)**

Over the course of the three decades following his purchase of the Wheeler Place in May 1867, James Roosevelt made few major alterations to the house and landscape that originated under the ownership of Widow Everson in the 1790s, with its cultivated fields fronting on the Post Road known as the North Avenue Lot and the South Avenue Lot, divided by a straight, tree-lined entrance drive initially known as “the avenue” and later as the Home Road (fig. 2.18). The fields were used for growing crops such as hay and grains, except for a small oval trotting course at the northwest corner of the South Avenue Lot that had been built by the Wheelers. West of the North and South Avenue Lots bordering the edge of the terrace and overlooking the Hudson River were the main house, gardens, and service buildings.

Except for two small additions made in the 1880s and expansion of the verandah in the 1890s, the Roosevelts made few exterior changes to the main house at Springwood, which had been last renovated in the Italianate style by the Wheelers in the 1840s (fig. 2.19). The house faced east toward the Post Road across a lawn shaded by specimen trees. Open fields to the west and south of the house permitted views across the adjoining Boreel Place to the Hudson River, with the Shawangunk Mountain foothills in the distance (fig. 2.20). Due north of the house was a complex of service buildings, which included a laundry, small ice
2. Land-Use History, 1867–1900

Figure 2.18. The “park” part of Springwood west of the Post Road as surveyed in 1906, showing the estate as it existed during James Roosevelt's lifetime. The Wheeler Place is the top parcel in pink, and the Kirchner and Boreel Places (labeled as Fuller) in green comprise the J. R. Roosevelt Place. (Map 15-2-13b, Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, annotated by SUNY ESF.)

Figure 2.19 (right). The river side of the Springwood house, ca. 1880. The three-story tower and other Italianate-style details were added to the Federal-period house before James Roosevelt purchased the property. (Photograph NPx 63-528, Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.)
A new stable was built in 1886, a large Queen Anne–style building designed by noted Hudson Valley architect Frederick C. Withers (fig. 2.21). In 1898, the family built a new, larger ice house north of the greenhouses, but retained the earlier ice house.38 North and east of the main house and service buildings, the Roosevelts maintained the Wheelers’ hedge-enclosed formal lawn that defined was bounded by the Home Road on the south and service roads on the other sides. Immediately north of the hedge, in the present-day Rose Garden, were two parallel wood-frame greenhouses surrounded by flower and vegetable gardens. Northwest of these gardens was the Gothic Revival–style gardener’s cottage, erected by the Wheeler in ca. 1850. East of the gardener’s cottage was an orchard.39

At the base of the terrace, downhill from the main house and coach house, was a service and farm area known as the Paddock Lot. Here was the old barn that that James Roosevelt used to stable brood mares, with horse corrals enclosed by locust post and barbed-wire fencing (fig 2.22). The barn dated to the Wheeler ownership and may have been the original barn associated with the Everson house, dating to the 1790s.40 South of the barn was a two-story staff residence, called the “Duplex,” constructed at some point between 1886 and 1896. The Roosevelts also kept chickens in this area. To the west of the Paddock Lot was the Gravel Lot, a partially wooded area bordering the unnamed creek that was used in part for mining gravel to surface roads on the estate.

West of the Gravel Lot to the river’s edge and New York Central and Hudson River Railroad was a forested area that FDR called the River Wood Lot, a rustic landscape in the fashion of Downing’s “Irregular” style.41 These woods were probably a favorite place for riding horses, taking forest strolls, and observing boats on the Hudson. The natural setting of the River Wood Lot and adjoining areas lent well to these uses. The land had several long rocky ridges running...
north to south, some up to 40 feet high, with swamps between the ridges where there were no drainage outlets. Although once used for its timber and as pasture, as reflected in the stone walls that ran along and in between the ridges, much of the land had been out of active agricultural use by the time the Roosevelts acquired the property in 1867. In the Gravel Lot along the creek, there was a small area of hemlock and red oak forest that had begun to regenerate as early as 1810. The woods on the adjoining River Wood Lot were of a similar age and dominated by hemlock, red oak, and chestnut oak. The only substantial opening in the River Wood Lot was at its northern boundary adjoining the Rogers Estate, where there was a field.42

One of the first improvements James Roosevelt made to River Wood Lot was the addition of a boathouse along the Hudson River. Boating was James’s favorite recreation in addition to trotting, and the family would often row or sail to nearby river estates, or use iceboats in winter. Soon after acquiring the Wheeler Place, James ordered a boathouse from a Poughkeepsie firm and had it shipped upriver in July 1867 to a small point that jutted out into the Hudson River on the west side of the railroad, about 1,000 feet north of the Big Cove.43 The boathouse and an adjoining dock were completed by June 1868, when Rebecca Roosevelt wrote in her diary, “...we took one of the men and walked to the river and back, cutting down trees and marking a path to the boat house.”44 There was no road to the boathouse due to the rough nature of the River Wood Lot, nor was there a bridge over the railroad. The boathouse path described by Rebecca was probably one of several trails that the Roosevelts maintained through the woods. Another trail probably led north from the boathouse to meet up with the “Cliff Walk” on the Rogers Estate that led to the Rogers mansion, known as Crumwold Hall.45

Figure 2.22. James Roosevelt’s horses in the Paddock Lot, looking south from River Road, ca. 1890. The person is probably William Plog. The Springwood house is to the left, behind the trees. (Photograph NPx 47-95:3223, Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.)

Figure 2.23. View southwest from the Springwood house to the frozen Hudson River, looking across the fields and lower woods on the Boreel Place, 1894. At the time, the lower woods were still open in areas along old pastures and cut-over areas. (Photograph NPx 47-96:2792, Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.)

South of the River Wood Lot were the lower woods and riverfront of the Boreel Place, a patchwork of old fields and woods (fig. 2.23). This part of the estate functioned as part of the Wheeler Place, providing the only relatively level route to the Hudson River from the Springwood house. At the time, the river road used by the Wheelers (Stone Cottage Road) was on the separately
owned Bellefield property. By 1870, James Roosevelt had completed his new road, known as River Road, extending from the Paddock Lot near the old barn below the Springwood house southwest across the Boreel Place toward the Hudson River at the north end of the Big Cove (see fig. 2.18). Here, between the railroad and the original river shoreline, the Roosevelts built a new and larger boathouse, probably soon after River Road was completed.46 Boats were launched into the Hudson River from a landing on a small area of land on the west side of the railroad, at the end of River Road. The road also served utilitarian purposes, for delivery of coal and other supplies from boats and railroad cars up to the Springwood house.47

Aside from the road and boathouse, the Roosevelts made several other improvements and additions to the lower woods for use as rustic pleasure grounds. The crossing of River Road over the unnamed creek was by a stone bridge that was lined with twig railings, reflecting a rustic style popular in forested landscapes such as those of the Adirondack Great Camps (fig. 2.24).48 In ca. 1875, the family built a cottage in the woods on a bluff overlooking the Hudson River and railroad, probably accessed by a path from the site of the old boathouse.49 Such cottages, which also included the nearby Stone Cottage on the Rogers Estate, provided a place for taking in river views and breezes. At the south end of the Gravel Lot, the Roosevelts had a small, 150-foot-long pond created in 1881 by damming a gorge in the unnamed creek. Aside from being a rustic enhancement and a place to swim, the pond also had utilitarian purposes, serving as a reservoir for the estate’s water supply and a source of ice.50

Although much of the land along the Hudson River had become reforested by the second half of the nineteenth century, not all of the woods had the refined character that would have been desirable for rustic pleasure grounds. The successional character of the younger woods on the old pastures would have had a scrubby appearance with brush that obscured views and inhibited access. Elsewhere, there is evidence that the Roosevelts managed the woods during this period by cleaning up the underbrush, and probably also by removing fallen trees and other debris to create a neater appearance.51 They also made other changes to the woods in order to make them more aesthetically pleasing and useful for recreational purposes, including draining swamps that formed between the ridges, and planting wildflowers on open ground.52
Across the Post Road from the Wheeler Place was the Springwood farm, consisting of the east half of the Boreel Place that Roosevelt acquired in 1868, and the Bracken Place (former Wheeler-Bellefield farm) acquired in 1871 (fig. 2.25). As a gentleman farmer, James Roosevelt practiced diversified agriculture that provided a range of products for domestic consumption. He maintained dairy cows, pigs, chickens, and horses, and raised fodder crops in the fields. During this period, the chickens were kept in the Paddock Lot on the Wheeler Place, where the main vegetable garden was also located, north of the greenhouse. The showpiece of the farm was James’s herd of Alderney (Jersey or Guernsey) cattle, which he had started in 1848 at the old country place, Mount Hope, and continued to improve into the 1890s. Springwood also had working agricultural fields on the west side of the Post Road, where the North and South Avenue Lots...
and the sloping ground west of the houses were used for growing crops such as hay, corn, and wheat.55

The center of the Home Farm operation was the old Boreel farmhouse and barn, located about 500 feet back from the Post Road on the south side of Farm Road, the easterly extension of the entry road to the Red House (figs. 2.26, 2.27). James Roosevelt presumably decided to consolidate his farm at this complex, rather than maintain the separate farmhouse and barn on the Bracken Place, formerly the Wheeler-Bellefield farm. At some point between 1871 and 1891, this second complex was removed, but the Roosevelts kept the tree-lined farm road, which they called Bracken Lane.56 James Roosevelt had a number of additions and improvements made to the eighteenth-century farmhouse and barn at the Boreel Place. He added a front porch to the farmhouse, which became the home of his farm manager or head farmer, James Edgar, in ca. 1868.57 Improvements to the barns included addition of a rectangular silo with a gable roof, wings on the barn, and several small sheds that together with the barn and farmhouse enclosed a small barnyard bordered by a plank fence.

North and south of the farmstead were two rectangular cultivated fields that bordered the Post Road, known as the North Farm Lot and the South Farm Lot (see fig. 2.25). Located on the rich soils of the river terrace, these fields were bounded by stone walls and were used to grow grains and hay for the livestock.58 To the east of the farmstead across a small creek or ditch were two additional lots. The one to the south of Farm Road, known as the East Farm Lot, probably contained cultivated fields and an orchard. The one to the north was known as the Night Pasture, the pasture closest to the barns. East of these two lots, the land dropped off into a ravine and was characterized by large rock outcroppings. Farm Road continued north and east through this land, crossing the Maritje Kill near
the northern boundary of the Bracken Place, and then extending a short distance on the other side. This rough land consisted of second-growth red oak, white oak, and chestnut oak that had begun to regenerate by the time James Roosevelt purchased the property in 1868, on old fields and pastures that were probably abandoned two decades earlier. The portion of the woods closest to the farm complex, known as the Farm Wood Lot, was patchy by 1900, presumably due to cutting of trees for firewood and timber. The rest of the forest extending to the eastern property line east of the Maritje Kill was of a similar age and species, but was apparently little used, as it had no formal name. Along the Maritje Kill, there were swamps characterized by clumps of red maple and open areas covered by ferns.

The portion of the Home Farm on the Bracken Place was also divided into fields, pastures, and woods separated by stone fences. The largest field along the Post Road, including the site of the old Bellefield farmhouse and barns, was known as the Big Lot. To its north were two smaller lots named the North Parker Lot and South Parker Lot. These names derived from their use by Thomas E. Parker. At some point prior to 1886, James Roosevelt agreed to sell these fields to Parker, who was one of the executors of Timothy Bracken’s estate. The sale was never executed, and by 1900 Bracken had formally decided not to purchase the property despite the earlier agreement. As with the Boreel fields, the Roosevelts used these fields along the Post Road for growing grain, hay, and fodder crops to feed their livestock.

To the east of the fields along the Post Road was rougher land characterized by level areas broken by rock outcroppings and ridges. This land formed three wooded pastures that extended due north from the Night Pasture on the Boreel Place. From north to south, these included the Middle Pasture, Locust Pasture, and Swamp Pasture. The Middle Pasture contained about three-quarters open pasture, with the rest forested in hemlock and hickory that had become established around the time James Roosevelt purchased the property in 1871. About one-half of the western part of the Locust Pasture was covered in black locust, which had regenerated where old stands (dating to the 1830s or earlier) of maple and elm had been clear-cut, probably by the Roosevelts. The eastern part of the Locust Pasture was covered in red oak, white oak, and chestnut oak on the uplands that had regenerated beginning about 1870, with a hardwood swamp around a small impoundment known as Bracken Pond (see fig. 2.25). This artificial pond was built prior to Roosevelt ownership, most likely as a water source for livestock or perhaps for the Bellefield farm buildings. To the north, the Swamp Pasture contained forest cover similar to the eastern part of the Locust Pasture, with white oak and red oak on the uplands, and clumps of red maple and shrubs in the swamps.
East of these pastures were woodlots that were part of the forest that extended onto the eastern end of the Boreel Place and east onto the adjoining upland farms. These included the Triangle Wood Lot and the Northeast Wood Lot at the northern boundary of the estate, covered in an even-aged stand of red oak, chestnut oak, and white oak with scattered hemlock that had regenerated around the time James Roosevelt purchased the property in 1871. The woodlots contained some open areas where cutting had occurred. The rest of the forest on the Bracken Place extending east to the Maritje Kill was a similar, but slightly older type, having regenerated beginning about 1850. In addition to oaks and maples, the forest also contained abundant stands of hickory and ironwoods, as well as swamps along the Maritje Kill at the southeast side of the property.65

The J. R. Roosevelt Place (Drawing 2.3)

At the time James Roosevelt acquired the Boreel Place in February 1868, the future country place of J. R. Roosevelt did not have the refinements characteristic of a stylish country place, despite its ownership by a prominent family. For ten years, James Roosevelt rented out the main house, known as the Red House, until 1878 when it became the country home of his eldest son James Roosevelt Roosevelt, known as Rosy, and his wife, Helen Schermerhorn Astor, whose cousin, Sarah Astor Langdon Boreel, had sold the property to James Roosevelt in 1868. Helen brought to the marriage a trust fund equal to approximately $7 million and a mansion on Fifth Avenue that was the couple’s permanent home. Although Rosy graduated with honors from Columbia, he lacked a profession and instead worked primarily to manage his estate. The couple had two children, James Roosevelt Roosevelt, Jr., known as Taddy, and Helen. Helen Schermerhorn Astor Roosevelt died while the children were still young, in 1893.66

The late Federal period house with its red-painted clapboards and black trim featured none of the picturesque qualities of the Wheeler House (fig. 2.28).67

The setting of the house, however, shared many similarities. It was bordered by agricultural fields along the Post Road that were divided by a straight drive lined by mature trees with gates at the road and a loop in front of the house (fig. 2.29). To the north of the house were the service buildings, and below the house were fields bordered by woods extending down to the river’s edge. The Kirchner Place on the south part of the property contained fields and an orchard near the Post
Road, a small stream, and woods along the lowlands that bordered the Big Cove and the Hudson River. A tree-lined road north of the orchard may have been the original alignment of the Post Road when it went around Teller’s Hill. Just south of the Kirchner property line was a building, perhaps a gatehouse, belonging to the Webendorfer Estate.

Although the Boreel Place had been separate from the Wheeler Place since the original subdivision of the water lots, the two properties became functionally and physically integrated under James Roosevelt’s ownership. This was especially true in the wooded lowlands of the Boreel Place that formed part of the rustic pleasure grounds associated with the Wheeler Place, including the site of the Roosevelt boathouse on the Big Cove. The connections were also evident in the open fields of the lowlands below the Red House that formed the foreground of the river view from the Springwood house.68 The degree to which the boundary between the two places largely disappeared during this period is also evident in the siting of the ice pond, which straddled the old property line. On the terrace there was little vegetation separating the front fields bordering the Post Road, and a road, the Estates Road, connected the two properties.69

Although the Red House became Rosy’s home beginning in 1878, the property remained under the ownership of James Roosevelt, and he probably had a dominant role in its care and improvement. Like the Wheeler Place, the Boreel and Kirchner Places witnessed few significant changes during this period. Porches were added to the front and sides of the house in ca. 1880 (fig. 2.30). The surrounding landscape retained its simple, rural character with agricultural fields lining the Post Road. The grounds around the house were kept with vines on the porches, planting beds, and a hipped-roof summerhouse, a type of gazebo, on the lawn to the north (fig 2.31). The old Dutch-style barn north of the house was used as stables, probably the trotters that were Rosy’s hobby. South of the house there was a greenhouse that may have adjoined a domestic kitchen garden.
The only major building added during this period was a residence for estate staff, known as the farmhouse and similar to the Duplex at the Wheeler Place (fig. 2.32). Built in ca. 1890, the tall two-story frame building with a three-bay, gable-front façade with two-over-two sash windows was built at the back of the south front field and accessed off the entrance road.70

Will of James Roosevelt, 1900

On December 8, 1900, James Roosevelt died in New York City. Under the detailed provisions of his will, he left the Wheeler Place and Home Farm (Boreel and Bracken Places) to Franklin D. Roosevelt, then eighteen and a freshman at Harvard, subject to the life “use and enjoyment” of FDR’s mother, Sara Delano Roosevelt. The will also provided Sara and FDR an easement over the adjoining Boreel Place and Kirchner Place to preserve the view of the Hudson River by having the right “…to cut down and remove all trees and timber of any and all kinds which may be necessary to secure and preserve the said ‘Wheeler Place’ and to the owners and occupants thereof, the River and Mountain Views as they now are from the said ‘Wheeler Place.’”71

In addition to the easement, James Roosevelt also left to FDR a narrow 7-acre strip of the Boreel Place along the south boundary of the Wheeler Place that extended from the Post Road to the Hudson River (see drawing 2.1). James Roosevelt had subdivided this property, which contained a portion of the ice pond and the cottage, to ensure that the Wheeler Place had drainage and sewer access to the Hudson River.72 The subdivision did not, however, place all of the River Road and the boathouse under FDR’s ownership. This land and all of the Boreel Place west of the Post Road (except for the drainage strip) and the Kirchner Place was left to Rosy, subject to the viewshed easement held by FDR.71
SUMMARY, 1867–1900

James Roosevelt's death in 1900 was a major event in the life of the family, but would have little immediate impact on the character of the 635-acre Hyde Park estate, Springwood. FDR’s father had maintained the estate with three related components: the Wheeler Place, containing the main house (FDR Home) and surrounding 110 acres; the Home Farm (east half of the Boreel Place and the Bracken Places), encompassing 324 acres; and the 201-acre J. R. Roosevelt Place (west half of the Boreel Place and the Kirchner Place). Although in 1900 FDR had gained legal title to the Wheeler Place and Home Farm, the property functionally belonged to his mother, Sara, by life estate granted in her husband’s will. Sara had no legal interest in the J. R. Roosevelt Place, which belonged outright to FDR’s half brother, Rosy.

Throughout this period between 1867 and 1900, the overall character of the Roosevelt Estate remained much as it had developed during its prior ownership by the Wheeler-Boorman and Boreel families, with the main houses and surrounding pleasure grounds, typically known as the “park,” on the west or river side of the Post Road, and the farm on the east side. The one significant change was removal of the Bellefield farm complex on the Bracken Place. Despite the acquisitions and changes in property boundaries made by James Roosevelt, the estate preserved the earlier rural character of the landscape, with agricultural fields bordering the Post Road and forest covering much of the rough land leading down to the Hudson River to the west, and toward the Maritje Kill to the east. East of the estate, the small market farms on the upper terrace along Violet Avenue and in the Taconic foothills bordering Cream Street also remained much as they had developed prior to 1867, although there was an increasing amount of marginal agricultural land that was being abandoned.
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ESTATE IMPROVEMENTS AND AMATEUR FORESTRY, 1900–1928

For five years following James Roosevelt’s death in 1900, while FDR was studying at Harvard and Columbia, Sara Delano Roosevelt maintained the Springwood estate with little change. Then in 1905, Franklin, upon his marriage to Anna Eleanor Roosevelt and return to Hyde Park, turned his attention to improving the family estate. Together with his mother, he planned and implemented major renovations to the Springwood house, gardens, and grounds during the following decade. The survey of the estate made in 1906 was completed before most of these improvements were begun (see figs. 2.18, 2.25). FDR focused much of his attention during this period on improving the estate’s farmland and forest. In the tradition of country estates as model farms, he tracked the production of the fields, improved the farm’s dairy operation, and most significantly, began a scientific forestry program during a time when this still relatively new conservation practice was just gaining widespread application across New York State.

FDR and Eleanor shared close quarters with Sara Roosevelt, who remained a dominant figure in their lives and in the management of the Springwood estate. In New York City, they shared a five-story townhouse designed by Charles Platt at 49 East 65th Street in New York that was a Christmas gift from Sara in 1907. Springwood served as the young couple’s country home, but remained very much Sara’s. Here, FDR and Eleanor raised six children: Anna Eleanor, Jr. (1906–1975), James (1907–1991), Franklin Delano, Jr. (1909, died in infancy), Elliott (1910–1990), Franklin Delano Jr. (1914–1988), and John Aspinwall (1916–1981). Since 1884, the family also had a summer cottage at Campobello Island, New Brunswick, where FDR contracted polio in 1921 at the age of thirty-nine.

At Hyde Park, FDR’s interest in forestry and conservation led him to acquire adjoining upland farms, where he expanded his forestry program to land that better represented the problems of typical small farms with worn-out soils and declining productivity. Aside from two plantations, however, FDR concentrated most of his forestry work during this period on the original estate lands. The two upland farms that he acquired during this period, the Bennett and Tompkins Farms, remained largely unchanged, with the exception of the east end of the Bennett Farm. Here, on the east bank of the Fall Kill at an old pasture and informal picnic ground, Eleanor Roosevelt and her two friends, Marion Dickerman and Nancy Cook, built a house and developed workshops to revive American craft traditions to address issues
of rural decline, not unlike those FDR was addressing through his forestry program.¹

COUNTRY PLACES AND FARMS

In the years between 1900 and 1928, the east bank of the Hudson River in Dutchess County remained the realm of large country places, while the adjoining uplands to the east were occupied by declining farms that were being abandoned at an unprecedented rate due to a widespread agricultural depression. Throughout the metropolitan area of New York City and most other cities in the country, this period saw the development of many new country places. Most of these were not, however, extensive seasonal residences and model farms that were typical of the late nineteenth century, but rather suburban estates set on smaller acreage serving as weekend retreats, easily accessible through commuter rail lines and later by automobiles.

The riverfront of the mid–Hudson Valley generally did not witness the frenzy of country place development as did the North Shore of Long Island, Greenwich, Connecticut, or other places closer to New York City. In contrast, the early twentieth century witnessed the beginning decline of country house life for the Hudson Valley that had characterized the previous century.² This trend may have helped preserve the character of the Hyde Park river estates, where the overall patterns and organization of the landscape remained largely unchanged—the main house overlooking the river on the west side of the Post Road, and the farm operation centered on the east side. Despite the relative lack of change, there were notable shifts in the design of country places at the turn of the century. The picturesque, dark, and romantic quality of the post–Civil War era was largely abandoned for classical design that was popularized through the 1893–94 World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago and the work of architects trained at the École des Beaux Arts. This change in popular tastes became evident not only in architecture, but in landscapes as well, particularly in formal gardens associated with the main houses.

The Vanderbilts were some of the first in Dutchess County to incorporate neoclassical design into their country estate, Hyde Park. Between 1896 and 1899, Frederick Vanderbilt erected a new mansion designed by McKim, Mead & White on the site of the previous house, in the ornate style of Beaux Arts neoclassicism with a symmetrical white stone façade and monumental Corinthian porticos (fig. 2.33). Soon after, Vanderbilt redesigned the estate’s formal gardens in a neoclassical style characterized...
by architectural spaces, axial walks, and geometric beds in the Italian manner. In a similar but far less opulent way, the Roosevelts’ neighbor, Thomas Newbold, began a series of improvements in 1909 to redesign the Bellefield house and gardens. The house was enlarged and redesigned by McKim, Mead & White in a restrained neoclassical style, with casement windows and a symmetrical, center-entrance façade and portico supported by Doric columns (fig. 2.34). At the same time, Newbold added a formal rectangular flower garden off the south side of the house, designed by landscape architect Beatrix Farrand with a neoclassical organization defined by a perimeter hemlock hedge, stone walls, and axial paths. These renovations at the Newbold and Vanderbilt estates illustrated both new design influences as well as a strong continuity with the nineteenth century through retention of the original house sites and much of the surrounding organization of the landscape.

Such continuity also marked the farming operations that remained central to the river estates through the early twentieth century, with many improved according to progressive agricultural practices. In 1901, the Vanderbilts erected a new complex of farm buildings at Hyde Park as an addition to the earlier farm buildings on the east side of Post Road. The new complex featured a central clock tower that was a symbol of efficient farm management (fig. 2.35). At Crumwold Farms, Archibald Rogers maintained his large farm complex that he had erected late in the nineteenth century on the east side of the road, north of Bellefield. While he continued traditional agriculture centered on dairy, he began a number of progressive improvements, notably the introduction of forestry.

Thomas Newbold followed the lead of other estate owners in maintaining a farm component to Bellefield to replace the one that had been lost when the original Bellefield farm property east of the Post Road was sold to Timothy Bracken and then James Roosevelt in 1871. In 1905, Newbold purchased the Dumphy Farm due east of the old Bellefield farm, and four years later, he purchased the adjoining farm to the northeast owned by the Hughson family (see fig. 2.9). Newbold’s purchase of distant farms appears to have been a novel approach for riverfront estate owners, at least in Hyde Park. Under Newbold’s ownership, the Dumphy and Hughson Farms were operated by tenants, but whether they supplied Bellefield with agricultural produce is not known. Newbold may have been
interested in these farms—which like many in Hyde Park were declining due to a loss of productivity in the soil and increasing market competition—in the hopes of improving them in the tradition of gentleman farming. Perhaps to address these issues or to follow the lead of his estate neighbors, Newbold had an old field at the northeast corner of the Hughson Farm planted in ca. 1927 with red and white pine, to serve as a timber crop.6

Worn-out and abandoned farmland was becoming increasingly prevalent in Dutchess County and throughout the Northeast during the early twentieth century, a trend that was having vast economic as well as social ramifications. At the beginning of this period, agriculture was still by far the dominant economic activity in Dutchess County. The 1910 census recorded that Dutchess County was the third-largest corn-producing county in the state; the second largest in apples; and the ninth largest in barley.7 Dairy, which had become widespread after the Civil War, was the county’s most important agricultural product, but increasing competition during this period brought decreasing returns for many farmers. Whereas Dutchess County had once enjoyed an advantage in the enormous New York City dairy market due to its geographic proximity, the advent of the refrigerated railcars and trucks in the 1920s made shipment of fluid milk profitable from all the milk-producing counties of the state. The larger dairy farms in central and western New York could often outcompete the smaller Dutchess County dairy farmer, especially those on marginal lands found in Hyde Park. This shift in the dairy industry came at the same time as a serious agricultural depression, resulting in heightened rates of farmland abandonment.8

Idle or abandoned farmland had been a growing problem in New York State since the late nineteenth century. Many farmers were finding agriculture unprofitable in the context of stiff competition from larger and more fertile Midwestern farms, while higher-paying jobs in industrial cities were bringing new alternatives for making a living. Although new machinery and advanced methods of fertilization and soil conservation were available by the early twentieth century, these improvements could do little to enhance the productivity of marginal land that was never well suited to cultivation, or which had been stripped of its soils through poor husbandry. Due to these economic and environmental issues, farmers across the state abandoned their unproductive fields and even entire farms from agricultural use. In New York, this problem was becoming so acute by the early twentieth century that it was identified as the “land problem.”9 The land problem affected not only individual farms, but also the viability of whole rural regions that relied on an agricultural economy. As the State of New York published in 1909,

This land is lying idle, is not producing any revenue for its owner; in fact, is held at a loss because taxes must be paid, and the interest on the capital
invested is lost. A large area of such idle land in any state is just as serious an economic proposition as idle labor, because both are non-productive.\textsuperscript{10}

In 1880, the number of acres actively used for farming in New York reached its peak at approximately 23 million acres. From then until 1920, the rate of farmland abandonment averaged a loss of 40,000 acres per year; during the farm depression of the 1920s, the rate increased dramatically to 272,000 acres a year, so that by 1930, there were estimated to be five million fewer acres of farmland than there were in 1880. This amount of abandoned farmland represented nearly one-fifth of the total land area of the state.\textsuperscript{11} On top of the loss of productive fields, farmers who remained in business were abandoning the management of their farm woodlots, at a loss of 27,000 acres per year between 1910 and 1920.\textsuperscript{12} This idle wooded and agricultural land typically ranged from a part of an active farm, to whole farms and even groups of farms.

Much of the abandoned farmland in the state was concentrated in hilly and rocky regions with thin soils, such as in the Southern Tier, Adirondack and Catskill foothills, and the Hudson Valley. In Dutchess County, 30 percent of the farmland had been converted to other uses by 1930, much of it probably abandoned.\textsuperscript{13} As one writer in a popular journal explained during this time, referring to Hyde Park: “Years ago men could make a living by using this land for conventional farm purposes, even though much of it is broken woodland, rocky, swampy, hilly. But with the opening up of the better farming land of the West, that day passed; it became unprofitable to farm any but the best pieces of arable land.”\textsuperscript{14}

\section*{FORESTRY AND CONSERVATION}

The land problem and general agricultural decline in Dutchess County and elsewhere in New York State led to new interest in making marginal agricultural lands productive. For estate owners, governments, and the average farmer, forestry seemed to provide some of the best solutions to enhancing the productivity of marginal agricultural land (fig. 2.36). When FDR began his tree-planting program in 1911, forestry was a relatively recent introduction to the United States, but was well on its way to becoming a highly developed profession supported by academics and government programs.

In its initial development as a profession during the early twentieth century, forestry was generally defined as the rational treatment of forests, and so was also known as scientific forestry. This treatment stressed sustainable timber
production, in contrast to clear-cutting that produced one-time harvests and usually left an environmental disaster in its wake. The pioneer American forester Bernhard E. Fernow defined forestry for *The Standard Cyclopedia of Horticulture* as “...the art and business of making revenue from the growing of wood crops, just as all agriculture is finally concerned in producing values from food crops and other crops.”

Nelson C. Brown and Franklin Moon, professors at the New York State College of Forestry, provided a similar definition in the introduction to their 1914 manual, *Elements of Forestry*, in which they wrote that “...forestry means the freest and fullest use compatible with permanent soil productivity and the supplying of repeated crops of timber and other forest products in perpetuity.”

Forestry was also often touted as helping to prevent erosion, guard against flooding, and support game populations, yet these benefits were almost always secondary to timber production.

FDR practiced forestry at his Hyde Park estate in accordance with these definitions, although, like many of his contemporary estate owners, he also believed in the ecological, recreational, and aesthetic value of forests. Such values reflected the opposing views within the American conservation movement at the beginning of the twentieth century. Widespread interest in conservation began after the Civil War, following the 1864 publication of George Perkins Marsh’s *Man and Nature, Or Physical Geography As Modified by Human Action*. In this seminal work, widely considered to be the fountainhead of the American conservation movement, Marsh drew on environmental degradation and associated social decline in past civilizations to warn of pending disaster:

> The earth is fast becoming an unfit home for its noblest inhabitant, and another era of equal human crime and human improvidence would reduce it to such a condition of impoverished productiveness, of shattered surface, of climatic excess, as to threaten the depravation, barbarism, and perhaps even extinction of the species.

Marsh’s conservation philosophy was about reversing exploitive practices to ensure that natural resources could be sustained for human use. For many first-generation American foresters such as Fernow and Brown, *Man and Nature* helped establish forestry as a fundamental conservation practice. Forestry illustrated a utilitarian-economic model of conservation, historically often known as “wise-use conservation,” that shared Marsh’s vision of nature existing from human use and benefit. The opposing conservation model, whose best-known advocate in the early twentieth century was John Muir, defined conservation as the preservation of wild nature for nature’s sake as well as for spiritual benefit. Professional forestry was often viewed as the epitome of utilitarian-economic conservation and thus the opposite of Muir’s view of conservation, as one early twentieth-century conservationist wrote:
Everybody believes in conservation.... Most difficult to resolve is the conflict between those who believe in “wild nature” and those who believe that man, by judicious effort, can definitely improve on nature as he finds it. The naturalist wants his woods full of dead snags to harbor woodpeckers, fallen trees to shelter insects and salamanders, and dense undergrowth to provide food and lodging for towhees, thrushes and song-sparrows. The trained forester, equally earnest and sincere, shudders at dead snags, regards rotting logs as criminal waste, considers underbrush a fire hazard, and would like to see the forest looking substantially like a well-kept orchard.

The economic-utilitarian model of American forestry was heavily indebted to European precedent. In Europe, forestry was a well-established land-use practice by the nineteenth century when Americans first began to manage forests. In both Germany and France in particular, forests were treated as a highly managed, renewable resource. Dr. John A. Warder’s *Forests and Forestry of Germany*, prepared when he was American Commissioner to the World’s Fair in Vienna in 1873, was one of the influential early works to introduce European forestry in the United States. German and French precedents were also clearly evident in the professional pioneers of American forestry. Bernard E. Fernow, who was the first recognized professional forester to work in the United States and became the second federal chief of the Division of Forestry in 1886, was born and trained in Germany; Gifford Pinchot, the acknowledged father of American forestry who was the first manager of the forest at the Vanderbilt Estate at Biltmore, North Carolina, and succeeded Fernow in 1898, was trained in France and Germany in 1889–90; and Carl Schenck, manager of the Biltmore forest and founder of the Biltmore forestry school in 1898, was, like Fernow, born and trained in Germany.

Although European forestry addressed a number of different conservation-related issues, it was the potential of forestry to address the depletion of timber resources and rural depression that held the widest appeal in the United States. These two problems had become significant issues of public welfare by the late nineteenth century. Forestry was certainly not the first practice to address these issues. Rural improvement had long been an interest of the private and public sectors, such as evidenced by the Scientific Farming Movement of the mid-nineteenth century, which advocated improved agricultural practices, and the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862, which helped establish state universities for the purpose of providing agricultural education. Despite such advances, rural depression and timber depletion had become acute problems by the late nineteenth century, especially in Northeastern states with large amounts of marginal farmland and limited forest cover. In 1850, New York State was the largest timber producer in the nation, but by 1912 it had dropped to twenty-third in rank, a condition that affected not only wood-product industries, but also the communities that relied on them. Concurrently, the potential amount of land available for growing forests was expanding significantly, based in large part to the vast amount of abandoned farmland—New York’s so-called land problem.
Many foresters, however, did not see their profession as simply providing resources for the timber industry. They saw forestry as addressing the needs of rural society, much in the spirit of George Perkins Marsh’s conservation philosophy that stressed the interconnections between people and nature. Arthur B. Recknagel, a forestry professor at Cornell University, referred to this purpose in his 1923 forestry manual:

The question is broader than the supplying of raw material to restore our waning industries: it is, rather, “How can forestry serve to rehabilitate the farms and villages and to rebuild the rural civilization that has broken down?” That is, what can forestry do to check the constant lessening of rural population and the progressive closing down of local industries?26

American forestry, particularly in the Northeast, addressed these issues through two practices: woodlot management and reforestation (artificial regeneration), each of which sought to increase the productivity of idle lands and increase timber resources in general.27 Woodlot management referred to the application of scientific forestry practices to existing farm woodlots consisting of naturally regenerated forest. The practice was based on the so-called French system, or French standard forest, which involved the management of natural woodlands for natural reproduction by thinning and selective harvesting (fig. 2.37).28 Also known as the “selection system,” this forestry practice required minimal capital investment, and thus the role of government in fostering this practice as a means to address the productivity of private farmland was largely limited to education and technical outreach.

Reforestation, as opposed to woodlot management, was based in large part on the so-called German model involving artificial regeneration through the establishment and intensive management of planted forests, known as plantations. The German-model forest was characterized by a monoculture or a limited number of species, and a clean appearance with tall, symmetrical trees and the absence of litter and debris on the forest floor (fig. 2.38). Conifer species were preferred due to their quick growth, and were planted in even rows to provide uniform growing space. Such forests were typically used for multiple purposes other than timber production, including hunting, game conservation, recreation, and water conservation.29

Due to the influence of German forestry in the training of the first generation of American foresters, and the suitability of the German model to addressing the land problem caused by the widespread abandonment of farmland, reforestation became the dominant forestry practice of the early twentieth century, and was almost universally acclaimed to be the best use for abandoned open farmland.30 Planting artificial forests on open lands was first undertaken on a large scale in the United States at country estates of wealthy businessmen in New York,
New England, and other Appalachian regions where abandoned and worn-out farmland was becoming increasingly prevalent. These gentlemen farmers took up reforestation and forestry in general as a progressive land-use practice in the spirit of model farming, intended to address the issues of rural decline and natural resource protection, as well as to provide utility and beauty to their estate landscapes. In addition to reforesting worn-out agricultural lands, many of the estate owners also improved their existing woodlots as part of their model farming practices.

Frederick Billings of Woodstock, Vermont, was one of the earliest estate owners to experiment with the practice beginning in 1874. Here, on the same farm where the conservationist George Perkins Marsh had been born and raised, Billings established his first forest plantation using 600 Norway spruce transplants set out in 8-foot spacing to help stabilize the soils and enhance the beauty of the landscape around his country house. Over the course of the next sixteen years until his death in 1890, Frederick Billings established numerous conifer plantations on worn-out farmland on his 1,000-acre estate (fig. 2.39). He planted tens of thousands of trees according to scientific forestry practices in monoculture plantations and evenly spaced rows. In addition to Norway spruce, Billings planted white pine, hemlock, European larch, white ash, and sugar maple, most of which he purchased from private nurseries. Billings intended these plantations in part to serve demonstration purposes that would address the decline of small farms in the surrounding region.

Seven years after Billings began his reforestation program, Stephen Girard began planting trees in 1881 at his country estate near Lost Creek in Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania, subsequently pronounced by experts as one of the most interesting and instructive experiments of its kind undertaken in the United States. Girard established numerous plantations on wasteland that had been burned over and mined (fig. 2.40). Between 1881 and 1899, he planted nearly a quarter million trees, almost half of which were European larch, with
smaller numbers of catalpa, Austrian pine, Norway spruce, Scotch pine, Russian mulberry, white pine, black cherry, white oak, and Douglas fir, mostly in plantations consisting of even rows with one or two species.33

The largest and best known of the early estate reforestation programs was begun 1890 in the Appalachian highlands of Biltmore, North Carolina, the country estate of George W. Vanderbilt of New York. The idea of forestry at Biltmore had been suggested to Vanderbilt by the landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted, who was familiar with German forestry practice and had previously used reforestation in his landscape design to address rural improvement. In 1880, Olmsted had 70 acres planted with conifers at the Phillips Estate, Moraine Farm, in Beverly, Massachusetts.34 Olmsted’s forestry plan for Biltmore was far more ambitious. To create and manage the forest, Vanderbilt employed two of the pioneer American foresters, Gifford Pinchot and Carl Schenck.35 Through 1911, Vanderbilt oversaw the reforestation of thousands of acres of idle farmland and poor-quality successional woods in the hilly country surrounding his mansion (fig 2.41). In sheer size and extent, his plantations were unlike any artificial forest that had yet been planted in the United States. From a single order placed in 1897, for example, Schenck planted 500,000 white pine seedlings imported from Germany. Such imports were necessary because nurseries in the United States, which sold primarily ornamental stock, could not supply the quantities required for reforestation. Between 1889 and 1908, 2,500 acres of abandoned farm fields at Biltmore had been reforested as part of a larger 7,500-acre professionally managed forest.36

As this private reforestation work was occurring in the late nineteenth century, federal and state governments were beginning to address forestry. It was not until the first decade of the twentieth
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century, however, that the interest coalesced into institutionalized public programs. At the federal level, the Division of Forestry was established within the Department of Agriculture in 1881 for educational purposes, primarily to address threats to existing timber stands on federal land in the West, and in 1891, the federal government set aside land to protect timber resources. In 1905, the U.S. Forest Service was established under the direction of Gifford Pinchot, setting the stage for a decade of vast expansion of the National Forest System and the wide acceptance of forestry as a national goal. Unlike much of the forestry work on private land in the East, the initial emphasis of the federal program was largely in management of old-growth forests on federal land in the West. In the Northeastern states, where there was little land in federal ownership, the state governments developed forestry programs of their own, largely independent of federal involvement and with a greater emphasis on reforestation. By 1909, all of the Northeastern states had established forestry departments.

The Reforestation Movement in New York State

New York State was one of the pioneers in establishing forestry as a state-supported program. The state set out its first forest plantation in 1900 and during the following decades developed a pioneering reforestation program for state and private lands. By 1912, when FDR set out his first forest plantation at Hyde Park, the state had a fully institutionalized reforestation program that had expanded in scope and support to the degree that it was being referred to as the “reforestation movement.” While woodlot management remained an important aspect of forestry and the subject of much educational outreach by universities and state agencies, reforestation developed into the dominant forestry program of New York State government. This was due not only to the interest in solving the land problem, but also to issues in reforestation that the state government could most ably address: making available large numbers of trees at low cost to the private landowner. State government in New York was also in a good position to assist private landowners in reforestation due to its technical expertise, bureaucratic infrastructure, and a well-established conservation ethic. The establishment of the Forest Preserve in the Adirondack and Catskill regions in 1885 was an unprecedented conservation achievement that addressed both utilitarian and preservation issues. The legislation, drafted by the country’s first professional forester, Bernhard E. Fernow, was intended to protect and sustain the state’s timber resources, and also set aside certain state-owned land as “forever wild.” The Forest Preserve also provided for a state system of fire protection and encouraged the practice of forestry on private lands.

The earliest known example of reforestation in New York State was begun in 1870, four years prior to Frederick Billings’s reforestation program in Vermont, at the T. Dallarme Farm located in the southern Adirondack region at White...
Lake Corners, Oneida County (fig. 2.42). Mr. Dallarme, who had farmed the property since 1856, found his sandy soils had become too poor after two decades of production to grow satisfactory crops. In 1870, he purchased seeds and young trees from Germany and set out small plantations of Scotch pine, maple, larch, and white pine on old pasture. Four years later, he established a plantation of Norway spruce, Scotch pine, and white pine in an old buckwheat field. Between 1879 and 1883, Dallarme set out an additional six forest plantations using similar tree species, primarily on the top of sandy knolls. Altogether, the plantations were small in extent, not covering more than 15 acres, and generally not following strict planting patterns. This lack of even planting may have been due to the fact that, although Dallarme harvested timber from the stands, his object was largely to enhance the beauty of his farm.41

Other early pioneers of reforestation in New York included Storrs A. Barrows, who set out a plantation of Norway spruce in 1882 at his farm in Groton, north of Ithaca.42 Three years later, Charles H. Faxon established a plantation of white pine on his eastern Adirondack land in Warren County, planting the trees in straight rows (fig. 2.43).43 The largest of the early New York reforestation programs was begun in 1895 by Charles F. Dietrich at his estate in Millbrook, approximately 15 miles due east of Hyde Park in the Taconic foothills of Dutchess County. Covering over 100 acres on the slopes of two ridges, Dietrich established plantations of Norway spruce, white pine, Scotch pine, and European larch with three-year-old transplants imported from Germany. Dietrich planted the trees primarily for their aesthetic value, purportedly to reproduce a forest landscape characteristic of his native Germany (fig. 2.44).44

New York’s state reforestation program began in 1898, shortly after the work at the Dietrich Estate, with establishment of the New York State College of Forestry at Cornell University, the state’s land-grant institution. Headed by the German-
born forester Bernhard Fernow, the state forestry college shared the distinction of being one of the first three professional forestry schools in the country, founded a few months after the Biltmore School at the Vanderbilt Estate established by Carl Schenk and two years before the Yale School of Forestry founded through a gift by the family of Gifford Pinchot. In 1899, the college began the first coniferous tree nursery in New York on state Forest Preserve land in the Adirondacks at Axton, Franklin County, under the direction of Bernhard Fernow. The following spring, the college set out the state’s very first forest plantations on 50 adjoining acres, using seedling stock imported from Europe and set out in straight rows (fig. 2.45). The purpose of the plantations was professional forestry education.45

Soon after the first plantation at Axton was established, the state commission responsible for the management of the Forest Preserve in the Adirondacks and Catskills—the Forest, Fish and Game Commission—began its own reforestation work. In developing its program, the Commission looked both to the precedent of European forestry as well as to work done on American country estates. The commission studied the Girard Estate in Pennsylvania and the Faxon Estate in Warren County, among many others, and looked at the beneficial financial returns earned in Germany through public reforestation work.46 In the spring of 1901, the Commission planted 1,000 European-grown seedlings donated by Bernhard Fernow on Forest Preserve lands in the Catskills. Later that year, the Commission began work on an enormous state reforestation area on 650 acres in the Adirondacks, where more than 1,300,000 trees were planted by 1902 (fig. 2.46). The plantations used a variety of tree species, including white pine, Norway spruce, Scotch pine, European larch, and Douglas fir. This work marked the beginnings of the state’s reforestation program, which was initially developed only for reforesting the state land within the Forest Preserve in the Catskills and Adirondacks, where extensive clear-cutting, floods, and fires had decimated the forests during the nineteenth century.47

Over the course of the first decade of the twentieth century, New York’s reforestation program expanded exponentially. While other Northeastern states such as Pennsylvania established similar programs around the same time, the State of New York planted more trees during the first decade of the twentieth
New York began the work of expanding its reforestation program in 1902 by establishing nurseries to supply tree stock, one each in the Catskill and Adirondack regions of the Forest Preserve. With tree seedlings from these and other state nurseries that were soon established, the Forest, Fish and Game Commission reforested nearly 2,000 acres by 1907. The impact of New York’s reforestation program by this time was reaching beyond the confines of state government and Forest Preserve lands. In 1907, the Forest, Fish and Game Commission reported: “Public sentiment is rapidly crystallizing along the lines of...reforestation.... [I]t seems very important that the State should increase its work in tree planting, and that all persons owning land not especially desirable for agricultural purposes, should be encouraged to plant trees thereon.” In 1904, for example, the commission received no inquiries into how to reforest land; by 1907, the number of inquiries amounted to “many hundreds.” This public interest led the state legislature to enact a law in 1908 authorizing the distribution of trees from state nurseries to private landowners for reforestation purposes at cost. The state made this offer to encourage reforestation by farmers who had acres of idle or abandoned land. At the time, there private efforts had reforested approximately 2,000 acres, about the same amount as had been reforested by the state within the Forest Preserve. Most of this had been done by wealthy estate owners, rather than farmers.
The availability of cheap tree stock quickly led to growth of reforestation on farms and other private land. In 1908, the first year of the program, the Forest, Fish and Game Commission received seven applications for the purchase of 25,100 tree seedlings, enough to plant about 20 acres. Two years later, there were 179 applicants who purchased 1,005,325 trees, enough to plant almost 1,000 acres.\(^{53}\) Between 1909 and 1911—the year that FDR began his forestry program—the number of orders statewide jumped from 189 to 410. These 410 orders requested 2,037,270 trees, but the five state nurseries had enough stock only to fill orders for 1,670,370 trees. The orders in FDR’s home county of Dutchess followed a similar growth. In 1909, the state recorded a single order from Dutchess by P. N. Paine (location unknown) for 1,000 trees. The next year, orders from Dutchess totaled 13,500 trees, and in 1911 the state distributed 68,250 trees to Dutchess County landowners, the second largest amount of any county outside of the Forest Preserve.\(^{54}\) Local municipalities were also gaining interest in reforestation. In 1911, the City of Poughkeepsie established its community forest, one of the earliest in the state.\(^{55}\)

Private reforestation in New York during the first decade of the twentieth century was mostly on country estates, farms, and land belonging to water companies. The water companies, who were interested in protecting their watersheds, typically established the largest plantations, such as the 155 acres reforested by the Great Bear Spring Water Company of Fulton between 1907 and 1910. Plantations made by private individuals during this time were typically about 15 acres, but included larger areas, such as the 60 acres reforested by the Clark Estate in Cooperstown between 1909 and 1910.\(^{56}\) In addition to receiving subsidized tree stock, some property owners also received technical assistance from the state and federal governments for their forestry work. Archibald Rogers, the Hyde Park neighbor of the Roosevelts, began his forestry work at Crumwold Farms in the late 1890s, and then in 1905 began to scientifically manage his forest through a formal management plan developed by the U.S. Forest Service. According to Charles A. Lyford, the Forest Service assistant who initially visited the Crumwold Farms in 1905:

> The owner [Rogers] wishes to place the management of this tract on a scientific basis, at the same time handling it as a strictly business proposition. His object in this is not only the improvement of his own property, but he wishes to provide also by the example thus offered, a proof of the practicability of forestry as applied to woodlots in this locality.\(^{57}\)

The Forest Service forest management plan established forty-three plots, between one-eighth and one-half acre in size, which were to serve as examples in how Rogers was to manage his woodlots, comprised of second-growth (sprout) white oak, chestnut oak, and hardwood swamp forests, for timber production. The report did not recommend reforestation, but the next year, in 1906, Rogers set
out an underplanting of red pine in a hardwood forest that was presumably his first forest plantation (fig. 2.47). In 1909, he set out his first plantations on open ground, one on a rocky ridge near the Hudson River, the other on a more level area east of the Post Road, covering a total of 10 acres by 1910.\(^{58}\)

While Archibald Rogers practiced forestry in large part for practical purposes, many owners of country estates throughout the Northeast were also scientifically managing their woodlots or planting forests as fashionable additions to their landscapes. The *Boston Herald* reported in 1913:

> One of the most interesting developments of the love of gardening and outdoor things to-day is the rapidly increasing application of forestry principles, especially forest planting, to private grounds. Already one's friends begin to boast of their young plantations of pine or spruce, their little groves of oak and maple and their scientific care of the old wood lot....\(^{59}\)

The increase in private reforestation activity during the first decade of the twentieth century corresponded with several organizational changes and expansions in New York’s state forestry program. In 1911, the state reestablished its forestry college at Syracuse University, a private institution founded in 1870. Known as The New York State College of Forestry at Syracuse University, the college was established as the state’s professional forestry school to provide professional training, undertake research and statewide investigations in forestry, to help in the solution of state forestry problems, and to carry on public educational work.\(^{60}\) The former college at Cornell University had been suspended in 1903 and was reorganized in 1910 as the more limited Department of Forestry within the New York State College of Agriculture at Cornell University.\(^{61}\) The Cornell Department of Forestry still promoted forestry through the County Farm Bureau System, the cooperative extension program of Cornell that employed agents in every agricultural county in the state. The services of the Cornell Department of Forestry were available upon request by any resident of the state, and requested information or assistance was usually given without cost to the applicant. Cornell was typically more involved in farm forestry work than was the College of Forestry at Syracuse University.\(^{62}\)

In addition to these educational changes, the year 1911 also saw the reorganization and expansion of the Forest, Fish and Game Commission into the New York State Conservation Commission (Conservation Department after 1926), an organizational change that addressed the expanding role of the state in forestry matters beyond the Forest Preserve lands for which the commission was originally organized.\(^{63}\) Within the commission, the Division of Lands and Forests was responsible for managing the state’s reforestation program. In order to manage

---

**Figure 2.47.** Red pine plantation at the Rogers Estate, Crumwold Farms, planted in 1906, photographed 1910. (B. H. Paul, “Reforesting Methods and Results of Forest Planting in New York,” *Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin*, no. 374, April 1916.)
anticipated growth in the program, the Conservation Commission established several more tree nurseries. In 1911, it announced plans for establishing what would become its largest nursery, located near Saratoga Springs near the Adirondacks. This nursery, where FDR would purchase much of his tree stock, soon developed into the largest nursery in the world, reaching a capacity of 44,000,000 trees by the late 1920s (fig. 2.48).64

In the first seventeen years of the Conservation Commission, corresponding with the time FDR was planting trees at Hyde Park, the reforestation movement in New York State underwent rapid growth, with the exception of the years during the First World War. In its 1926 annual report, the Conservation Commission announced great strides:

Great Progress Made in Reforestation—The movement for the profitable reclamation of idle non-agricultural land by reforestation has made remarkable progress during the year, more than twenty million young trees having been set out in over 2,500 separate plantations. This total exceeds the combined plantings of 1924 and 1925 and a trifle more than equals the aggregate plantings made during the first fourteen years of the reforestation movement—20,481,112 for 1926 as compared with 20,442,225 for the years 1901–1914, inclusive.65

Throughout this period, reforestation on private (non–state owned) land was the leading reforestation work in the state, far surpassing the state’s own reforestation work except during the war years, a testament to the state’s advocacy and availability of low-cost tree saplings. An increasing amount of reforestation during the 1920s was undertaken by city water districts for conserving watersheds near reservoirs; by counties, towns, villages, and school districts for establishing community forests; and by the Boy Scouts, 4-H clubs, and sporting organizations, the latter generally on a small scale. Total reforestation on non–state owned land averaged roughly two million trees per year through 1920, then accelerated beginning 1921, rising from 3,000,000 trees planted in 1921 to 16,500,000 trees planted in 1927; by 1928, 51 percent of all trees produced by state nurseries went to private individuals.66 There were several reasons for this growth. In 1920, the legislature passed the so-called “Free Tree Bill,” allowing the state to provide private landowners trees free of charge; however, the state requirement that the Conservation Commission place a lien on property in exchange for
the trees made the program unpopular. More important was the intensive promotional campaign for reforestation undertaken by the Conservation Commission, as well as the promotional work and technical assistance provided through Cornell and Syracuse Universities, the Farm Bureau, 4-H clubs, and the state’s system of agricultural extension agents (fig. 2.49). State extension work was aided by the passage of a federal law in 1924 appropriating funds, through the U.S. Forest Service, for extension work that aimed “…to make the farmer woodsminded so that he may handle his forest crop with the same intelligence that he now applies to his field crops.”

In Dutchess County, reforestation also increased during the 1920s, but the county did not maintain the early lead it had at the beginning of the 1910s. By 1922, a total of 767,430 trees from state nurseries had been set out in seventy separate plantations across the county, exclusive of two at the Hudson River and Mattewan state hospitals. Estate owners and municipalities represented some of the biggest purchasers at the time. FDR had purchased 41,000 trees from state nurseries, compared with 139,000 purchased by his neighbor Archibald Rogers, 1,000 by Thomas Newbold, and 1,000 by F. W. Vanderbilt. By 1927, the City of Poughkeepsie’s community forest had planted 3,250 trees, and other Dutchess County municipalities, including Wappingers Falls, Pawling, and Pleasant Valley, had also established small community forests.

**THE LANDSCAPE OF FORESTY**

Managed forests—both native woodlots following the French model and artificial forests following the German model—had distinctive characteristics that made them distinct from unmanaged or natural forests. The character of these forest landscapes, which typified portions of the Roosevelt Estate landscape during this period, was in large part peculiar to highly managed forestry practices that dominated the early twentieth century.

Forestry was classified into several branches, but there were two primary ones that addressed the dominant economic and utilitarian ends of the profession: silviculture, the technical aspects of making trees grow; and forest management, covering the business aspects of tree growing. Foresters generally classified forests into three categories based on their purpose and use: supply forests managed to provide wood products; protection forests intended to stabilize environmental conditions, including soils, water, and wind; and luxury forests that were managed for aesthetic and recreational purposes. While many forests served the function of all three classes, most were ultimately about supply, with the other two, protection and luxury, generally serving secondary purposes.
The character of managed woodlots varied greatly based on the dominant tree species, age of the forest, and type of forest use—as a supply, protection, or luxury forest. Most, however, were distinguished from natural, unmanaged forests of a similar age by their relatively open understory, clean appearance, and wide spacing of trees (fig. 2.50). Woodlots were typically managed by the improvement cutting system, which included four types of cuttings: (1) cleanings, a cutting made in a very young stand to improve the mixture and reduce competition; (2) liberation cuttings, the removal of wolf-trees that inhibited younger growth; (3) damage cuttings, the removal of diseased or unsound trees; and (4) thinnings, the removal of trees in an immature stand too dense to allow for rapid growth. In American forestry practice, heavy thinning—characterized by removing of dead or dying trees, suppressed trees, and intermediate trees—had the widest use. Pruning of limbs on individual trees was usually considered an aesthetic, rather than an economic measure, due to the high labor costs involved.72

Improvement cuttings in oak-chestnuts forests, such as those in the Hudson Valley, were necessary during the early twentieth century due to chestnut blight. Also known as the chestnut bark disease, the blight was probably introduced from Asia at the turn of the century. Infected trees were first observed at the Bronx Zoo in 1904; from here, the blight spread very rapidly and led to the death of nearly all mature chestnut trees in New York State within a few decades. Prior to the blight, the majestic American chestnut was typically the largest forest tree and composed up to 50 percent of the forest in its range.73 In the Hudson Valley, chestnut trees became infected during the first decade of the twentieth century, and by the 1910s there was widespread death, giving oak-chestnut forests a patchy character. The removal of dead chestnut trees, and salvage as timber, thus became a big task in managed woodlots of the region during the early twentieth century.

Some of the most highly managed woodlots were found on country estates, where the owners had the economic resources not only to maximize labor-intensive pruning and thinning, but also the desire for a more park-like, aesthetic character. Such a management style was outlined by the United Forestry Company, a
Hudson Valley forest management firm, in its flyer entitled, “Esthetic Management of Woodlands,” a copy of which it sent to FDR in 1915:

Improvement cuttings should be made in the existing stands by removing all worthless trees so as to give those remaining plenty of light, air, and room to develop; ... Thinnings may be needed to make the woods and their natural beauties accessible.... A cleaning is usually needed because of much dead wood and unnatural undergrowth. After the existing trees are taken care of, plantings are in many cases imperative to re-inforce [sic] the remaining stand, to give depth to a thick hardwood forest by planting conifers, to screen unsightly places, and to establish new woodland.74

In contrast to managed woodlots, plantations or artificial forests were very distinctive features in the landscape, once established after several years of growth. Planted primarily on open idle agricultural land, early-twentieth-century plantations were characterized by a monoculture or limited number of species (most often conifers), regular planting patterns (topography permitting), and definite boundaries (fig. 2.51). Plantations often adjoined existing woodlots or hedgerows, and sometimes were planted around existing field trees known as “wolf trees.”75 In contrast to planting on open land, some plantations were established through underplanting within low-density woodlots or wooded pastures (such as had been done on the Rogers Estate, see fig. 2.47), usually with shade-tolerant species such as red pine or Norway spruce.76

The process of establishing a forest plantation began with securing stock from a nursery. In New York State, private individuals most often purchased their trees for reforestation purposes after 1908 from the state nurseries due to cost advantages and enormous stock quantities. By doing so, however, there were a limited number of tree species available. When FDR began his reforestation program in 1911, the state nurseries were primarily growing white pine, red pine,
Scotch pine (today called Scots pine), European larch, and Norway spruce, plus smaller amounts of black locust and Carolina poplar. By the late 1920s, state nurseries were producing white pine, Scotch pine, red pine, Norway spruce, white spruce, white cedar (arborvitae), European larch, balsam fir, Corsican pine, and black locust; other species were grown on a very limited basis, usually for experimental purposes. White pine represented the largest amount of stock grown by the state, at over 33 million plants inventoried in 1927, followed by red pine and Norway spruce at roughly 17 million each, and Scotch pine and white spruce at about 5.5 million each.

These species were selected largely for their timber value and rapid growth. White pine, a native species and typically the most valuable lumber, had a moderate rate of growth and thrived in well-drained, unshaded locations. Red pine (also called Norway pine), a native species, and Scotch pine, a European introduction, were both considered fast growers that did well in poor soils, but their timber was less valuable than white pine. Norway spruce, a European species used extensively in German forestry, was favored over the native red or white spruce because it was a faster grower and produced equally good timber. Norway spruce could tolerate moderate-quality soil, a large amount of shade, and wet locations. Monoculture plantations, where one species was used to foster consistent growing conditions, was the most popular form of planting, although mixed plantations using two or more species with similar growing requirements were not uncommon.

Trees were sold by the state as either one- or two-year seedlings, or as three- or four-year transplants (fig. 2.52). As a rule, the smaller seedlings had a higher rate of survival, since the younger stock could better withstand the shock of field planting. Transplants, however, could better withstand drought and shade often caused by competing field grasses. The young trees were typically shipped in hampers or baskets packed with moist sphagnum moss, and then were temporarily "heeled in" in a trench dug at the planting site, to protect the root systems. Spring was considered the best time for planting, followed by the fall.

During this period, planting was done manually, with the basic unit for small plantations consisting of two people, one who made the hole and the other who planted the tree, with planting crews usually made up of multiple units (fig. 2.53). There were three methods of tree planting. The mattock-slit method, where a chunk of earth was lifted and the young tree inserted, was the fastest, and gained most widespread use (fig. 2.54). Shovel-digging individual holes or plowing furrows were two other methods that better loosened the soil, but were more labor intensive. Trees were carried into the field in watertight pails, and were set out in regular rows, a pattern necessary to ensure even growing space for each tree and ease of access into the plantation. The typical tree spacing for reforestation...
purposes was 6 feet by 6 feet, meaning the rows were 6 feet apart and there was 6 feet between trees within each row (fig. 2.55). This amount of spacing resulted in 1,210 trees to the acre. Trees were planted in such close spacing to produce a crowded and shaded condition that would kill off the side branches of the young trees, thereby reducing the number and size of knots necessary to produce a high grade of lumber. Close spacing also ensured that competing native hardwoods would not become established, and also caused the trees to grow much taller, thus producing more logs per tree. Lower densities were sometimes used due to poor soil conditions, and higher densities, such as 3-foot spacing, were used when the trees would be harvested young, such as those planted as fence-post crops. While regular spacing became a hallmark of plantations during this period, rows and tree spacing were not always exact due to the manual nature of the planting, and impediments such as topography, rock outcroppings, or rocky soils (fig. 2.56).
The size of plantations varied greatly. In general, a plantation was considered small if it did not exceed 10,000 trees, an amount which could be set out by a two-person crew in ten days at the rate of 1,000 trees planted per day.\textsuperscript{85} Plantations established by the state Conservation Commission were often larger than their private counterparts. The largest ever set out by the state during this period was the 2,000,000-tree plantation covering 2,000 acres at North Creek in the Adirondacks, planted in 1926 and named the Roosevelt Forest in honor of Theodore Roosevelt. This was one example of reforestation areas dedicated for memorial purposes. Others included the memorial forest of 10,000 white pines established by the Conservation Commission in 1925 in honor of Clara Barton (see fig. 2.55).\textsuperscript{86} Most state plantations fell somewhere between these two examples in size. At the opposite end of the spectrum, the Elba school district in western New York established a 100-tree plantation in 1926.\textsuperscript{87} Plantations were often part of larger artificial forests composed of multiple plantations established over the course of many years, separated by access roads that also served as firebreaks.

When initially established, a plantation of tree seedlings or transplants had a minimal impact on the character of the landscape, and sometimes was even invisible due to tall grasses that often grew higher than the tree saplings. Growth in conifer plantations was typically slow during the first few years as the trees overcame the shock of transplanting. Within a short time, however, the lines of trees became conspicuous in the surrounding field. Rates of growth varied greatly depending on the species and growing conditions. White pine and Norway spruce, for example, often grew 1 to 2 feet per year, so that within six years, the plantation was typically at head-level and stood out in the open ground (fig. 2.57). By fifteen years of age, these species were often up to 25 and 30 feet tall.\textsuperscript{88}

To encourage public education and support for
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Forestry was only part of the program of improvements that FDR began to implement at the family estate after 1905, following his marriage to Eleanor Roosevelt. Sara had maintained Springwood with little change since her husband’s death in 1900, and the original estate remained very much her home. However, as Eleanor later recalled, FDR developed a “sense of complete ownership and partnership with her,” building on the lessons from his father that gave him “great enjoyment in country life and a great understanding of what was owed to the land.”

In a letter to Sara that he wrote during his honeymoon in England in September 1905, FDR wrote enthusiastically about his planned improvements:

Dearest Mama, ...I have had many long and interesting talks with Mr. Ferguson on forestry, and with Mr. Foljambe and Mr. Kaye on farming and cattle raising, and the plans for Hyde Park now include not only a new house but a new farm, cattle, trees, etc.

FDR’s plans for reforestation led him to expand the boundaries of the estate, beginning with his purchase of the Bennett Farm in 1911 (fig. 2.59). Improvements and tree planting ceased with the onset of World War I and FDR’s bout of polio in 1921. Then, in the mid-1920s following his return from recuperation at Warm Springs, Georgia, FDR took up forest planting again, helped with the building of Val-Kill on the Bennett Farm, and added another major parcel to the estate, the Tompkins Farm, in 1925.

Despite the various changes and improvements during this period, the rural landscape of the Roosevelt Estate, including the original Springwood estate as well as the upland farms, retained much of its earlier nineteenth-century character formed by patterns of fields and forests, building sites, and roads. Even in naming, FDR retained historic continuity, as evidenced by his use of former owners’ names for various parcels, such as the Wheeler Place and Boreel Place. Through his...
2. Land-Use History, 1900–1928

FDR’s Amateur Forestry Program

While Franklin D. Roosevelt began planning his forestry program in 1905, it was not until 1911, the year he entered the New York State Senate and was appointed chairman of the Forest, Fish and Game Committee, that he began to implement his plans. This time corresponded with the maturation of American forestry from a pioneering conservation practice into a fully developed, institutionalized profession. FDR’s forestry program represented an innovative change at the family estate, but one that was in keeping with the traditional role of country estates as model farms, following the well-established precedent of the Billings Estate in Woodstock, Vermont, and the more recent work of Gifford Pinchot and F. W. Vanderbilt at Biltmore, and Archibald Rogers at Crumwold Farms.

Like many of the first American foresters, FDR’s interest in forestry stemmed in part from his exposure to German forestry during visits to the Black Forest as a child and again during his honeymoon in 1905. As Eleanor Roosevelt remembered:

It was here [Nauheim, Black Forest], I think, that he [FDR] became interested in the care of trees. These forests were so beautifully kept. When the trees matured they were cut in certain areas and, as they were cut, new trees were planted. He pointed out to me how every twig was gathered up in winter for firewood by the peasants and how beautifully cared-for and cultivated the forests were.92
FDR’s first known mention of his plans for a forestry program at Hyde Park occurred in the letter he sent to his mother during his honeymoon in 1905, in which he mentions speaking about forestry with a Mr. Ferguson (identity not known). By this time, however, FDR had probably been observing forestry work for a number of years at the neighboring estate of Archibald Rogers, who had begun managing his forest in the 1890s and in 1905 had secured a forest management plan from the U.S. Forest Service, which was then headed by Gifford Pinchot. FDR later credited his interest in forestry to Pinchot, who was widely acknowledged as the leader in scientific forestry at the time. Rogers’s forest management plan including a map that identified the various forest stands, many of which were part of the same oak-chestnut forest that extended south onto the Roosevelt Estate (fig. 2.60). He intended his forest as a demonstration to encourage other landowners to practice forestry, and thus had one of its early adherents in FDR. German forestry and Rogers’s practical forestry program may have also heightened FDR’s interest in forestry as a business enterprise and a way to address the plight of marginal farms on worn-out agricultural land, a message that was reinforced through state and federal forestry programs then being established.

FDR was not a pioneer in reforestation, such as Frederick Billings, Stephen Girard, and George W. Vanderbilt had been during the nineteenth century, but
was instead an early forestry practitioner at a time when New York State was institutionalizing the practice of reforestation. When FDR planted his first tree seedlings in the spring of 1912, it had been four years since the state had offered tree stock to the public at cost, and just a dozen years since its first forest plantation was set out at Axton. Although FDR was thus at the forefront of the reforestation movement, his forestry work was progressive but not pioneering. His first purchase from the state nurseries in 1912 totaled 8,000 trees. This was a significant but not overwhelming percentage of trees distributed to landowners in Dutchess County in 1911 (68,250), but only a tiny percentage of total plantings on private land statewide that amounted to 2,971,000 trees in 1912. By comparison, the state planted approximately 2,000,000 trees in 1912.

FDR developed his forestry program based on recommendations from a state forester who visited Springwood in 1911. Such technical assistance reflected the state’s increasing interest in encouraging reforestation on private land, a purpose institutionalized as early as 1885 in creation of the Forest Preserve and then greatly expanded during the first decade of the twentieth century as part of the state’s reforestation program. The state forester toured the estate with head gardener William Plog and recommended a wide variety of tree plantings for reforestation purposes, including willow in swampy areas in the River Wood Lot and near the Big Cove on the Boreel Place; infill plantings of tulip-poplar (also known as tulip tree or yellow-poplar), red oak, and basswood on high ground in the River Wood Lot; and Scotch pine, European larch, red pine, basswood, tulip-poplar, and Norway spruce for old fields and open areas in the River Wood Lot, Gravel Lot, and in the ravine south of the Springwood house. The state forester also recommended reforesting one of the old pastures on the Home Farm with Scotch pine and European larch planted at 6-foot spacing typical for reforestation purposes at the time. The state forester identified a fire hazard along the railroad, and recommended clearing back from it and planting three rows of Norway spruce, which he believed would not easily catch fire and act as a screen to prevent train sparks from blowing into the woods.

William Plog’s notes from the visit of the state forester (whose identity is not known and who apparently did not submit a written plan) do not indicate the intent of the reforestation work aside from the fire issue along the railroad. Most of the recommended trees, including Norway spruce, red pine, Scotch pine, European larch, and willow, were species that the state stocked in its nurseries, intended ultimately for production of lumber and other wood products. The state forester’s inclusion of the native tulip-poplar was probably at FDR’s request, since it was his favorite tree and was not grown by the state at the time. For FDR, who long admired an old specimen with a trunk about 4 feet in diameter that grew in the field southeast of the Springwood house, the tulip-poplar had romantic interest and beauty, but he also hoped to test its commercial value.
Over the course of the next five years, FDR implemented many of the state forester’s recommendations, beginning in the spring of 1912 with plantings in the Gravel Lot and on the Home Farm. He ordered his trees from the Conservation Commission, which offered them at cost and substantially below the prices of commercial nurseries, and had them planted by the estate staff. FDR’s tree stock came from the state nurseries at Saratoga north of Albany and at Salamanca in western New York. Throughout this period, FDR’s annual tree plantings averaged about 5,000 to 8,000 trees per year, constituting a small reforestation program for the period, when a plantation was considered large if it involved more than 10,000 trees. Between 1912 and 1916 during his first phase of forest planting, FDR purchased a total of 42,000 trees from the Conservation Commission, exclusively white pine except for 1,000 each of Scotch pine, red pine, and Norway spruce purchased in 1912, and another 1,000 Norway spruce purchased in 1913 (table 2.1, see also Appendix B for plantation tallies by plot). FDR also planted tulip-poplar, but since the state did not sell these, he had to purchase stock from a private nursery. At a typical spacing of 6 by 6 feet, 42,000 trees covered approximately 35 acres. While the two largest plantations were on the Home Farm and Bennett Farm, the majority of the plantations were on the Wheeler Place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Spring or Fall Planting</th>
<th>White Pine</th>
<th>Scotch Pine</th>
<th>Red Pine</th>
<th>Norway Spruce</th>
<th>White Spruce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>spring</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 yr</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>spring</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 yr</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>spring</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 yr</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>spring</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 yr</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>spring</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 yr</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>spring</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 yr</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>spring</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 yr</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
<td>2 yr</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>fall</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>spring</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
<td>3 yr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1. Record of tree distribution from New York State nurseries to the Roosevelt Estate (FDR), 1912–1928. (Source: New York State Conservation Commission records and Nelson Brown Papers, Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.)

During the war years through the early 1920s when FDR was recuperating from polio, he did not order any trees from the state; in 1917–18, two small plantations were set out from stock held in the Home Garden nursery, and then none for the next six years. Upon his return to Hyde Park, FDR took up tree planting again, but at a slower pace and apparently still following the state forester’s 1911 recommendations. Between 1924 and 1928, FDR purchased 25,000 trees from the state, a nearly equal number of white pine, Scotch pine, red pine, and Norway spruce, plus white spruce. Added to the previous 42,000 purchased during the first period of forest planting, the total area reforested with 67,000 trees by 1928 was approximately 55 acres, at standard spacing. FDR focused much of his planting between 1924 and 1928 on the Home Farm, with the exception of two plantations, one each on the Wheeler Place and Bennett Farm.
In addition to establishing plantations on worn-out fields and other so-called wasteland, FDR also actively managed his native woodlots during this period, for both aesthetic and production purposes. Aside from the River Wood Lot between the Springwood house and the Hudson River, the estate also contained the maturing oak-chestnut forest between the Post Road and Violet Avenue. FDR most likely followed the French selection method, as well as general aesthetic principles, such as those of the United Forestry Company, that stressed selective cutting and removing of brush and deadwood. The state forester’s 1911 recommendations to William Plog for using red oak, basswood, and tulip-poplar in “vacant places in the woods,” probably reflected FDR’s interest in enhancing the native woodlots, since these tree species were not offered by the state and were not typically used in plantations.

Aside from the traditional use of the woods to supply firewood for the estate, FDR took the opportunity to make the native oak-chestnut woods produce saleable timber. In the 1920s, for example, FDR annually harvested small amounts of red oak, white oak, and hemlock for products such as lumber and cross ties, providing a yearly annual profit of about $500. In addition to such harvesting, the need for woodlot management was becoming acute during this period due to the spread of the chestnut blight, which detracted from the character of the forest through the death of these large and dominant trees. In the lower woods bordering the Hudson River, the chestnut together with hickory made up approximately 20 percent of the forest; in the upland oak forest, the percentage was probably even greater. The blight had spread quickly up the Hudson Valley after its discovery at the Bronx Zoo in 1904, and was identified on the Roosevelt Estate as early as 1911; by 1918, it was seriously affecting the Roosevelt forest, which in subsequent years became converted into a mixed oak forest without any chestnuts.

The Original Estate

As the first plantations were established between 1912 and 1916, architectural, landscape, and agricultural improvements were underway at the original part of the Roosevelt estate consisting of the Wheeler Place, the Home Farm, and the J. R. Roosevelt Place. This period witnessed the introduction of automobiles, which led to widening and paving of the Post Road but little change to the estate roads, and the widespread availability of electricity. In 1913, FDR and Sara Roosevelt signed a lease agreement to allow the Central Hudson Gas & Electric Company to erect an overhead utility line through the Home Farm, along the east side of the fields bordering the Post Road. FDR had the company run the lines here to avoid impacting the old sycamores and other trees along the Post Road. The electric line to Springwood ran west along Newbold Road and the Bellefield property line.
The Wheeler Place (Drawing 2.4)

While FDR announced planned improvements to Springwood in 1905, it was several years before these were implemented. One of the first projects undertaken was the replacement of the two old wood-frame greenhouses dating from the Wheeler ownership in 1908 with an iron-framed, curved-eaved greenhouse complex manufactured by Lord & Burnham Company of Irvington-on-Hudson, New York (fig. 2.61). The new greenhouses occupied the same site as the old structures, in the flower-vegetable garden north of the hemlock hedge, and may have incorporated part of the old brick walls. It contained a rose house, another house for growing cooler plants, and a small moist room for ferns. Other changes included the addition of an outbuilding or cold frame next to the gardener’s cottage, a rose arbor, and installation of play equipment for the Roosevelts’ young children. A new shed was built in the service area behind the old stable (garage) in ca. 1911.111

At the time of the changes, work was beginning on redesign of the gardens surrounding the new greenhouses. The structure of the gardens was regularized through realignment of the road (Estates Road) along the east side of the garden,

Figure 2.61. Overview of Springwood showing the new greenhouse completed in 1908, and the Rose Garden and Home Garden redesigned in ca. 1911–12, photographed 1933. Parts of the new orchards in the North Avenue Lot and Paddock Lot are also visible. (Photograph NPx62-61, Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, annotated by SUNY ESF.)
bordering the North Avenue Lot, into a north–south axis extending from the Home Road north to the Bellefield property line (see fig. 2.61). This realignment created additional space around the old garden, which was redesigned in 1912 according to the work of a Mr. Anderson. In keeping with popular neoclassical styles, the old vegetable and flower garden surrounding the greenhouse was transformed into a formal flower garden, known as the Rose Garden. The new garden featured an orthogonal layout with two large rectangular garden rooms framed by the greenhouses and a new hemlock hedge. The vegetable beds were relocated to the north of the Rose Garden, in an area known as the Home Garden where vegetables and fruits were grown for the family’s use. The portion of the Home Garden immediately north of the Rose Garden was the small vegetable garden; to the north on the plateau east of the gardener’s cottage was the large vegetable garden, a portion of which was devoted to a tree nursery, to hold stock prior to planting. The large vegetable garden was laid out in four quadrants defined by two cross-axis roads, with the Estates Road delineating the east side.

Several years after completion of the gardens, FDR and Sara undertook a substantial enlargement and redesign of the Springwood house, transforming it from an Italianate villa into a Colonial Revival–style mansion designed by Hoppin & Koen of New York City (fig. 2.62). The enlargement, completed in 1915–16, accommodated FDR and Eleanor’s growing family (Anna, James, and Elliott born prior to the project, and John born in 1916), while creating more formal and stylish architecture, not unlike the neoclassical style of the family’s townhouse on East 65th Street completed in 1908. FDR played a major role in the redesign, notably in the selection of the Colonial style and use of native fieldstone in the walls. Similar in overall style to the McKim, Mead & White renovations at Bellefield, the Hoppin & Koen design was evocative of early-nineteenth-century neoclassical Federal-period mansions in the Hudson Valley, such as Montgomery Place in Annandale-on-Hudson. Much of the old rear of the house facing the river...
was left intact with its Italianate bracketed eaves and porches, perhaps reflecting FDR’s interest in history or the family’s frugality. The Roosevelts did not make similar stylistic changes to the estate outbuildings, leaving the Queen Anne–style stable and Gothic Revival–style gardener’s cottage unchanged.\textsuperscript{118}

The Roosevelts made a number of changes to the adjoining service area and gardens while the renovations on the house were underway. To provide improved water service to the new house, a water tower was built in ca. 1915 at the west side of the Home Garden, north of the gardener’s cottage, along with a new pumphouse on the slope west of the house.\textsuperscript{119} Agricultural uses were removed from the south end of the Paddock Lot, leaving the Duplex as a staff residence. In 1915, the old Wheeler barn (lower stable), paddocks, and chicken coop were removed. The chicken coop was moved to the Home Farm, south of the main barns.\textsuperscript{120} Two new orchards were planted in 1916, one at the south part of the Paddock Lot below the Springwood house (Lower Orchard), and a larger orchard along the north side of the North Avenue Lot, bordering Bellefield (see fig. 2.61).\textsuperscript{121}

Aside from these changes, the Roosevelts maintained much of the larger organization, circulation, and land-use patterns of the Wheeler Place. On the terrace between the Springwood house and the Post Road, the North and South Avenue Lots continued to be used for growing hay, wheat, rye, and corn, contrasting with the sweeping lawns that characterized the fronts of many country place landscapes during the period (fig. 2.63).\textsuperscript{122} At the west end of the South Avenue Lot, James Roosevelt’s trotting course was not maintained, but a new recreational feature, a tennis court, was built to its south in ca. 1920.\textsuperscript{123} West of the South Avenue Lot, the Roosevelts maintained a shaded lawn in front of the Springwood house extending north to the Rose Garden (see fig. 2.61). Hemlock hedges were extended along the service drive, screening views of the utilitarian area from the lawn and Rose Garden. South and west of the house, in the viewshed of the Hudson River, the sloping ground of the Paddock Lot was maintained as a field outside of the new orchard, although its earlier use for growing hay and grains ceased during this period.

While the designed landscape around the Springwood house and gardens was not a usual place for reforestation, FDR nonetheless established three plantations
there, probably using leftover trees from larger plantations, as well as a large border of trees. These plantings were not for utilitarian forestry purposes, but rather screened and reinforced existing spaces and views, and stabilized steep slopes. The plantations included mixed white pine and Scotch pine (Plot I) on the slope below the gardener’s cottage set out at some point between 1912 and 1916, and white pine (Plot G) set out in 1916 in a ravine between Springwood and the Red House (the state forester had recommended Norway spruce and red pine mixed with tulip-poplar for this spot). In the field near the Lower Orchard and the River Road, a small plot of Norway spruce (Plot J) was planted at some point between 1912 and 1916. In April 1914, FDR had three rows of white pines (Plot E) set out along the east side of the Post Road behind the existing roadside deciduous trees, presumably to screen the domestic landscape from the increasingly busy road. The Vanderbilts had established a similar border of white pine along the Post Road in 1906. FDR also planted many specimen trees on the lawn in front of the house, some of which may have been leftover stock from his plantations. At the northeast corner near the Home Road, for example, a small grove of Norway spruce was planted during this period.

FDR began to experiment at the Wheeler Place with his favorite tulip-poplar a few years into his forestry program. In spring 1914, a state forester referred him to the private Kelsey Nursery in New York City for 500 tulip-poplar tees because the state nurseries did not grow them. A year later, FDR purchased tulip-poplar saplings from the Riverview Nursery & Seed Company in McMinnville, Tennessee, and in the following spring of 1916 he secured another 1,000 from the Horticultural Company of Worcester, Massachusetts. The trees were held in the Home Garden nursery, and then planted in 1917 (Plot K) below the Springwood house in the open land adjoining the woods of the Gravel Lot, near where the old Wheeler barn had stood until ca. 1915 (fig. 2.64). Eleven years later in 1928, FDR set out another plantation of tulip-poplar (Plot P) nearby along River Road with stock from the Kelsey Nursery. FDR also planted experimental white ash and black walnut in ca. 1916–17, although the extent and location of these plantations is not known.

The rougher land of the lower woods, encompassing the River Wood Lot and Gravel Lot, was the initial focus of FDR’s forestry program between 1912 and 1917. FDR probably chose this area because of its old pastures and gravel pits that
provided excellent opportunities to experiment with reforestation on marginal land. Forestry also provided the opportunity for enhancement of the rustic landscape through management of the native forest. By the end of this period, the formerly patchy landscape of woodlots and fields was growing into a continuous forest, extending from the River Road along the Paddock Lot west to the Big Cove and railroad.

Along with changes in the forest cover, the landscape of the Gravel and River Wood Lots, along with the adjoining lower woods of the Boreel and Kirchner Places, experienced a number of additional changes during this period. The most extensive occurred with expansion of the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad to four tracks, a project begun in 1912 with surveying and planning for property acquisition. The next year, the railroad drafted an agreement with FDR and Eleanor Roosevelt to acquire three small parcels on the Wheeler Place, totaling 0.44 acre. In 1916, FDR’s lawyer, Henry Hackett, was still working out the details of the acquisitions, which the railroad apparently needed in order to remove rock outcroppings.131 By 1919, construction of the enlarged railroad through Hyde Park had been completed.132 The expansion obliterated the small point of land on the west side of the tracks where the first Roosevelt boat landing was located. Crum Elbow Point, the larger point to the north that provided river access for the Rogers Estate from Stone Cottage Road, was retained through the expansion project and was made accessible by a new steel truss bridge over the tracks.133

The railroad expansion also called for removal of the Roosevelts’ second landing to the south, near the second boathouse on Big Cove within the Boreel Place, owned by FDR’s half brother, J. R. Roosevelt. He applied to the state for a grant of land under water to build the new landing in January 1912, requesting an area extending 120 feet into the Hudson River and 300 feet along the railroad, comprising an eighth of an acre. Within this area, FDR and Sara planned to build a new boathouse and a 40-foot-wide dock built of rock fill extending 180 feet into the river. The grant was approved on November 12, 1912, and stipulated that the boathouse (of “substantial character”) and dock be built within five years of the date of the grant. The Roosevelts, however, did not end up building the new dock or boathouse, and instead maintained the old boathouse along the Big Cove, and built only a small boat landing by expanding the railroad’s riprap up to 30 feet into the river (fig. 2.65). The Roosevelts also arranged for the railroad to build a siding on the east side of the railroad, where the family could board trains from River Road.134

In addition to the loss of the old boathouse and dock, some of the rustic features built by FDR’s father in the lower woods disappeared during this period, perhaps as a result of the railroad expansion. The Cottage, located just south of Roosevelt Point on the drainage lot, was removed, and between 1914 and 1915 estate
workers rebuilt the River Road bridge, installing a concrete deck and parapet walls, and eliminating the rustic railings. These changes may have resulted from the conversion of the lower woods from a pleasure ground in the nineteenth-century sense to more of a working forest. The changing use was also evident in the construction or improvement of two roads related to FDR’s forestry program. One was a road leading north off the River Road into the Gravel Lot. A second road leading north off the River Road into the River Wood Lot was built in 1925 and subsequently known as the Lower Woods Road. Probably following in part an old trail or bridle path to the old Roosevelt boathouse, this road was built to draw timber from the lower woods without having to go through the Rogers Estate via Stone Cottage Road.

The Gravel Lot road provided access to open ground bordering the unnamed creek north of the ice pond, where FDR set out first forest plantations in 1912. On his 1911 site visit, the state forester had recommended that this area, which was probably quite rough after years of gravel extraction, be planted with Scotch or red pine and European larch. In April 1912, FDR set out a narrow plantation of red pine and Scotch pine (Plot A) on the east bank of the creek, using about 1,000 saplings of each species. At the same time, he set out a plantation of white pine (Plot B) on the opposite side of the creek. In 1914, FDR expanded this white pine plantation to the north, comprising in total approximately 3.3 acres along with the earlier planting, and also set out a 3-acre plantation of white pine (Plot F) in an old field along the boundary of the Rogers Estate within the River Wood Lot. Although there was no road to this plot, there was a bridle trail. FDR had these plantations set out in a typical 6-foot spacing, except for the 1914 portion of the white pine plantation (Plot B) in the Gravel Lot, where the trees were planted at 5½-foot spacing. The plantations were maintained through annual mowing to keep down competing vegetation, and by fertilizing.

FDR managed the natural forest surrounding these plantations to reduce fire hazards and increase production, in keeping with the state forester’s recommendations, although he did not follow through on the proposal for the spark screen of Norway spruce along the railroad. In 1911, all deadwood and underbrush in the woods along the railroad were cleared to a depth of 100 feet. Between 1912 and 1913, all of the remaining woods in the River Wood Lot were cleared of deadwood and selectively cut to provide proper growing room for the
best trees.\textsuperscript{138} While FDR managed these woods in part for timber production, their aesthetic value was probably of equal or greater value. FDR may have followed the advice of the United Forestry Company, which sent him guidelines in ca. 1915 for the aesthetic management of woodlands that stressed, for example, thinnings and cleanings to “...make the woods and their natural beauties accessible.”\textsuperscript{139}

\textit{Home Farm (Drawing 2.5)}

The Home Farm continued during this period as a mixed gentlemen’s farming operation based on dairy, poultry, and grain crops. FDR planned to run the farm on a more scientific and efficient basis, as part of his overall improvement plan for the estate he was working on following his 1905 marriage. In 1911, he began to systematically record the farm production and forestry work from each of the lots on the Home Farm, as well as the lots on the Wheeler Place, using a journal with a map locating each of the lots (fig. 2.66).

One of the first major changes to the landscape during this period was not, however, a direct result of FDR’s plans, but rather of Thomas Newbold’s acquisition of the Dumphy Farm, the upland farm east of the Home Farm, in 1905 (see fig. 2.59). Four years later in 1909, Newbold purchased the Hughson Farm to the northeast of the Dumphy Farm.\textsuperscript{140} When Newbold purchased the Dumphy Farm, there were no roads connecting it with Bellefield, the closest being over a mile to the north in Hyde Park village. Newbold presumably reached an agreement with FDR and Sara Roosevelt to build a road across the Bracken Place to provide a direct link with the Dumphy Farm from Bellefield. By July 1906, work was underway on the new road, as Sara noted in her diary: “Today F. [D.R.] and
I walked over part of what is to be our new road out East.” On the west end near the Post Road, the new road followed the alignment of Bracken Lane, the road that once led to the Bellefield farmstead (fig. 2.67, see also fig. 2.66). The new road continued south and east through the pastures and woodlots to the southeast corner of the Bracken Place, where it crossed the Maritje Kill. Thomas Newbold built the rest of the road on his property that connected with an existing farm road that led to the Dumphy barns and farmhouse on Violet Avenue. The road, which the Roosevelts appropriately called the “Newbold Road,” was completed in the fall of 1906.

Prior to this period, the Home Farm functioned largely as a back end to the Roosevelt Estate, without much access to or through its pastures and woodlots to the adjoining upland farms. This began to change in 1906 with construction of Newbold Road, and in subsequent years, FDR building a number of additional roads to reach the upland farms and access plantations and woodlots. In fall 1911, a new road, which FDR called “the Road to Rogers,” was built from Newbold Road extending north through the Locust Pasture to the Rogers Estate. During the same year, a north–south cross-road was built to connect Newbold Road to the original road through the Home Farm, known as Farm Road (see fig. 2.66). Soon after, Farm Road was extended southeast to a field at the southeast corner of the Farm Wood Lot near the Maritje Kill, which FDR reforested in 1912 (Plot C).

To reach the Bennett Farm, the Roosevelts initially used Newbold Road, and then turned south on Violet Avenue. In 1923, however, FDR decided to build a direct connection by extending Farm Road east from Plot C to the Bennett farm road that led to Violet Avenue. A main reason for constructing the road was to provide direct access from Springwood to Val-Kill, then being planned and constructed at the east end of the Bennett Farm. To carry Farm Road over the Maritje Kill, FDR had a substantial concrete bridge constructed in the fall of 1923, complete with concrete parapets topped by finials (fig. 2.68). The road was completed the following year.

The center of the Home Farm during this period remained the farm complex on the South Farm Lot, which according to a period account consisted of “...typical red farm buildings, with hens and turkeys in the farmyard, cows out behind...”
the fence and farm machinery both inside and outside of the farm.\footnote{146} The complex featured the multi-wing frame dairy barn and farmhouse that dated to the eighteenth century (fig. 2.69). A modern 80-ton crane-wrapped silo was added to the barn, most likely as one of FDR’s improvements in the 1910s, supplementing an earlier frame silo with a gable roof. Around the barnyard were several smaller buildings, including an implement shed, granary, manure shed, two bull stalls and pens, and two brooder houses.\footnote{147} In 1915, the chicken coop that stood next to the Duplex below the Springwood house was moved south of the barnyard, at the south end of a fence-enclosed chicken yard.\footnote{148} A major improvement during the 1910s was construction of a modern milk house (dairy) at the southwest corner of the barnyard, approximately 50 feet in front (west) of the farmhouse. This substantial one-story, hipped-roof Colonial Revival–style building featured rough-coursed stone walls, a slate roof, and a front porch, and contained a separating room, small storage room, and refrigerator room cooled by ice (fig. 2.70).\footnote{149}

Outside of the farm complex, much of the South Farm Lot consisted of open fields used to grow hay, rye, corn, and mangelwurzel (a fodder beet).\footnote{150} South of the chicken coop, bordering the south boundary of the estate, was an apple orchard containing sixty trees planted in ca. 1915.\footnote{151} Across the power line installed in 1913 and an unnamed stream east of the barns was the East Farm Lot, which in 1911 was used to grow hay, but produced a poor crop; the following year, it was used as a pasture. After a year of rest, however, the land was cultivated in 1914–16 to grow potatoes, beets, mangelwurzels, oats, peas, and wheat. In 1917, it was returned to growing hay. North of the South Farm Lot, the other fields bordering the Post Road (North Farm Lot, Big Lot, and North and South Parker Lots) continued to have productive soils, although they required substantial fertilization. They were used to grow primarily grain crops, as well as some hay. In 1912, FDR wrote his mother, “The crops...have been wonderful on the place—good hay, rye, wheat and the oats are just going in, over 300 bushels from the North Farm lot and fine straw.”\footnote{152}

East and north of the Post Road fields were the pastures and wood lots occupying the rougher land characterized by swamps, rock outcroppings, and ravines extending to the Maritje Kill. The pastures, including the Night Pasture, Middle
Pasture, Locust Pasture, and Swamp Pasture, were a mix of wooded and open land, and were lined by stone walls and wire or wood fences. Here was where the farm’s dairy herd, which averaged approximately fourteen to eighteen cows, grazed.\textsuperscript{153} Much of this land was unsuitable for cultivation, although a portion of the Middle Pasture, east of the Big Lot, was used during the 1910s for growing potatoes, corn, and mangelwurzels.\textsuperscript{154} Apparently not all of the pastures were needed for the cows, because FDR reforested portions of them. The state forester had recommended planting Scotch pine, European larch, basswood, and tulip-poplar on the Home Farm during his 1911 inspection.\textsuperscript{155} The 5-acre pasture at the southeast corner of the Farm Wood Lot near the Maritje Kill east of Farm Road was where FDR established a large white pine plantation in 1912 (Plot C), the first year of his reforestation program, lending it the name “White Pine Lot.” The year before, FDR had noted in his farm journal that this field was used as pasture, and was “very poor.” Between April 20 and April 25, 1912, the southern three-quarters of the field was planted with white pine at 5- to 6-foot spacing, probably using most of the 5,000 trees FDR had ordered from the state nursery that year (the others being used along the creek in the Gravel Lot, Plot B). The following year, the rest of the field was planted with white pines, and the 10 percent of the previous year’s plantings that had died were replaced.\textsuperscript{156}

Aside from the White Pine Lot, FDR only established one other plantation on the Home Farm prior to World War I. For this plantation, he chose the Locust Pasture, a former grazing land covered in black locust trees, an early successional species. In 1911 FDR harvested the locusts for use as posts and poles, and in 1912 cleared portions of the lot of brush and poor trees for use once again as a pasture.\textsuperscript{157} In ca. 1916, FDR planted white pines on the edge of the pasture, northeast of Bracken Pond (Plot H).\textsuperscript{158} Following the war and after his return home after recuperating from polio, FDR once again began tree planting on the Home Farm. He set out four plantations, including a second in the Locust Pasture with Scotch and red pine (Plot N) in ca. 1925–26 on a rise west of Bracken Pond at the juncture of Newbold Road and the Road to Rogers.\textsuperscript{159} In 1925, FDR had a small plot of tulip-
poplars (Plot L) set out along along Newbold Road near the former site of the Bellefield farmstead at the northeast corner of the Big Lot; in ca. 1927, a Norway spruce plantation (Plot O) along a ridge bordering the woods on the east side of the East Farm Lot; and between 1924 and 1928, a very small plot of Scotch pine (Plot Q) on the north side of Farm Road in the southeast corner of the Night Pasture.160

Aside from reforestation, FDR also managed the native oak forest that occupied much of the east end of the Home Farm. Unlike the lower woods west of the Post Road, the Home Farm woods were probably managed primarily for timber production, with aesthetics and recreation serving secondary purposes. In 1911, the Triangle Wood Lot, containing both young successional and mature woods, was cleaned up through removal of underbrush, deadwood, and poor trees, a job probably made necessary by the chestnut blight; and in 1926–27, a general thinning was done throughout the woods on the Home Farm.161

**J. R. Roosevelt Place (Drawing 2.6)**

J. R. Roosevelt (“Rosy”) and his second wife, Elizabeth Riley Roosevelt, made a number of improvements to the property he inherited from his father in 1900 that included the west half of the Boreel Place with the Red House and the Kirchner Place. While Rosy managed the house and its adjoining gardens and outbuildings, the surrounding woods and agricultural fields continued to be managed as part of the Home Farm during this period, such as the fields on the Kirchner Place along the Post Road that were used to pasture cows from the Home Farm. Rosy did not undertake a reforestation program, and only maintained a small farm operation, probably just chickens in the service area.162

The Red House and its surrounding grounds received a number of improvements during this period, most of which were most likely made just prior or soon after Rosy’s marriage to Elizabeth Riley in 1914. These included replacement of the original double-hung window sash with casements windows, the same type of windows the Newbolds had used in the renovation of Bellefield house several years earlier (fig. 2.71). Soon after, and corresponding with the renovation of the Springwood house in 1915–16, the J. R. Roosevelts built a new gambrel-roofed Colonial Revival-style kitchen and servants’ wing on...
the north side of the Red House, replacing the earlier one-story wing (fig. 2.72). A 10,000-gallon water tank on a steel tower, located at the rear of the farmhouse, also known as the Teamster’s House, was most probably installed as part of the expansion (see fig. 2.32). Water was pumped from springs on the Kirchner Place to a 40,000-gallon storage reservoir near the ravine west of the farmhouse. The Roosevelts also redesigned the garden south of the Red House around the same time. The new garden was positioned along the edge of the terrace overlooking the Hudson River, and was redesigned as a long, rectangular space bordered by a clipped hemlock hedge and crossed by axial paths. At the north end of the garden, the old wood-frame greenhouse was removed and replaced by an iron-framed, curved-eaved greenhouse with a potting shed, a smaller version of the greenhouses built at Springwood in 1908 (fig. 2.73). The garden was bordered to the east by a road that led to the chauffeur’s quarters, a two-story frame structure built in ca. 1910. To the south was a smaller building erected in ca. 1915 as a garage. Rosy called this building his “motor house.”

Rosy was well known for his love of horses, coachmanship, and carriages, interests no doubt gained from his father. In ca. 1910, during the years after the death of his first wife, Helen, in 1893, and remarriage to Elizabeth in 1914, Rosy built a half-mile trotting course on the Kirchner Place. The course, accessed by the road that ran from the Red House past the formal garden to the motor house, was situated on a narrow plateau overlooking the lower woods. Sugar maple trees were planted on both sides of the teardrop-shaped loop track.

FDR managed most of the forested portions of the J. R. Roosevelt Place, notably the woods near the Wheeler Place along River Road. Here, near the rustic bridge and pond, FDR identified what he considered to be a virgin stand of hemlock and hardwoods covering roughly 15 acres. FDR and Sara also took care of the rustic bridge and the boathouse as well, and most likely
were also responsible for grazing and other agricultural uses in the front fields that were part of the Home Farm operation. However, when improvements requiring legal action were required, Rosy became involved as the owner of the property. Rosy had applied for the water grant for the new dock at the end of the River Road in 1912, probably at FDR’s request. Rosy maintained another water grant in the Hudson River at the southern extreme of the Kirchner Place, identified as a “Commerce Grant,” that had been held by Elizabeth Clew (relationship unknown) in 1858. The grant extended 150 feet into the Hudson River and was 100 feet in width. Rosy, however, did not maintain a dock or landing at this water grant. 169

In May 1927, Rosy died of a heart attack, which FDR believed had been brought on by anguish over his son, James Roosevelt Roosevelt, Jr. (Taddy), who had dropped out of Harvard to marry a prostitute two decades earlier. 170 Rosy left his portion of the Boreel Place to FDR, subject to the life estate of his wife, Elizabeth Riley Roosevelt, and his daughter, Helen Roosevelt Robinson (Mrs. Theodore D. Robinson). It was Rosy’s hope that FDR would give the Boreel Place to one of his sons. FDR also undoubtedly persuaded Rosy to leave him the Boreel Place to protect the views from Springwood and the River Road, boathouse, and lower woods from possible subdivision and sale out of the family. Rosy left the south half of his estate, the Kirchner Place, to his daughter Helen, subject to two conditions. First, he gave his wife Elizabeth life estate on a 1-acre parcel of the Kirchner Place containing the motor house, as well as rights to the springs and ram house on the property that supplied the estate with water. Second, Rosy gave Mary Newbold, the daughter of Thomas Newbold and close friend and neighbor of the family, an interest in the Kirchner Place as a gift on her wedding in 1916 to Gerald Morgan, perhaps as property to build a house. 171 Mrs. Morgan never made use of her interest in the property.

Rosy died at a time when a number of improvements were planned or underway on the Boreel Place. In 1927, a new horse barn was completed in the service area containing the farmhouse south of the entrance drive, probably as a replacement for the old barn and stables located north of the Red House. 172 The new barn featured a slate gambrel roof, ridge ventilators, novelty wood siding, and six-over-six sash windows, with three horse stalls, a large wagon space, and a hayloft (fig. 2.74). At the same time, a new house was built for the gardener (superintendent), northwest of the farmhouse. Completed in the summer of 1927 after Rosy’s death, the Craftsman-
2. Land-Use History, 1900–1928

style house, known as the bungalow, had a slate gable roof, clapboard siding, a partial-width front porch, and six-over-one sash windows (fig. 2.75). With completion of the bungalow, the Red House service area had grown into a cluster of six buildings that also included a farmhouse (by this time known as the Teamster’s House), new barn, two sheds, and a chicken house behind the barn, plus the water tower behind the Teamster’s House. The service area was screened from the entrance drive by a line of white pines, and was accessed by two roads, the original one leading to the bungalow and Teamster’s House, the other added when the new barn was built in 1927.173

Upland Farms

FDR’s purchase of the Bennett Farm in 1911 and the Tompkins Farm in 1925 greatly expanded the area of the family estate during this period. The acquisition of an upland farm by the owner of a river estate was not unprecedented in Hyde Park, since Thomas Newbold had purchased the adjoining Dumphy Farm in 1906, and the Hughson Farm three years later. FDR, who was just beginning his forestry work at the time he purchased the Bennett Farm, acquired the two farms primarily because of their potential for demonstrating the practical aspects of forestry on a typical farm. These farms allowed FDR to manage land as he saw fit, unlike the Springwood property, where his mother played a major role. Estate staff thus called the Bennett Farm “Mr. Franklin’s Farm,” to distinguish it from the Home Farm, and both physically and functionally, the upland farms remained largely separate from the original estate.174

From the beginning, FDR leased his property to tenant farmers, but he managed the native oak woods and worn-out pastures himself for forestry purposes. The east end of the Bennett Farm along the Fall Kill also became a favorite picnic ground for the Roosevelts, far removed from the constraints of the Springwood house. Here, Eleanor and her two friends, Marion Dickerman and Nancy Cook, built their Val-Kill retreat and workshops beginning in 1924.

Bennett Farm and Tompkins Farm (Drawing 2.7)

In the summer of 1911, FDR was completing his $10,000 purchase of the 191-acre Bennett Farm from Willet E. Bennett, whose family had owned the land since 1868. Although the farm adjoined the east end of the Home Farm, it was
quite remote from Springwood. To reach it by car or wagon, FDR had to take the recently constructed Newbold Road through the Bracken Place to the Dumphy Farm, and then go south on Violet Avenue. At the time, however, FDR probably did not need direct access, since he planned on having a tenant run the farm.

In August 1911, a month prior to recording of the deed, FDR prepared a lease agreement that allowed Willet E. Bennett continued use of the property until April 1916. Bennett had only acquired full title to the farm from his siblings a decade earlier, in 1905. Under this agreement, Bennett had the right not only to use the farmhouse, barns, and other outbuildings on the west side of Creek Road (later Violet Avenue), but also the right to rent out a tenant house on the east side of the road. In the deed, recorded on September 5, 1911, Willet Bennett reserved ownership of a tank house, greenhouse, slaughterhouse, and wagon shed on the property, which he was to remove before his lease expired in 1916. These buildings were apparently within the main farm complex on the west side of Creek Road.\(^{175}\)

When Bennett’s lease expired, FDR rented the farm to Patrick E. Morris, but added the provision that Morris was prohibited from cutting or selling any timber, except for his own firewood. Morris was followed by John Townsend, the Poughkeepsie postmaster, and on April 1, 1920 by Moses Smith, who would remain on the property for the next quarter century. Smith was a farmer (it is not known if the previous two tenants were) and used the property for dairy and general farming, including truck farming (vegetables).\(^{176}\) As with the previous tenants, Smith had the use of most of the farm, but FDR kept use of the woods and the old pastures for forestry.

During this period, the Bennett Farm retained its overall nineteenth-century organization characterized by fields to either side of Creek Road and the farmstead on the west side of the road. The house, named Woodlawns presumably for its front lawn shaded by large trees, was accessed by a tree-lined farm road off Creek Road (fig. 2.76). Past the house and barns, the farm road turned south and then west along the south property line bordering the Tompkins Farm and then passed through woods that extended into the Home Farm. East of Creek Road were fields extending east to the Fall Kill that Smith often used to grow corn. The north half of these fields, north of the farm road (Val-Kill Lane), contained wet areas that had been ditch-drained.\(^{177}\) The tenant farmhouse was halfway along the north side of the farm road between Creek Road and the Fall Kill. Probably constructed by the Bennett family

Figure 2.76. The Bennett farmhouse known as Woodlawns looking northwest across the shaded front lawn, ca. 1945. (Collection of Clifford M. Smith.)
after 1876, the house was a simple, one-and-a-half-story frame building that was banked into the grade, with an exposed stone foundation (fig. 2.77).\textsuperscript{178}

The farm road continued east past the tenant house, through abandoned pastures to either side of the Fall Kill, and crossed the creek over a corduroy bridge (fig. 2.78). Farther east and uphill was a fifty-year-old woodlot dominated by red oak, white oak, hickory, chestnut oak, and American chestnut. The old pastures along the Fall Kill were characterized by dense old-field successional vegetation, including gray birch, red cedar, prickly ash, sugar maple, oak, and witch hazel. As characteristic abandoned farmland, these pastures were prime candidates for reforestation, but required substantial work to remove the successional vegetation in preparation for planting. In 1914, three years into his reforestation program, FDR set out a large plantation of white pine (Plot D) at the northwest corner of these old pastures, bounded by the wetlands of the Fall Kill to the west and the north property line. He had ordered 7,000 four-year white pine transplants from the Conservation Commission in 1914, and most of them went to this plantation, which covered 5 acres, requiring approximately 6,000 trees.\textsuperscript{179} This plantation was similar in size and composition to the plantation at the White Pine Lot on the Home Farm planted in 1912–13, but much bigger than the plantations on the Wheeler Place.

At the west end of the Bennett Farm, behind the farmhouse and barns, there was also old pasture, but it was not until the 1920s that FDR reforested any portion of this area, perhaps due to their use by the tenant farmers. Along the west side of the pasture was a Central Hudson power line erected in ca. 1921. FDR had presumably urged the power company to locate the line here, back from Violet Avenue, to avoid spoiling the rural streetscape, much as he had done along the Post Road. In 1926, FDR used the pasture below the power line as a 3-acre Norway spruce plantation (Plot M) planted at close, 3-foot spacing for the production of Christmas trees. Since the trees were not intended to mature, the power line did not pose a conflict. Although not one of the first to grow Christmas trees as a commercial crop, FDR was an early practitioner.\textsuperscript{180} Like his tulip-poplar plantations, this Christmas tree plantation reflected FDR's interest in experimenting with forestry practices.
To the south of the white pines in Plot D was the old pasture along the Fall Kill where Eleanor, FDR, and their family and friends picnicked, beginning in the early 1920s in the years after FDR contracted polio (see fig. 2.78). For Eleanor especially, this location provided a retreat from her mother-in-law’s realm at Springwood. FDR began to improve access to this area from Springwood by 1923–24, when he had Farm Road extended through the east end of the Home Farm to link up with the Bennett farm road. In 1924, he had the old corduroy bridge over the Fall Kill rebuilt and cleared the old-field successional vegetation to either side of the creek, leaving scattered red cedar and gray birch (fig. 2.79). The bridge was built as part of a dam across the Fall Kill that created a pond to the north.

It was during the summer of 1924 that Eleanor and her close friends, Nancy Cook and Marion Dickerman, developed an idea with FDR of making the picnic ground a year-round retreat by building a cottage there. As Eleanor Roosevelt later recalled, the idea came about during a picnic and discussion of rural problems, including the lack of small industries in rural communities:

So as we were talking over all these problems, Miss Cook suddenly said she thought the spot we were picnicking would be an ideal place for a cottage, and added that she had a longing to go back to her wood working which she had taught before the War. “Why not start a factory and copy Early American furniture?” she said. At first we did not think of it seriously, but the plan gradually grew and before we knew it our stone cottage was built, and the little factory back of it, consisting of the cellar, one large work room, a small apartment over it for our caretaker, and one long dormitory containing a shower and which was the place many boys chose to sleep in when we came up to the country for week-ends.

Cook and Dickerman, who knew each other as students at Syracuse University and were active in progressive reform, had met Eleanor through the New York State Democratic Party. The women named their retreat Val-Kill, the Dutch derivation of Fall Kill. They began a number of improvements that year, including construction of a swimming pool near the east bank of the Fall Kill, begun in August 1924 and completed the following year. Although FDR had envisioned a more formal swimming pool, Eleanor, Nancy, and Marion wanted a naturalistic pool that would be in keeping with the rustic character of the landscape. Water for the pool came from the adjoining pond in the Fall Kill. Part of the improvements
included rebuilding of the Bennett farm road from Violet Avenue, which was graveled by July 1925.\textsuperscript{185}

As work on the pool and road was underway, the three women and FDR commissioned architect Henry Toombs to design the Val-Kill cottage. The project was the first commission for Toombs, who had graduated with a master’s degree in architecture from the University of Pennsylvania in 1923. FDR sketched his concept for the house, which reflected not only the rural setting of Val-Kill and his own keen interest in Dutch Colonial architecture, but also the American Arts and Crafts Movement, which stressed pre-industrial methods of construction and natural materials. Construction of the house, known as the Stone Cottage or Val-Kill Cottage, was underway by July 1925 and substantially completed by the middle of the next year (fig. 2.80).\textsuperscript{186} The rural and rustic character of Val-Kill was described in a magazine article that appeared several years after completion of the cottage:

> About five miles out on Violet Avenue swings a sign “Val-Kill Lane,” and if you are an adventurous as well as a wise person, you will turn right into this narrow road and follow it to its end. Between two fields it goes and presently finds itself following the winding of a brook or “kill” as they were called by the early Dutch settlers in colonial times. Its banks are gay with columbine, cardinal flowers, mallows, marsh marigolds, purple loostrife and golden rod, that bring their riot of color with the changing seasons. Over a little bridge and past a swimming pool, the road swings around and up a gentle slope, to reach its goal at the doorstep of a Dutch Colonial stone cottage surrounded by silver birches and tall cedars.\textsuperscript{187}

As construction of Stone Cottage was underway, Eleanor, Nancy, and Marion, with FDR’s encouragement, began to implement their plans for craft industries to help revive the struggling rural economy and perpetuate early American craft conditions. Named Val-Kill Industries, the enterprise initially developed around Nancy Cook’s expertise in furniture making, and included production of all the furnishings for the cottage. At first conceived to be housed in a wing of the Stone Cottage, the three women soon decided to erect a separate building containing the furniture factory, garage, and living quarters for workers. Sited northeast of the Stone Cottage, the modest two-story stucco building, known as the “Factory” or “Shops,” was also designed by Henry Toombs (fig. 2.81). Construction was begun in the spring of 1926, before work ended on the Stone Cottage. Within three years, a number of small additions were made to accommodate the growing business.\textsuperscript{188}
On January 26, 1926, as the idea of Val-Kill Industries was taking hold, FDR entered into a written lease agreement with Eleanor, Nancy, and Marion for the Val-Kill property, encompassing approximately 8 acres in a four-sided parcel centered on the bridge and extending to the south property line with the Tompkins Farm. The lease agreement, which was not legally executed or acknowledged in Dutchess County land records, allowed the three women to use the property for residential, industrial, or manufacturing purposes for their life term, upon the end of which the lease would cease and the property would revert to use by FDR or his estate. The women owned the improvements on the property and were responsible for maintenance.189 An understood aspect of the lease was the right of access along Val-Kill Lane, the former Bennett farm road that the women shared with Moses Smith and the resident of the tenant farmhouse.190

Bordering the Bennett Farm to the south and only 300 feet south of the Stone Cottage at Val-Kill was the Tompkins Farm, a 192-acre property centered at the intersection of Violet Avenue and Creek Road known as “Dead Man’s Curve.” Unlike the Bennett Farm, the Tompkins Farm saw few changes during this period, but FDR had big plans for the property and its abandoned agricultural fields, primarily for forestry purposes. In the fall of 1923, a year before FDR resumed reforestation following a six-year hiatus, he was making plans to purchase the Tompkins Farm.

Mrs. Sarah Tompkins had inherited the farm in 1885 from Susan Tompkins and George W. Tompkins as executors of the last will and testament of Elias Tompkins.191 By the 1920s, the farm had become run-down, with the pastures west of Creek Road abandoned to gray birch and the farmhouse and barn in poor condition.192 For FDR, the Tompkins property provided an opportunity to revive a declining farm through reforestation and sound agricultural practices. Situated along busy Creek Road and Violet Avenue, recently designated a state highway (Route 9G, although not yet improved), the farm was seen by FDR as having great potential as a demonstration project, serving as the agricultural counterpart to Val-Kill Industries. At the time, he was in fact inquiring whether the state Conservation Commission might be interested in supervising the establishment of a demonstration woodlot along Violet Avenue.193 As a complement to this woodlot, the old fields bordering the state highway would provide the ideal conditions for demonstrating the benefits of reforestation.
At the time he was considering its purchase, Mrs. Tompkins was planning on selling off building lots along the road frontage to finance her mortgage on the place, a plan that would have ruined the property’s potential for demonstration forestry. To change Mrs. Tompkins’s mind, in December 1923 FDR offered to provide her with a second mortgage, interest free, in return for keeping her farm intact. FDR advised his lawyer to tell Mrs. Tompkins, “...even if one building lot on the road is sold off I could have no interest in the rest of the place.” Mrs. Tompkins quickly accepted FDR’s offer, which he was willing to make “...as there is no question that the value of the farm will fully cover the 2nd mortgage. Also, I am really touched by her [Mrs. Tompkins’s] feeling for the old place and by her desire to keep it intact during her lifetime.” FDR’s plan of financial assistance for Mrs. Tompkins soon turned into a purchase offer. On July 3, 1925, his acquired the farm for $7,000.

In the fall following his purchase, FDR began renovations to the farm, beginning with painting of the farmhouse, an eighteenth-century building with late-nineteenth-century alterations, white with apple-green trim and foundation, and gray on the chimneys and metal roof (fig. 2.82). FDR also hoped to repair the barn, located across the street on the east side of Creek Road. He wrote William Plog in November 1925, “When I get home I want to go over the Tompkins barn with you. It is a very old building—built I think about the time of the Revolution, but it is worth saving from falling down.” In addition to this main barn, there were two smaller barns. One, a granary, was located next to the main barn, and the other, a wagon and chicken house, was located behind the farmhouse. The main barn and granary framed the north side of a small barnyard, which was enclosed by a stone wall. Along the east side of Creek Road south of the barnyard was an orchard.

While the building work was being planned in the fall of 1925, FDR had worked out an agreement with Peter Rohan, who owned the adjoining farm to the east, to use the fertile fields east of the barn and Creek Road. FDR erected a hay shed for Rohan, and in November 1925, Rohan was enclosing one of the fields with post and wire fencing, probably to pasture dairy cows. For the remaining old fields, FDR had been unable to interest the state Conservation Commission in establishing a demonstration forestry plot. Within a few years, however, he would have success when the New York State College of Forestry took up the idea.
SUMMARY, 1900–1928

Between James Roosevelt’s death in 1900 and FDR’s election as governor in 1928, the landscape of the Roosevelt Estate underwent many changes. FDR’s planned improvements to the estate’s house, gardens, farm, and forest that he envisioned as early as 1905 during his honeymoon, began largely following his entrance into politics in 1911. During this year, FDR set up a forest management plan, created a journal to record operations of the Home Farm, and acquired the Bennett Farm, the first property he purchased in his name and the first expansion of the estate into the uplands. The following year, the gardens at Springwood were redesigned and three years later, the main house was rebuilt into a Colonial Revival mansion. Meanwhile, FDR’s half brother, J. Roosevelt Roosevelt, was making similar improvements on the Boreel and Kirchner Places. At the east end of the Bennett Farm, tucked away on an old pasture along the Fall Kill, Eleanor Roosevelt and her friends Nancy Cook and Marion Dickerman developed their Val-Kill retreat and industries with FDR’s assistance. Despite these developments, the landscape of the Roosevelt Estate and the upland farms retained much of their nineteenth-century character defined by building locations and patterns of fields, roads, and woodlots. The estate remained, overall, composed of modest country places and typical farms, at least in the character of their landscapes, if not in their ownership and operation.

The innovative operation of the estate by FDR became evident in the landscape during this period through his forestry program. Owners of country estates in the Northeast had pioneered scientific forestry practices in the decades following the Civil War, and by the first decade of the twentieth century, these practices were becoming institutionalized at both the state and federal levels. FDR’s forestry program, begun in 1911 during the very early years of the reforestation movement in New York State, stressed both woodlot management and reforestation. Over the course of fourteen years, FDR set out approximately sixteen plantations that included more than 42,000 trees. Aside from tulip-poplar and his experimental Christmas tree plantation, FDR’s reforestation work represented the standard tree species and planting patterns characteristic of forestry practice during the early twentieth century. In the landscape, FDR’s forestry led to a more managed appearance to the native woods, and his plantations began to fill in old pastures and woodlots. While most of his plantations remained quite young and therefore had little impact on the character of the landscape during this period, his oldest plantations, particularly those on the Wheeler Place in the woods below the Springwood house, were filling in the old pastures and open spaces, creating continuous forest cover.

FDR’s convictions about the importance of forestry, particularly for the average farmer with marginal land, reflected the same arguments used by the state to encourage reforestation as a means to address the “land problem” stemming from
the rapid abandonment of farmland. As FDR was elected to ever-higher political office, he increasingly saw the value of his own forestry work at Hyde Park for demonstration purposes. This, along with a need for professional assistance and expansion of Christmas tree production, would characterize forestry at the Roosevelt Estate during FDR’s years as governor and president. These same years also led to marked changes in the way the family used the original estate, but the landscape would overall retain much of its character.
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49 Fedkiw, 19.


52 Fedkiw, 19.


55 *Conservation Commission Seventeenth Annual Report for the Year of 1927* (Albany: Published by the Commission, 1928), 211.

56 The following table, by Cornell University foresters (Paul, 670–71), provides a sampling of reforestation programs in New York State established between 1900 and 1910:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Acreage (to 1910)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Water Company, Hemlock Lake</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers Estate, Hyde Park</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Bear Spring Water Company, Fulton</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloversville Water Company, Gloversville</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Estate, Gloversville</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark Estate, Cooperstown</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuBois Estate, Waverly</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Estate, Gloversville</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hays Estate, Johnstown</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakleigh Thorne, Millbrook</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Cemetery Association, Norwich</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


59 Sara Cone Bryant, “Forestry at Home,” *Boston Herald*, February 9, 1913, editorial page, clipping sent to FDR by the United Forestry Company in 1916, Papers as the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, FDRL. An article appearing in *American Forestry* in 1914 stated: “…the exercise of a little practical forestry, such as every country gentleman should be reasonably conversant with, would cover the stony pasture with thriving trees at far less expense than stoning [for cultivation], and transform the brushy woodlot into a noble forest that will be a favorite place in you walks in the cool of the evening when the thrushes are singing…” Warren H. Miller, “Forestry on the Country Estate, I. The Woodlot” *American Forestry*, vol. XX, no. 1 (January 1914), 1–2.


63 In addition to the Forest Preserve and reforestation program, the Division of Lands and Forests and also managed the state’s forest fire control system, forest pest control program, forest recreational facilities, and demonstrational forests and game refuges. Other divisions within the Conservation Commission by the late 1920s managed the state’s system of parks and historic sites, water power system, and fish and game resources.
Conservation Commission Seventeenth Annual Report for the Year of 1927, 200. The Saratoga nursery at this time supplemented a number of smaller state nurseries located at Lowville and Lake Clear in the Adirondacks, as well as one operated by the state College of Forestry just outside of Syracuse.

Conservation Commission Sixteenth Annual Report for the Year of 1926, 12.

Conservation Commission Seventeenth Annual Report for the Year of 1927, 24, 201–2; Annual Report for the Year 1928, 124. The breakdown of reforestation on non-state lands in 1927, for example, was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Owner</th>
<th>Total trees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipalities</td>
<td>3,716,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industries</td>
<td>2,210,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>228,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy Scouts</td>
<td>97,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous organizations</td>
<td>764,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals</td>
<td>10,484,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,501,852</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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United Forestry Company, Ninerville, Columbia County, New York, “Esthetic Management of Woodlands,” single-page leaflet, ca. 1915, Papers as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, FDRL.
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Moon and Brown, 116.


Conservation Commission Annual Report for the Year 1927 (Albany: Published by the Commission, 1928), 222. The state maintained three nurseries at this time at Saratoga, Lowville, and Lake Clear.
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99 William Plog’s notes from the state forester, 1911, enclosure in FDR’s Farm Journal, 1912, quoted in Snell forestry report, 5.

100 F. Franklin Moon, later Dean of the New York State College of Forestry, was the State Forester at the Conservation Commission around this time, as listed in the 1910 Annual Report.

101 Conservation Commission Annual Report for the Year 1911, 47.
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- Parcel (farm) boundary
- Lot line
- Road
- Building
- Stone wall
- Fence
- Stream, wetland
- 25' contour
- Woods (tree canopy)
- Orchard
- Cultivated field
- Feature removed during period
- Successional old field
- Forest plantation, key (Appendix A)
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FDR’s rise to governor of New York and president of the United States between 1928 and 1945 corresponded with a number of significant changes at the Roosevelt Estate, yet overall the landscape retained strong continuity with the years prior to 1928, particularly at Springwood and the Home Farm which remained largely under Sara Roosevelt’s control. The most notable changes occurred through FDR’s continued acquisition of upland farms that extended east to Cream Street above Dutchess Hill, increasing the family estate to over 1,514 acres. He purchased an additional three farms as well as four smaller parcels, and laid out a network of roads that allowed FDR access to remote corners in his specially equipped automobile. At the east end of the Bennett Farm, Eleanor Roosevelt, Nancy Cook, and Marion Dickerman continued to improve and maintain Val-Kill, while farther east in the woods on Dutchess Hill, FDR completed his own retreat, Top Cottage, in 1939. FDR rented portions of the upland farms to tenants, who continued traditional agricultural uses, including growing crops and raising livestock. On a considerable part of the acreage, FDR expanded his forestry program to produce income and demonstrate how marginal farmlands could be restored to productivity.

Upon becoming governor in 1928, FDR had been managing his own forestry program at Hyde Park for more than sixteen years, mostly based on advice from foresters at the New York State Department of Conservation and implemented with estate staff under William Plog’s supervision. In the fall of 1929, however, FDR began to make plans with the New York State College of Forestry at Syracuse University for experimental and demonstration forestry at the estate, something he had been considering for a number of years. His formal relationship with the college during four years from 1930 to 1933 enhanced the visibility and quality of his forestry program at a time when he was advocating the importance of forestry from the governor’s office. After 1933, FDR continued to rely on professional assistance from the college’s forestry faculty, particularly Nelson C. Brown. Brown became FDR’s forest manager from 1934 to 1945, overseeing expanded plantings and increased harvests from the woodlots. As with his earlier amateur work at the estate, FDR closely paralleled statewide developments in forestry. Due to the public offices he held and the involvement of the College of Forestry, the Roosevelt Estate during this period attained an unusual level of renown for a private forestry program among professional foresters and the public alike.
As FDR was focusing on forestry as a way to revive farming in the 1930s, the first signs of the suburban transformation of the region were appearing. FDR was aware of these changes, but they did not significantly change his approach to managing the estate or his forestry program. In the late 1930s, he began to plan for the transition of Springwood to public ownership through establishment of his presidential library and designation of the main house and grounds as a national historic site. For the rest of the estate, FDR looked forward to his retirement when he would have the time to devote to its farms and forests, and to documenting the history of his public life.

**TWILIGHT OF THE RURAL LANDSCAPE**

By the late 1920s, at the time FDR was elected governor of New York State, rural areas near cities both small and large were experiencing a significant shift away from urban and rural land uses to suburban patterns of development. Residential, commercial, and industrial development set on large lots, often located outside of cities and villages, proliferated due to widespread use of automobile transportation, as well as to economic, political, and social factors that discouraged investment in urban areas. In the Town of Hyde Park, which was north of the City of Poughkeepsie, automobile access was improved beginning in the late 1920s along the two main north–south roads. In 1928, the state rebuilt the Post Road, designated as U.S. Route 9, into a two-lane concrete highway; by 1941, due to increasing traffic volumes, plans were being circulated to widen the highway through Hyde Park. On the upper terrace, Violet Avenue and portions of Creek Road, designated as state Route 9E (later changed to 9G), were rebuilt into a concrete highway in 1931–32, connecting Poughkeepsie and Rhinebeck.

For many rural areas in the Hudson Valley experiencing farmland abandonment, especially those near improved highways, suburban development gave farmers unrivaled potential for economic return on their land—returns that far outstripped those available through forestry. As a 1937 study of Dutchess County found,

> When a farmer is not making ends meet, he either returns to self-sufficient farming; abandons his farm; or sells to a “city man.” Now the third choice is the most often open to him, and seems to him to offer the most cash for the least work. Since an alternative to subsistence farming has been opened to farmers of this region, agriculture stands on an entirely new basis.

Suburban development on farmland was beginning to encroach into Hyde Park during this period, notably on the farms along Violet Avenue (fig. 2.83). In the mid-1930s, Fred Wright began to lay out streets and subdivide his farm east of Violet Avenue and south of Van Wagner (Haviland) Road, a short distance
Partly in response to this growth, the local school district erected a central junior-senior high school on Van Wagner Road, which FDR helped design. FDR supported suburban development in this area, but he hoped to see, as he wrote in 1938, “restricted, high-class development” with lots no smaller than 2 acres, probably to retain a semblance of rural character. By 1939, Eleanor Roosevelt was noting in her “My Day” newspaper column, “I was struck by the number of new small houses which have sprung up around us. Before we know it, this is going to be a real suburban development.”

In Dutchess County during this period, agriculture continued to be a dominant land use, although roughly 30 percent of the county once farmed had been turned to other uses by 1930; in Hyde Park, farms still made up half of all properties in 1935. Most unproductive land had been abandoned by the late 1930s, with some of it used for suburban development; other land was used by people who did not rely on agriculture for a living. Most farming in the region continued to be specialized agriculture, including dairy and poultry farms, commercial fruit farms, and truck-crop (vegetable) farms.

As part of the rural landscape, the river estates were not only impacted by these surrounding changes to land-use and development patterns, but were also experiencing significant changes themselves. After the stock market crash of 1929, when FDR was frequently away from Hyde Park as governor of New York and president, many of the river estates were falling into decline due to a range of social and economic factors. A number of estates were converted to other uses, some were subdivided for suburban development, and a few were simply abandoned.
abandoned. Few country places underwent the expansion and improvements characteristic of earlier years, and still fewer new country places were established. By 1930, the “Country Place Era,” coined to describe the period when estate work dominated the landscape architecture profession, had come to an end.9

In Dutchess County, a 1937 survey of eighty river estates found that just over one-half were still occupied by their original families. While many had retained their original form, fully one-quarter had been sold to institutions, and thirteen were unoccupied.10 To the north of the Roosevelt Estate, Gerald and Mary Newbold Morgan maintained Bellefield as their country home following the death of Thomas Newbold in 1929. The Rogers family kept their sprawling Crumwold Farms intact until 1930s, up until the death of Anne C. Rogers, the widow of Archibald Rogers. The estate then began to sell off land, and in 1942 the main house became home to the Eymard Preparatory Seminary, a two-year Roman Catholic educational institution.11 The Novitiate of Saint Andrew, which moved to Hyde Park in 1895, was the Roosevelts’ neighbor to the south in the former Webendorfer Estate that it had acquired in 1919. By the 1920s, the novitiate had erected a massive, five-story, multi-winged building on its campus.12 Perhaps the most prominent and telling change in the area came with the sale of the Vanderbilt Estate, Hyde Park, following the death of Frederick W. Vanderbilt in 1938. FDR had long hoped to see the estate opened to the public as an arboretum. The widower Vanderbilt left the estate to his niece, Mrs. James Van Alen, but she did not have use for the property herself and put it on the market. She had difficulty finding a purchaser, but ultimately received offers from two religious institutions. FDR urged Mrs. Van Alen to instead consider donating the property to the public, and helped guide her donation of the mansion and land west of the Post Road to National Park Service under the provisions of the Historic Sites Act of 1935. This portion of the estate was designated a national historic site and opened to the public in 1940. The farm component of the estate on the east side of the Post Road was sold separately and subsequently subdivided for suburban housing.13

**HEYDAY OF THE REFORESTATION MOVEMENT**

As country estates declined and suburban development increased in and around Hyde Park, reforestation at the statewide level gained momentum in addressing land-use issues, especially in more remote rural areas. The percentage of abandoned farmland converted to suburban and other non-agricultural land uses remained very small statewide in comparison with the continued high rate of farmland abandonment in New York and other Northeastern states. In response, the New York State Conservation Department (the successor to the Conservation Commission following a 1927 reorganization) continued to emphasize the value of trees as a profitable crop for idle farm acres (fig. 2.84). Although FDR was well aware of the land problem and how forestry could address it from his years...
as state senator and his practical experience at Hyde Park, as governor he was urged to make it a priority, as reflected in a letter received in 1928 from Franklin Moon, Dean of the New York State College of Forestry:

...may I request that in the consideration of the farm problem of New York, the problem of sub-marginal farm and pasture lands be not overlooked. When I tell you that—the most recent figures show that since 1880 5,300,000 acres of land once tilled or pastured have been abandoned and that we have within the boundaries of the Empire State an area greater in size than the four New England States, viz. Rhode Island, Connecticut, Massachusetts and Vermont, which altho [sic] unsuited to agriculture will raise repeated crops of timber, conserve runoff and provide for opportunities for recreation, you can realize that the whole land problem is one of the first magnitude and should be considered in its entirety....

Private reforestation efforts at the time, although substantial, were only resulting in the reforestation of less than 20 percent of annual farm acreage being abandoned. While private reforestation would remain important throughout this period, increased government intervention beginning in the late 1920s led to the heyday of the reforestation movement in New York State, which lasted through the 1930s. State reforestation prior to 1929 had been restricted by law to land within the Adirondack and Catskill Forest Preserves, which by the late 1920s had been largely reforested through planting of over 51,500,000 trees. Many leaders in forestry and conservation circles realized that for the reforestation movement to be successful in addressing the broader land problem, greater state involvement was necessary in lands outside of the Forest Preserve. As the state Conservation Department reported in its 1928 annual report:

There has been greater general interest in reforestation on the part of the public during the year 1928 than ever before. However, it is apparent that a reforestation campaign on a scale much larger than that now existing is absolutely essential if we are to succeed in putting the idle lands of the State to work within any reasonable period of time.

It was thought that the job of reforesting New York State’s abandoned farmlands was simply too big and too expensive for the private sector. For a number of reasons, state government was perceived to be the most appropriate entity not only to plant the trees, but also to take ownership of the land. These reasons included the long-term financial returns in forestry, the belief that abandoned

Figure 2.84. Advertisement from the New York State Conservation Commission advocating reforestation to farmers, ca. 1935. (Reverse side of Conservation Commission tree order form, Nelson Brown Papers, Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.)
farmlands could never sustain general agriculture for the private farmer, and the public interest in maintaining the state’s timber and soils resources. Such reasons led to a series of state initiatives beginning in the late 1920s that together were popularly known as the Enlarged Reforestation Program.17 This program continued New York State’s national lead in reforestation efforts, but other states were quickly catching up as the benefits of reforestation were becoming more widely accepted.18

The first movement toward the Enlarged Reforestation Program came in January 1927, when Senator C. A. Hewitt proposed a constitutional amendment that would authorize the state to expend $100,000,000 for reforestation purposes (state land acquisition and planting) outside of the Forest Preserve. This proposal led to the creation of the State Reforestation Commission in 1928 to study the proposal. Based on the findings of the commission, the State Reforestation Law was passed in 1929 under FDR’s term as governor, giving the state the authority to reforest lands outside of the Forest Preserve in so-called “reforestation areas.” These were state-acquired tracts of marginal farmland that were a minimum of 500 acres each, “which shall be forever devoted to the planting, growth and harvesting of such trees as shall be reforested.”19 The law authorized the Conservation Department to expend $120,000 for a pilot program involving land acquisition and reforestation. This program was begun in the fall of 1929 with acquisition of Reforestation Area No. 1 in Madison County (Central New York) and subsequent planting of 1.6 million trees on the abandoned farmland (fig. 2.85).20

Based on the success of this pilot program, and the need for a definite, fixed, and continuing reforestation program, the State Reforestation Commission and the Conservation Department proposed a constitutional amendment, building on the Hewitt concept, that was passed by the legislature in 1930 under FDR’s term as governor and approved by the people in 1931. Popularly known as the Hewitt Amendment, the law established reforestation as official policy of the state with the goal of a minimum 1 million acres (about one-thirtieth of the state land area) to be reforested within fifteen years, by 1944. The amendment established ten Forest Districts covering all of the state north of metropolitan New York City, including Dutchess County (fig. 2.86). The reforestation goal was set within a budget of $20,000,000, requiring an average annual appropriation of between
The objectives of the Enlarged Reforestation Program, to be implemented by the Conservation Department, were first to retire abandoned farmland permanently from agricultural use; and second, to provide a future supply of timber, public recreation, watershed protection, and scenic improvement. The Hewitt Amendment did not directly address forestry on privately owned land, such as farms and estates.

By 1931 toward the end of FDR’s term as governor, a total of $1,116,250 had been appropriated for land acquisition and reforestation under the 1929 State Reforestation Law. In 1932, the first $1,000,000 mandated by the Hewitt Amendment was made available, and by September of that year, 182 reforestation areas covering 173,681 acres had been placed under contract for state purchase (see fig. 2.86). Most of these areas were located in a band of marginal farmland from the Catskills west to the Southern Tier, and along the western periphery of the Adirondack Park; none were established in Dutchess County. The state’s replanting program followed a rapid pace that paralleled land acquisitions, totaling 61,349 acres planted in 1932. During the depths of the Depression, however, state finances required that appropriations for reforestation be reduced to roughly a third of what they had been at their height in 1931. Fortunately, the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), created in 1933 under FDR’s first term as president, permitted the state to continue its extensive planting work despite decreasing appropriations.

During the nine years that it was active in New York between 1933 and 1942, the CCC planted 146,641 acres of trees, surveyed 215,591 acres for state acquisition, managed natural stands, and made recreational improvements, among other work. The help of the CCC allowed the state to plant a record number of trees between 1933 and 1937, as measured by tree distribution from state nurseries (fig. 2.87). With the end of the CCC and the beginning of World War II, the state reforestation program was largely curtailed, although sufficient funding was continued to allow the state
nurseries to operate and to maintain existing plantations. By 1943, New York State had acquired approximately 450,000 acres and had planted approximately 225,000 acres, less than one-quarter of the goal in the Hewitt Amendment.\footnote{24} Total reforestation efforts in New York by the end of this period in 1945 totaled 651,258,000 trees distributed from state nurseries since their inception in 1900.\footnote{25} This number reflected total orders from both state and non-state landowners.

Reforestation on non-state lands was at its height at the beginning of this period in 1928, when the state nurseries distributed 17,540,000 trees, of which 11,181,865 trees went to individuals such as farmers and estate owners.\footnote{26} Distribution remained at or near this level through 1932; in 1933, at the depth of the Great Depression, the number fell roughly in half, to 8.9 million trees, and subsequently remained at an annual average of 11 million trees up until World War II. Landowners such as farmers and estate owners remained the largest single category for private and non-state distribution from the state nurseries, followed by municipalities (community forests, watersheds), industries, schools and colleges, Boy Scouts, and 4-H clubs.\footnote{27} During the war years, distribution to non-state landowners fell from 8.8 million in 1942 to 2.9 million trees in 1945.\footnote{28}

The continued interest in reforestation among non-state landowners was due no doubt to the visibility of the state’s Enlarged Reforestation Program, as well as to the continued extension forestry work undertaken by the New York State Conservation Department, the New York State College of Forestry at Syracuse University, the Department of Forestry at the New York State College of Agriculture at Cornell University, and agents for the County Farm Bureau System. Forestry extension work was geared in large part to the average farmer. In 1928, for example, extension work included the Farm Bureau’s mailing of tree order forms and covering reforestation in its newsletter, which generated 303 orders for 1,116,850 trees. Cornell and the Conservation Department also showcased state nurseries and reforestation areas to the public and legislative leaders through conducting “Annual Reforestation Tours,” which Governor Roosevelt attended (fig. 2.88).\footnote{29}

An important aspect of extension work in forestry during this period was the establishment of demonstration forests, usually located along public highways. Ralph S. Hosmer, Professor of Forestry at Cornell, wrote: “It was early found in extension work in forestry that actual examples of forests under management counted
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\caption{Photograph of FDR (in rear seat, right) touring a state reforestation area in 1932. New York State Department of Conservation, Annual Report for 1932.}
\end{figure}
Cornell’s policy was to establish demonstration forest areas in cooperation with private landowners in each of the forested counties of the state (which did not include Dutchess County because it had no designated state reforestation areas). Between 1923 and 1926, the state nurseries distributed more than half a million trees annually for demonstration purposes, primarily through Cornell extension agents. In 1927, the Conservation Department provided signs to mark ninety-six of the most successful demonstration plantations located on well-traveled roads in thirty-two counties of the state.

In addition to demonstration forestry, the Conservation Department and state colleges also practiced experimental forestry, sometimes in conjunction with demonstration plots. Experimental plantations were established to test out the viability of exotic tree species or new environmental conditions, or to study diseases and pests. Between 1923 and 1930, the Conservation Department established 335 permanent plantation study plots on state, municipal, and private lands. In the Hudson Valley, for example, the Department established eighty-four experimental plantations, thirty-nine of which were on land belonging to private individuals or clubs, and thirty-seven of which were on municipal land.

The New York State College of Forestry at Syracuse University also undertook experimental and demonstration forestry work, but generally did not rely on private or municipal landowners as it maintained extensive tracts of its own land for such purposes in the Adirondacks and in the central and southwestern part of the state. Despite this, the college did some extension work on private and municipal lands to fulfill its mission to undertake special research and statewide investigations in forestry and to carry on public educational work. At the time it was planning work at the Roosevelt Estate in the early 1930s, the College of Forestry was busy with requests for assistance, so much so that it was short of staff. In 1930, for example, the college assisted in carrying out fifty-two projects, planting over 264,000 trees for demonstration and experimental purposes. In addition to planting 13,000 trees at the Roosevelt Estate in 1930, the college’s extension work during this year included planting 16,000 trees at the Broome County Sanitarium in the Southern Tier, 14,000 for the Village of Arcade in western New York, and 7,000 at the Loomis State Sanatorium in the Catskills.

Extension work in Dutchess County during this period was an important component in reforestation efforts as elsewhere in the state, yet the county did not receive much attention from the state under the State Reforestation Law. Reforestation in Dutchess County was undertaken only by private and municipal landowners and not by the state. While upwards of 10 million trees were distributed from state nurseries to landowners in Dutchess County by 1945, still no state reforestation areas had been established, probably due to high land
values and lack of tracts greater than 500 acres. In contrast, upwards of 57 million trees were distributed to Chenango County in central New York, where the state established reforestation areas covering upwards of 60,000 acres.36

**LANDSCAPE OF FORESTRY**

Developments in planting methods, species availability, and changing markets, as well as appearance of new diseases, resulted in some minor changes to the landscape of managed forests by the 1930s. The most significant changes, however, occurred through the natural maturation of the plantations established over the preceding three decades. By the 1930s, many of the earliest plantations were maturing into forest, with a closed canopy, open understory, and humus-rich floor.37

For the average farmer, woodlot management, in the French manner, continued to be a popular forestry practice, although despite the educational work done by Farm Bureau agents in New York, many farmers still did not properly manage their woodlots. Removal of dead American chestnuts, wiped out by the chestnut blight of the 1910s, remained an obvious need for management in many woodlots. Another disease, Dutch elm disease, also began to impact woodlots during this period; although the elm was not as dominant a tree in the forests of the Hudson Valley as was the chestnut, its impact in formal plantings such as street trees and specimens would become enormous. A fatal fungal infection transmitted by the elm bark beetle, Dutch elm disease was discovered in Holland in 1919, and was first detected in the United States in Ohio in the summer of 1930. Along the East Coast, beginning in the 1930s, the disease spread rapidly from New York City where it had been an undetected infestation for several years.38

Many farmers continued to plant and manage forests on their idle agricultural lands throughout this period, using the straight rows and monoculture planting practices that had become hallmarks of scientific forestry (fig. 2.89). Farmers and other private landowners followed such practices based on availability of trees from the state nurseries, state requirements, and extension work. State nurseries remained the dominant source of tree seedlings and transplants for reforestation purposes due to low costs and huge stocks. The largest state nursery during this period was at Saratoga Springs, which held an average stock of roughly 60 million trees, with smaller nurseries at Lowville, Lake Clear, Horseheads, Painted Post, and Tully.39 While private nurseries continued to supply trees, their stock was generally smaller and tended to be for ornamental purposes.40 In ordering trees, the state required private landowners during the 1930s to purchase a minimum of 1,000 trees, and not less than 500 trees of any one species. Private landowners also had to agree to use the trees for the sole purpose of reforesting lands within New York State (defined as using a 6-foot spacing on areas containing not less than 1
acre), to plant them on land assessed at less than $50 per acre, to return the empty crates in which the trees were shipped, to protect the planted area from fire, grazing, and other damage, and to provide reports on the condition of the plantation upon request.41

The leading tree species ordered by farmers in the East were red, white, and Scotch pine, along with Norway spruce and white spruce.42 Throughout this period, red pine constituted the most popular species distributed from state nurseries in New York at 30 percent, followed by white pine at 22 percent, Norway spruce at 21 percent, white spruce at 10 percent, Scotch pine at 5 percent, and European and Japanese larches at 5 percent, with other species making up the remaining 5 percent.43 These other species included white cedar, hemlock, black locust, balsam fir, and white ash. Experimental stock available in limited quantities at state nurseries included red oak, thornapple (hawthorn), Japanese barberry, flowering dogwood, gray dogwood, and Japanese chestnut.44 The Conservation Department advocated pines for lumber; spruce for pulp; larch for posts, poles, and ties; cedar for posts and poles; and locust for posts only.45

In 1939, balsam fir was listed on the Conservation Department’s standard tree order form for the first time, reflecting the increasing popularity of growing Christmas trees as a cash crop.46 The European tradition of decorating with evergreens for Christmas first became popular in America during the second half of the nineteenth century, and by 1923, when President Calvin Coolidge began the national Christmas Tree Lighting Ceremony, was well on its way to becoming a national holiday tradition (it was just three years after this that FDR established his first Christmas tree plantation on the Bennett Farm). Christmas trees had usually been cut from native forest stands until the early twentieth century. In 1901, the first Christmas tree farm, of 25,000 Norway spruce, was begun near Trenton, New Jersey.47 In subsequent decades, young plantations sometimes were cut for Christmas trees, which was counter to state regulations. By the 1930s, the State of New York was realizing the value of growing Christmas trees not only to help protect plantations and native forests, but also as a way to interest farmers in reforestation due to the shorter production cycle. In 1931, the state established its first demonstration Christmas tree plantation and soon planted others across the state (fig. 2.90). The journal American Forests published the following account of the state’s first Christmas tree plantation in December 1931:
An experimental Christmas tree plantation, the first of its kind to be operated by the State of New York, is being planted on a new reforestation area in Livingston County, north of Canaseraga [western New York]. On a 587-acre farm recently acquired for reforestation by the Conservation Department, ten acres are to be devoted to Norway spruces for Christmas trees. The department has been advocating for some time the growing by private landowners of young evergreens to be sold when six to ten years old for Christmas trees in order to prevent the destruction of valuable forests for that purpose. The object of the plantation near Canaseraga is to show landowners how this may be done profitably.

For farmers, raising Christmas trees was attractive because it produced a crop in a relatively short time compared with traditional forest plantations devoted to timber production; Christmas trees could also be harvested as part of an initial thinning in a traditional plantation. Christmas tree plantations differed from standard plantations by their close spacing, typically 3½ by 3½ feet. This close spacing was employed because the trees were harvested when small, thus allowing more trees per acre.

Standard plantation practices still involved the use of monocultures and spacing at 6 by 6 feet, set in rows. Several advances in planting technology beginning in the 1930s allowed for more exact and regular planting patterns. In 1930, the Conservation Department tried out two new planting machines on a 75,000-tree plantation. Both were basically modified wagons: one machine required a single person and was horse-drawn, the other required two people and was pulled by a tractor. The New York State College of Forestry introduced a similar innovation around the same time, known as the Heiberg Reforestation Plow after its inventor, Professor Svend Heiberg (fig. 2.91). Despite the introduction of these machines, manual planting with mattocks remained the dominant technique during this period, since the machines could not work on rocky or especially rough land that was often characteristic of reforestation areas.

This period witnessed some of the first timber harvests in plantations established with stock from the state nurseries. Twenty-five years was generally considered the earliest that coniferous lumber could be harvested. Yet the incentive in terms of lumber production was for allowing further growth in the stand. An additional five years of growth would typically produce nearly twice as much lumber; if allowed to mature to fifty years old, a plantation would produce nearly 40,000 more board feet of lumber. Thus, even though final harvesting of the first generation of plantations made after 1900 was feasible during this
period, most plantations probably remained unharvested, except for periodic thinnings of immature trees.

At a typical 6-foot spacing, forest plantations generally pruned themselves naturally, i.e., the lower branches naturally died off. As with woodlot management, pruning of dead or suppressed lower branches was usually considered an aesthetic, rather than an economic measure, except for white pines, because they tended not to prune naturally as well as other species, thus resulting in knotty wood that had less economic value. Dead branches were also pruned where there was a high risk of fire, such as near railroads. Where artificial pruning was required, limbs were generally removed for a distance equal to one log-length up the tree (about 10 feet). Removed material was generally taken out of the plantation to reduce the risk of fire. Such pruning work often resulted in a clean and manicured park-like appearance, a character that the state found was favored by the public (fig. 2.92).

In contrast to pruning, thinning plantations was a necessary cultural practice to ensure high-quality timber. Thinning (also known as improvement cuttings) was the removal of individual trees in an immature stand that was too dense for rapid growth, in favor of the fastest-growing trees with the best form. Thinnings were generally undertaken in coniferous plantations once they reached fifteen to twenty-five years old, depending on the species and site. Thinnings to produce the final crop would leave approximately 150 to 250 trees to the acre.

Both pruning and thinning work in plantations was time-consuming and expensive, although thinnings often provided some financial return from the timber harvested. Many private landowners, particularly farmers, did not undertake such cultural treatment necessary for quality timber production, and still more did not properly protect their plantations from damage through grazing or fire. Thus, despite the high rate of planting by private individuals such as farmers during this period, there was a corresponding high rate of failure in private reforestation efforts. Because of this, some foresters assumed that most private landowners who planted trees did so not for economic return, but rather as a hobby or “public-good” enterprise.
LANDSCAPE OF THE ROOSEVELT ESTATE, 1928–1945

FDR’s management of his Hyde Park land during this period had many parallels with the state’s development of its forestry program, including increased land acquisition, expanded tree planting, and educational extension. Between 1935 and 1938, FDR acquired a portion of the Rogers Estate west of Bellefield, three entire farms (Rohan Farm and Thomas Newbold’s Dumphy and Hughson Farms), portions of two farms (Wright Farm and Jones Farm), and two woodlots (Briggs Wood Lot and Lent Wood Lot), totaling nearly 512 acres (fig. 2.93). With professional assistance from the New York State College of Forestry and Nelson C. Brown, FDR planted nearly a half million trees during this period, mostly on the Tompkins, Dumphy, and Hughson Farms. Traditional agriculture—dairy, poultry, and crops—remained important land uses both at the Home Farm and the tenant farms, along with forestry.

Although major improvements at the Wheeler Place and Home Farm, which remained largely Sara Roosevelt’s realm up to her death in 1941, were few, FDR continued to improve his upland farm properties, notably with the construction of his own retreat on Dutchess Hill, Top Cottage, completed in 1939. This small, Dutch Colonial–style house in a remote, wooded area of the estate uphill from Val-Kill provided FDR with an escape from the Springwood house, which had become in many ways the country White House, with all the public exposure and pressures that the name implies. FDR carefully selected the hilltop site, which required acquisition of four different properties: the Dumphy Farm, Rohan Farm, Briggs Wood Lot, and Lent Wood Lot.

To reach Top Cottage and other areas of the estate, including his forest plantations, FDR built a network of roads for his specially equipped Ford, as well as for farm equipment. As Nelson C. Brown recalled:
F.D.R. simply loved to explore new and little known locations on his estate.... He constantly wanted to know what kind of woods grew beyond a hill or up a steep slope to which he had never or seldom been. Therefore, he had his road crew constantly building new woods roads and improving the old ones [so] that he could make his entire place more accessible in his little car.... Thus he developed a good many miles of woods roads. They were frequently just clearings through the woods and then surfaced and topped with a bulldozer and scraped to provide drainage and prevent washouts. On some of these roads, the familiar “thank you mams” were frequent. It required a well-built car to stand these precipitous slopes, sharp turns and to avoid trees, rocks, stumps and fallen logs that bordered some of these roadways....

With an increasingly diverse collection of properties, FDR searched for a name that would give the estate a cohesive identity. Springwood, the name that FDR’s parents had used, had little relevance to the upland farms that he had acquired since 1911. By 1931, as FDR was gaining national prominence, he began to use name Crum (Krum) Elbow, originally referring to the creek in Hyde Park and used by the Crooke family in the eighteenth century for their land on Water Lots Five and Six, including Bellefield and the Boreel Place. In the 1930s, FDR asked the U.S. Board on Geographic Names to formalize the location of Crum Elbow as the bend in the Hudson River and point on the Rogers Estate at the end of Stone Cottage Road (see fig. 2.83). FDR also used farming as a theme to link the original estate and upland farms, which shared a common rural character (fig. 2.94). It was the identity of the estate as a farm that FDR often stressed to visitors, such as a journalist who wrote about his tour of the estate for the popular journal Country Home in 1933:
We have come to think of farms, in these days, as something quite different from Krum Elbow. The place really harks back to more spacious, more diversified days. It has the atmosphere of a Mt. Vernon or a Monticello. The visitor to the homes of Washington and Jefferson pictures in his mind's eye a stately manner of living. The thought of a man in overalls, coming out the front door with a pitch fork, would seem incongruous. So it is with Krum Elbow. And yet Mt. Vernon and Monticello were farms, and so is Krum Elbow. You only have to get away from the stately front entrance to realize it....

By his second term as president in the late 1930s, FDR was planning for future public stewardship of part of the estate for educational purposes through establishment of his presidential library and preservation of the Springwood house and grounds. In 1939, Congress passed a joint resolution (No. 30, 76th Congress, 1st Session, 53 Stat. 1062-5) that authorized development of the library, and also authorized agencies to accept donation of any part of the Roosevelt Estate for use in connection with any designated function of the federal government. Based upon this legislation, Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes accepted a deed from FDR in 1939 for 16 acres of the Wheeler Place (North Avenue Lot) for construction of his presidential library, which was completed in 1940 (see fig. 2.93). Three years later in November 1943, the Secretary of the Interior accepted a second deed from FDR and Eleanor Roosevelt for 33 acres surrounding the Springwood house (see fig. 2.93). On January 27, 1944, this 33-acre property was designated the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site, based on the provisions of the Historic Sites Act of 1935. The designation preserved the family's right to life estate at the property, and the Springwood house remained the Roosevelts' private residence through 1945.

The advent of the Second World War brought about a number of changes to the landscape. Wartime labor shortages and the lack of Sara Roosevelt's oversight following her death in 1941 led to decline in maintenance, especially at the Springwood house, gardens, and Home Farm. More noticeable was the deployment of a large security presence across the estate by the U.S. Department of War, designed to protect FDR wherever he went on the estate, including his favorite rides through the woods and up to Top Cottage. An emergency communications system was also installed under the newly formed White House Signal Detachment, created by the War Department in March 1942. The entire system became operational on September 12, 1942, and covered most of the estate, which was organized into three zones: Lower Woods, Middle Woods, and Upper Woods (fig. 2.95). Excluded from the secured zone were the Kirchner Place (which was not owned by FDR), and portions of the Tompkins Farm. Bellefield was within the secured zone, presumably due to its proximity, as was the Rogers Estate, where the main house, Crumwold Hall, was occupied by the military forces as headquarters, presumably alongside the seminary that took over the property around the same time.
In addition to personnel stationed on foot as well as on jeep patrol, the security system included the addition of numerous guardhouses surrounding the Springwood house and at major entry points; a phone system mounted on wood poles; a system of jeep roads that included the construction of new roads along boundaries of the secured area; electric-eye security gates; and crash barriers consisting of cable strung between steel poles (fig. 2.96). While the Army used FDR’s extensive network of woods roads, it also cleared new jeep roads where there was inadequate access along the perimeter of the estate. These new jeep roads were built along the southern boundary of the Boreel Place (J. R. Roosevelt Place), across the Locust Pasture on the Home Farm, along the northern boundary of the Dumphy Farm west of Violet Avenue (Route 9G), and along the southern boundary of the Tompkins Farm east of Creek Road.
FDR's Enlarged Forestry Program

During his years as governor and president, FDR concentrated most of his efforts at Hyde Park on expanding his forestry work, in many ways paralleling growth of the state's forestry program. To undertake such an expansion, FDR needed professional assistance, especially since forestry and conservation were important policies of his administrations—he needed to make his own work in Hyde Park a model of progressive forestry to illustrate that he practiced what he preached. FDR’s foremost interest, in line with the theoretical framework of the state reforestation program, was to demonstrate that forestry could make marginal farmland productive, while providing recreation benefits and sustaining natural resources. As a reporter explained, FDR’s tree growing was an integral part of the agricultural operation of the estate:

His interest, to be sure, seemed to be chiefly in his tree crops.... But if you think, as I did when I went there, that tree-growing is one thing and farming is another, then you aren’t familiar with Mr. Roosevelt’s methods. His tree-growing seems to me a distinct farming operation; he is not a lumberman, but a wood-lot farmer. He works his lots as another farmer works his fields—getting one sort of crop here, another there, and paying minute attention to each lot in order to improve the quality of his product. By growing trees on more than half of the thousand acres in the Roosevelt holdings at Hyde Park, Mr. Roosevelt thinks he is getting the most out of the land, putting it to the best possible use. And that, certainly, is the first concern of every good farmer.61

While FDR sometimes portrayed his forestry program as a large but not atypical farm operation, the fact was that its success was due in large part to the active involvement after 1929 of the New York State College of Forestry at Syracuse University, and in particular to the assistance of forestry professor Nelson C. Brown. Brown belonged to the first generation of professional American foresters, having been trained in the decade following the founding of the first forestry schools at the turn of the century. A native of New Jersey, Brown received his master’s degree in forestry from Yale University in 1908. Following four years working for the U.S. Forest Service, Brown began his teaching career in 1911 at Iowa State College. In July 1912, he joined the New York State College of Forestry as Assistant Professor of Forest Utilization.62

Although FDR had been acquainted with some of the faculty of the College of Forestry through his membership in the New York State Forestry Association (he was elected vice president in 1914), his formal relationship with the college began in the fall of 1929, early in his term as governor. At a College Board of Trustees Meeting to discuss erecting a new building on the Syracuse campus, FDR inquired whether one of the forestry faculty could visit him at Hyde Park to advise on his forestry program. Nelson Brown, who was serving as acting dean of the college, was suggested, and FDR promptly invited him to Hyde Park. As Brown recalled, “I spent a very interesting weekend later in the Fall of 1929 in which he [FDR] told
me of his interest in taking care of his native woods and in planting trees in some of the worn-out old pastures and fields that had once been cultivated....”63 Brown quickly became captivated by FDR’s forestry work, which he admired for its great potential in promoting forestry and the profile of the college. A year and a half after his initial visit, Brown wrote an article in the journal *American Forests* that extolled the virtues of FDR’s forests:

> The Governor’s most impressive and stately stand of timber is the white and red oak forest lying to the east of the Boston [Albany] Post Road. By judicious and careful cutting, the beauty and capital growing stock have been preserved. It has yielded valuable products and is today a living example of successful American forest management. One might imagine he was in the stately forests of Epinal in the Vosges—the most successful of French municipal forests or even in the famous forests of Fontainebleau or of Compiègne.... The most impressive plantation is one of white pine—now fifteen years old. This has been thinned and pruned by the most acceptable forestry methods. It is very similar to the American white pine stands in the Rhine Valley or the Weymouth pine plantations as they are called in the British Islands....64

It was during the visit in the fall of 1929 that FDR settled on a plan with the College of Forestry to undertake a cooperative relationship to establish demonstration and experimental plantations on his Hyde Park estate. The idea of demonstration plantations was not new to FDR, and indeed he had initially developed his forestry program with demonstration purposes in mind, following the long tradition of country estates as model farms. As early as 1915, FDR wrote that through his own planting, he had “...succeeded in interesting a good many people” in forestry.65 Yet his early forestry, as amateur work, probably did not have the expert quality or public exposure that FDR wanted for demonstration purposes, and so he began to solicit direct involvement by professional foresters. This in part explained his offer in 1924 of land along Violet Avenue, without avail, as a location for the demonstration plantations that were being planned in each county of the state by the Conservation Commission and the College of Agriculture at Cornell.66

On February 4, 1930, Nelson Brown wrote FDR, “We have not forgotten the plan I discussed informally with you last September to put in a demonstration planting of some of our best trees, particularly some Colorado blue spruce, upon your Hyde Park estate.”67 Soon after, Brown and other College of Forestry faculty members made a site visit to the spot FDR selected for the demonstration area, on the Tompkins Farm at the highly visible intersection of Violet Avenue and Creek Road known as Dead Man’s Curve. Here in April 1930, the college established a 5-acre demonstration area encompassing eight different plantations using 13,600 trees (fig. 2.97). Those immediately along the roads were considered demonstration plantations, while those in the back were designed for experimental purposes.68 Nelson Brown saw great opportunity in expanding the demonstration work, as he wrote to FDR soon after the initial planting was
completed: “...I am very glad that the work the College did at your place in Hyde Park was satisfactory. We would like to make your woodlands a real forestry demonstration. From a public educational viewpoint it will be doubly valuable because it is yours.”69

For the following three years, the college expanded its plantations on the Tompkins Farm south along Creek Road and west across Violet Avenue (fig. 2.98). It also planted a small demonstration plot visible from the Post Road on the Home Farm, and set out several experimental plantations at the east end of the Tompkins Farm near Val-Kill and on the Home Farm. In keeping with FDR’s practical interest in forestry, the college demonstration plots were not just for show or educational purposes. As Ray F. Bower, a faculty member involved in the work at the estate, explained in an article published in American Forests in January 1934, the college plantations “...are planned with an eye to furnishing intermediate cash returns from the sale of thinnings for such uses as grape and fruit stakes for fruit growers on the opposite side of the Hudson, or as material for crates and boxes used in marketing fruit....”70

During its four years of planting from 1930 through 1933, the college set out approximately 88,600 trees within twenty-nine demonstration plots and seven
experimental plots, about 20,000 more trees than FDR had planted on the entire estate between 1912 and 1928. Most of the trees were furnished by the college free of charge from its nursery in Syracuse; those it did not stock were ordered from the state Conservation Commission and billed to the Roosevelt Estate. Given the experimental and demonstrative nature of the college plantations, the species represented an unusual variety, including Japanese red pine, jack pine, Corsican pine, western yellow pine, Sitka spruce, Dahurian (Japanese or Korean) larch, and Douglas fir. Standard reforestation species, however, represented the bulk of the trees planted, including red pine, Scotch pine, white pine, Norway spruce, European larch, white spruce, and northern white-cedar (see Appendix C for complete list of college plots and species).

While the initial plans for the demonstration area were being developed in the spring of 1930, Nelson Brown took the opportunity to suggest to FDR that the entire estate, with its extensive woodlots and plantations set out earlier by FDR, be used as an experimental station for the college. As Brown wrote FDR in April 1930, “We [the college] have no experimental operations in the Hudson Valley and your tract offers an excellent opportunity for some cooperative experiments not only in reforestation but in woodlot management.... I am sure it would be a real pleasure for this institution to cooperate in having your estate serve as a demonstration and experimental area.” Although the College of Forestry never officially designated the Roosevelt Estate one of its experiment stations (presumably because it did not own the land), Brown and other college faculty and students nonetheless made active use of its woodlots and plantations for study purposes in the years following the initial demonstration planting. The college’s experiments, some of which were suggested by FDR, were used to compare growth rates among various types and ages of oak acorns, to evaluate the success of planting black walnut seed spots and test various species in swampy ground, and to experiment with tulip-poplar.

As part of its experimental interests, the College of Forestry worked closely with FDR in managing his extensive woodlots, from the River Wood Lot and adjoining woods on the J. R. Roosevelt Place, to those on the Home Farm to the east ends of the Tompkins and Bennett Farms. The work, involving primarily selective thinning and firewood production, was initially directed by professor...
In the summer of 1931, Irving Isenberg, a recent College of Forestry graduate who most likely worked under Heiberg, was employed by FDR to develop a forest management plan for the woodlots of the entire estate. Completed later that year and entitled “Management Plan for Kromelbooge Woods” (Kromelbooge being another Dutch derivation of Crum Elbow), the plan outlined three main goals to be achieved over a ten-year time frame: (1) increase the proportion of valuable species in the forest; (2) eliminate undesirable species and replant; and (3) beautify the woods between the Hudson River and the Post Road. Toward these goals, the plan provided a mapped numbering system, written description, and forestry statistics for each section of the native woods, identified as “compartments” (fig. 2.99).78

FDR’s forests received professional recognition in the fall of 1931 when the Society of American Foresters, which was having its annual meeting at the Rogers Estate, Crumwold Farms, made a site visit to the adjoining Roosevelt Estate at the suggestion of Hugh Baker, dean of the College of Forestry.79 The college published an illustrated brochure to accompany the tour, entitled “Forestry Practice on the Roosevelt Farm,” which led visitors to the older plantations and woodlots on the Wheeler Place below the Springwood house, then approaching two decades old (fig. 2.100, see also fig. 1.8). The brochure also mentioned the 1926 Christmas tree plantation (Plot M) and white pine plantation (Plot D) on the Bennett Farm, and the ongoing college demonstration plantings on the Tompkins Farm.80

In subsequent years through the early 1940s, FDR’s forestry work received significant publicity in professional forestry journals, thanks in large part to articles about the estate written by Nelson Brown and his fellow faculty members.

The college’s spring planting in 1933 would be its last under its cooperative relationship begun in 1930—after this time, FDR would again be responsible for the cost of labor and materials.81 The reasons why the cooperative relationship ended are not known for certain—perhaps FDR’s presidency presented potential

---

**Figure 2.99. Example of statistics gathered for a woodlot compartment on the Bennett Farm east and north of Val-Kill from Irving Isenberg’s 1931 “Management Plan for Kromelbooge Woods.” (Papers Pertaining to Family, Business and Personal Affairs, Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.)**
conflicts of interest, since he was in effect receiving free services from the college. Despite the termination of the formal relationship, Nelson Brown and other college faculty continued to assist and advise FDR in his forestry work. In fall 1934, for example, college foresters spent a whole day at the estate going over the plantations, outlining thinning experiments in the woodlots, and planning for the planting of 30,000 to 35,000 trees the following spring.82

After 1936 or so, Nelson Brown alone served as FDR’s unofficial professional forestry advisor and manager, without compensation, a role he continued through FDR’s death (FDR claimed he could not afford to hire a professional forester).83 While Nelson Brown remained a faculty member of the college throughout this period, he apparently did not represent the college in his services to FDR. Brown was most actively involved through 1939, when he assisted William Plog, the estate gardener, in carrying out the planting and maintenance operations. In 1939, however, FDR hired a former Navy grounds supervisor, Russell Linaka, to carry out his forestry operations (William Plog had been dividing his time among the Home Farm, Springwood gardens, and the forestry operations). Thus, in the years after 1939, Nelson Brown spent less time at the estate, instead providing Linaka with direction mostly through the mail or telephone.84

As a manager, Brown assisted FDR by making plans for annual plantings, placing tree orders with the Conservation Commission and the college nursery, making site inspections, coordinating planting and maintenance with estate staff, preparing fall and spring reports, keeping tree planting records, and planning for timber harvests in the woodlots (fig. 2.101). Brown managed all of the plantations on the Roosevelt Estate, including those planted by the College of Forestry beginning in 1930 and all those that

Figure 2.100. Detail of brochure showing tour of FDR’s plantations below the Springwood house offered during a Society of American Foresters 1931 annual meeting in Hyde Park. The corresponding plots on Drawing 2.8 are: 1 = G, 2 = I, 3 = K, 3A = P, 4 = J, 5 = B. The map is not to scale. (Hoverter Memorial Archives, SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry.)

Figure 2.101. Nelson Brown (center, front) with his student assistant Richard Salter (right), William Plog (left), and representatives from a lumber company discussing wartime harvesting in the woodlots on the Roosevelt Estate, ca. 1942. (Photograph NPx 61-119[2], Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.)
followed. Brown created a numbering and mapping system for these plantations, and carefully recorded the dates each was established, the species, and the number of trees. With one exception, he did not manage the plantations at Springwood and the Home Farm established prior to the College’s involvement, and thus an accurate record and numbering system for these were apparently never established (although Brown most probably advised FDR and William Plog on their care).

In his informal role as advisor and manager, Nelson Brown took an active interest in FDR’s financial returns from his forestry operation, very much treating it as a business proposition in keeping with professional forestry practice of the time. Toward the goal of increasing financial return, Brown oversaw the continued high rate of planting begun by the college, and emphasized increased timber harvesting from the woodlots for sawlogs and pulpwood, as well as production of Christmas trees. By advising FDR to increase his Christmas tree production (FDR had experimented with a plantation in 1926), Nelson Brown was shortening the amount of time needed to see financial returns, in what was otherwise a very long-term investment. In January 1938, following one of his first major Christmas tree harvests, FDR wrote his lawyer, Henry Hackett, who handled his financial matters for the estate, “I have not yet got my check for the sale of the Christmas trees in New York City, but I hope to make a clear net profit of about $300.00 this year—not bad, as I sold only 1,000 trees and when I get in full production I will be in a position to sell nearly 10,000 each year.” When harvests increased in the 1940s, Nelson Brown helped FDR market his trees to large retail stores, such as Macy’s, Bloomingdale’s, A & P, and Grand Union, primarily in New York City. FDR’s increasing Christmas tree production beginning in the mid-1930s paralleled the growing interest in the crop throughout the state, especially by farmers, occurring just a few years after the state established its first Christmas tree demonstration plantation in 1931.

To maintain high rates of tree planting and expand Christmas tree production, FDR needed additional open land, since most of the old pastures on the Tompkins Farm had been reforested by the college (although the southern end along Creek Road was not filled up until 1937) and the fields of the Bennett Farm were actively farmed by FDR’s tenant, Moses Smith. Between 1935 and 1938, FDR purchased significant acreage for reforestation purposes that also gave him additional woodlots as well as a site for Top Cottage. Although there were a few plantations established elsewhere, the majority planted after 1934 were on this newly acquired property that included the Dumphy and Hughson Farms, and portions of the Wright and Jones Farms, all located north of Val-Kill. In 1942, Nelson Brown remarked that there still remained much available ground for tree planting, and that the president’s planting program would “probably continue for some time.”
With the acquisition of this land, tree planting from the mid-1930s through the early 1940s remained at the high rates begun by the College of Forestry, averaging about 30,000 trees per year, with a high of 50,000 trees planted in 1940 (see Appendix 2, tree planting tally). Despite the onset of World War II, Nelson Brown continued the same rates of planting, with the only significant decrease evident in 1945, when only 20,000 trees were planted. Between 1930 and 1945, Brown and the College of Forestry oversaw the planting of approximately 462,810 trees on the Roosevelt Estate. This accounted for the vast majority of trees planted for reforestation purposes during this period, except for the 22,000 trees FDR had planted on his own between 1929 and 1931 as the college’s planting program was getting underway. Combined with FDR’s previous tally of 67,000 trees planted between 1912 and 1928, the grand total amounted to more than 551,810 trees planted on the estate for reforestation and Christmas tree purposes. This number does not, however, represent the total number of plantation trees that existed on the estate in 1945, since many saplings failed to take root. The worst year for this was 1939, a drought year, in which 24,670 trees had to be replaced.

The tree species planted after 1933 reflected FDR’s shift toward Christmas tree production. Initially, FDR and Nelson Brown preferred Norway spruce, which FDR had used in his 1926 Christmas tree plantation (Plot M) on the Bennett Farm. From just 8,400 planted between 1930 and 1933, Brown ordered 13,800 Norway spruce trees in 1934 alone, and annual purchase of this species averaged 20,700 trees between 1934 and 1943, with a high of 48,000 ordered in 1940 (the large amount was due in part to losses from the drought of 1939). In the 1940s, FDR and Brown began to shift toward using a greater percentage of white spruce, Douglas fir, and balsam fir for Christmas tree production. Norway spruce orders were still substantial, totaling 49,287 between 1941 and 1944, but were closely followed in number with a total of 41,509 white spruce ordered between 1941 and 1945; 31,310 Douglas fir between 1940 and 1945; and 16,933 balsam fir in 1943–44. A small number of concolor (white) fir and grand fir were planted as experiments in 1943 and 1945. By 1944, Nelson Brown was reporting, “...The Douglas fir and balsam fir have both done splendidly on the President’s place and that is why we are going into more of those species.”

Non–Christmas tree species planted after 1933 included relatively small numbers of northern white-cedar, European and Japanese larch, white pine, American beech, tulip-poplar, and red pine. Most of the trees planted on the estate continued to come from the state Conservation Department nurseries, and Nelson Brown would annually place the tree orders in FDR’s name (fig. 2.102). FDR’s continued interest in experimentation led him to order non-standard and exotic species from private nurseries, and sponsor experiments for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. In 1937, for example, Nelson Brown coordinated the planting of an experimental plot of Asiatic chestnuts for the Department of
Figure 2.102. FDR's spring 1935 tree order to the state Conservation Department completed by Nelson Brown. (Nelson Brown Papers, Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.)

Colonel White of the Sequoia National Park in California sent FDR samples of the park's native trees, which were planted at Springwood. Nelson Brown reported the following spring that the two incense cedars had died over the winter, but “...the two Sequoias or Big Trees, the two Ponderosa pine and the two Lodgepole pines have survived the winter very well and look most promising for the future.”

In addition to tree planting, Nelson Brown also spent much effort in managing the native oak forest. Work in the woodlots was typically undertaken during the winters, when Brown directed the estate staff to cut fallen trees for fuelwood or sawlogs (for lumber), and clear vines, “poor-looking specimens,” dead trees, and debris. Up until the early 1940s, there had been little large-scale harvesting of the quality mature hardwoods in the woodlots, but with the onset of the war,
lumber prices rose nearly 100 percent, due in part to demand for shipbuilding. In the winter of 1942, a local lumber company, Woodland Management Company of Garrison, New York, approached William Plog about harvesting the oaks and other hardwoods on the estate. Nelson Brown provided Plog with his thoughts on the proposal:

Replying to your good letter, I have carefully reviewed what you have written and also read over Mr. Hanaburgh’s [lumberman] letter.... There are some trees that have reached maturity and could be cut to advantage on the place.... I do not think any trees along the roadways or on steep hillsides, where the woods would be permanently injured in any way, should be cut.... I would like to get down to look over the property and see that the trees are marked in proper shape myself, as I feel a real obligation to the President to have this done properly.... I did not think the President wanted much timber cut below the house [Springwood house]....98

Despite initial hesitation, FDR and Nelson Brown accepted Woodland’s proposal. Brown even became enthusiastic about the project, as he wrote to FDR, “I believe it is good forestry and good business to take advantage of current market prices.”99 The oak woods on the Home Farm and on the Rogers Land were selected for harvesting, and Brown oversaw the marking of trees and drafting of plans showing marked and unmarked stands (fig 2.103). Through Woodland Management Company, Outpost Nurseries of Ridgefield, Connecticut undertook the harvesting, hauling, and milling of the timber. A total of 1,335 trees were harvested on 80 acres during the spring and summer of 1942. This harvest included 430 white oak, 409 red oak, 205 black oak, 176 rock or chestnut oak, and 94 swamp white oak, with smaller numbers of hemlock and hard maple, an equivalent of 287,123 board feet of lumber.100 Three hundred of the best oaks were sold to the Navy for use in building the keels of warships. Brown wrote an article on the project that was published in

Figure 2.103. Plan of the 1942 wartime timber harvest on the Rogers Land (top) and Home Farm (bottom), drafted by the College of Forestry, 1942. (President’s Secretary’s Files, Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, annotated by SUNY ESF)
Southern Lumberman, and the harvesting and milling operations received full-page coverage in LIFE magazine (fig. 2.104, see also fig. 1.13).  

FDR must have been quite pleased with the harvest, because Brown organized a similar but somewhat smaller harvest the following year, the 1943–44 winter season, while lumber prices were still high. Rather than using an outside company to manage the harvest, Brown did it himself, using four students from the College of Forestry who helped mark the trees over the course of three days in November 1943. These included 710 trees, equivalent to 137,705 board feet of lumber, near Top Cottage, on the west end of the Bennett Farm, in the River Wood Lot on the Wheeler Place, and in the lower woods of the Boreel Place (fig. 2.105). Brown carefully avoided cutting in the supposed stand of virgin timber along the River Road on the Boreel Place. Under Brown’s supervision, the timber was cut and hauled out by the Hudson Valley Lumber

---

Figure 2.104 (top). Illustration of timber harvest on the Roosevelt Estate in 1942, from an article by Nelson Brown. (Nelson C. Brown, “President Practices Selective Logging,” Southern Lumberman, December 15, 1942.)

Figure 2.105 (bottom). Map of cutting plots delineated by Nelson Brown for harvest in the winter and spring of 1944. The map is not to scale. (Nelson Brown Papers, Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, annotated by SUNY ESF.)
Company of Nanuet, New York, in January and February 1944.\textsuperscript{102} Despite the ongoing war and other pressures of his office, FDR toured the harvest with Nelson Brown (fig. 2.106).

By 1944, Brown anticipated that most of the remaining unplanted fields on the Hughson Farm and Jones Land would soon be used up. After that point, he and FDR agreed to pursue a policy of replacement plantings as harvests increased within the Christmas tree plots, rather than acquire more land. In the fall of 1944, however, the lack of stock in the state nurseries and high prices in retail nurseries forced Brown to suggest to FDR that no planting be done for the spring of 1945. FDR countered, “...I hate to plant nothing and I suggest that we put in Douglas [fir] in the eastern most lot [Jones Land].... I would really like to plant twenty or twenty-five thousand trees to keep the record going.”\textsuperscript{103} So for the spring of 1945, FDR’s last planting season, Nelson Brown ordered 17,000 Douglas fir and 3,000 white spruce to be set out on the Jones Land, all for Christmas trees.\textsuperscript{104}

The Original Estate

The original Springwood estate, including the J. R. Roosevelt Place, did not witness the extent of improvements to its buildings and grounds that occurred during the 1910s, as Sara Roosevelt tried to maintain traditional country life and agriculture at the estate in the midst of what had become a very public life for the family. By the late 1930s, however, FDR had apparently convinced his mother that life at Springwood could never be the same for him or his children, and she agreed to his plan to eventually turn over the Springwood house and surrounding 50 acres to the people of the United States as an historic site and repository for the records of his public life.

While the focus of FDR’s reforestation work shifted to the upland farms during this period, he continued to manage the existing plantations and woodlots on the original estate. His acquisition of the Rogers Land—a part of the old Rogers Estate adjoining the Wheeler Place and west of Bellefield—allowed him to establish a new plantation and increase the area of his woodlots, as well as to lay out new roads that gave him greater access to the woodlands along the Hudson River.
Sara Roosevelt continued to enjoy her right to life estate at Springwood for most of this period, as granted in her husband’s will. She maintained the modest, rural character of the landscape, keeping the North and South Avenue Lots in cultivation with hay and corn crops, and orchards west of the house and along the border with Bellefield (fig. 2.107). She carefully tended the Rose Garden, with its roses and beds of flowering annuals and perennials enclosed by the high hemlock hedge. With FDR’s election as governor and president, the character of Springwood was transformed intangibly, but actual built changes were few until the late 1930s. These included construction of a small building in ca. 1933 to house the Secret Service at the northwest corner of the Home Garden, and a small wooden playhouse named Swan Cottage built in May 1935 at the southeast corner of the main lawn. The Home Garden continued to provide fruits and vegetables for the estate, and also played a role in FDR’s reforestation program during the 1930s. Here, in the small vegetable garden and the southeast quadrant of the large vegetable garden, young trees were held as planted rows or, in the case of seedlings and young transplants, heeled into long trenches in keeping with standard forestry practice. In 1934, for example, 12,000 Norway spruce were held in the nursery for a period of two years.

FDR’s early plantations began to have a more dramatic impact on the character of the landscape as the trees matured, including the white pine in the ravine to the south of the Springwood house (Plot G) and the mixed white and Scotch pine on the slope below the gardener’s cottage (Plot I). Along the Post Road, the maturing white pines planted in 1914 (Plot E) screened Springwood from the increasingly busy Post Road, while also blocking views across the landscape to the fields of the Home Farm. The numerous American elms, including those that dominated the canopy on the main lawn, were apparently not seriously affected by Dutch elm disease during this period, although the disease had been detected in the region.

On the property between the Springwood house and the Hudson River—encompassing the Gravel Lot, River Wood Lot, and lower woods along the River Road on the J. R. Roosevelt Place—the native woods and FDR’s early plantations matured into continuous forest cover. In 1929–30, most of these plantations, including the red pine in Plot A (the Scotch pine originally planted had apparently not survived), the white pine in Plots B and F, and the tulip-poplar trees in Plot...
K, were thinned and pruned by removing lower limbs up to a height of approximately 10 feet. These plantations, along with those close to the Springwood house, were the ones visited by the Society of American Foresters during their tour of the estate in September 1931. Two years later, Nelson Brown extolled these plantations and other aspects of FDR’s forestry work in an article he wrote for the New York Times. Of the 1917 tulip-poplar plantation (Plot K), he wrote that “...foresters who have seen it declare that nowhere else in New York State have they seen such a demonstration of what this tree will do in the planted form” (fig. 2.108). Of the red pine plantation in the Gravel Lot (Plot A), Brown celebrated it as resembling “…the beautiful and admirable planted rows of trees one finds so frequently in European countries.” Another forester from the College of Forestry, Ray F. Bower, wrote similar praise in an article published in American Forests the following year, while also providing additional perspective on FDR’s forestry practices (fig. 2.109):

...Winding and twisting around the numerous wood roads in this lower woodland one suddenly comes upon two fine plantations, one of white pine and one of red pine [Plots A, B]. They occupy what was once a small cleared field. A casual count of whorls establishes their age at somewhere around twenty years. They indicate an early and sustained interest in forestry, for the trees have already been pruned of their lower dead branches so that knot free, high quality lumber may be produced. Some visitors may be surprised to find these dead branches on the grounds just as they fell from the tree. An inquiry gives a clearer insight into the President’s forestry views. It costs money to haul out and burn pruned limbs. They will decay in five to eight years lying scattered on the ground as they fall from the saw. They will add humus and some nutrients to the soils and with careful protection the fire hazard is very low....

The woods surrounding these plantations in the River Wood Lot and adjoining woods of the J. R. Roosevelt Place, comprising approximately 117 acres and part of the old Roosevelt rustic pleasure grounds, were classified by College of Forestry graduate Irving Isenberg in his 1931 report, “Management Plan for Kromelbooge Woods,” under the working group entitled “Park,” which was reserved for “ecological, aesthetic, and experimental purposes.” The report stated:

It was thought best to treat this area aesthetically because of topography and other limiting factors. The numerous rock ledges and hollows offset by larger trees give a beautiful effect. Dead trees should be removed and thinning should be for beauty effect. The accessibility with the aid of the new road [lower woods...
Of special consideration within these woodlots was the area along the River Road southwest of the ice pond that FDR believed was a virgin forest. In a 1931 article published in *American Forests*, Brown reiterated FDR’s assessment and plans for the stand’s preservation: “On the steep Hudson River slope is a primeval grove of hemlocks, whose pristine beauty is unmarred by the ax. This grove is being preserved for posterity as a museum of what our original forests looked like when the sturdy Dutch forefathers first settled these shores...” (fig. 2.110). In his 1931 forest management plan, Irving Isenberg identified this woodlot as compartment 18, and documented that the stand contained 1,070 hemlock and 850 hardwoods that were “virgin timber, all aged up to 200 years,” implying the stand had not been cut since the area was settled by Europeans in the eighteenth century (fig. 2.111). Isenberg’s recommendation for this stand, most certainly made at FDR’s request, was to manage it as an ecological reserve, allowing nature to take its course: “Leave entirely alone, not even removing dead trees unless absolutely necessary.”

Despite active forestry work outside of the virgin stand, which aside from plantation management included timber harvesting in 1942 and 1944, the lower road] will far repay in aesthetic value the small economic loss. Of special consideration within these woodlots was the area along the River Road southwest of the ice pond that FDR believed was a virgin forest. In a 1931 article published in *American Forests*, Brown reiterated FDR’s assessment and plans for the stand’s preservation: “On the steep Hudson River slope is a primeval grove of hemlocks, whose pristine beauty is unmarred by the ax. This grove is being preserved for posterity as a museum of what our original forests looked like when the sturdy Dutch forefathers first settled these shores....” (fig. 2.110). In his 1931 forest management plan, Irving Isenberg identified this woodlot as compartment 18, and documented that the stand contained 1,070 hemlock and 850 hardwoods that were “virgin timber, all aged up to 200 years,” implying the stand had not been cut since the area was settled by Europeans in the eighteenth century (fig. 2.111). Isenberg’s recommendation for this stand, most certainly made at FDR’s request, was to manage it as an ecological reserve, allowing nature to take its course: “Leave entirely alone, not even removing dead trees unless absolutely necessary.”

Despite active forestry work outside of the virgin stand, which aside from plantation management included timber harvesting in 1942 and 1944, the lower road] will far repay in aesthetic value the small economic loss. Of special consideration within these woodlots was the area along the River Road southwest of the ice pond that FDR believed was a virgin forest. In a 1931 article published in *American Forests*, Brown reiterated FDR’s assessment and plans for the stand’s preservation: “On the steep Hudson River slope is a primeval grove of hemlocks, whose pristine beauty is unmarred by the ax. This grove is being preserved for posterity as a museum of what our original forests looked like when the sturdy Dutch forefathers first settled these shores....” (fig. 2.110). In his 1931 forest management plan, Irving Isenberg identified this woodlot as compartment 18, and documented that the stand contained 1,070 hemlock and 850 hardwoods that were “virgin timber, all aged up to 200 years,” implying the stand had not been cut since the area was settled by Europeans in the eighteenth century (fig. 2.111). Isenberg’s recommendation for this stand, most certainly made at FDR’s request, was to manage it as an ecological reserve, allowing nature to take its course: “Leave entirely alone, not even removing dead trees unless absolutely necessary.”

Despite active forestry work outside of the virgin stand, which aside from plantation management included timber harvesting in 1942 and 1944, the lower road] will far repay in aesthetic value the small economic loss. Of special consideration within these woodlots was the area along the River Road southwest of the ice pond that FDR believed was a virgin forest. In a 1931 article published in *American Forests*, Brown reiterated FDR’s assessment and plans for the stand’s preservation: “On the steep Hudson River slope is a primeval grove of hemlocks, whose pristine beauty is unmarred by the ax. This grove is being preserved for posterity as a museum of what our original forests looked like when the sturdy Dutch forefathers first settled these shores....” (fig. 2.110). In his 1931 forest management plan, Irving Isenberg identified this woodlot as compartment 18, and documented that the stand contained 1,070 hemlock and 850 hardwoods that were “virgin timber, all aged up to 200 years,” implying the stand had not been cut since the area was settled by Europeans in the eighteenth century (fig. 2.111). Isenberg’s recommendation for this stand, most certainly made at FDR’s request, was to manage it as an ecological reserve, allowing nature to take its course: “Leave entirely alone, not even removing dead trees unless absolutely necessary.”
woods continued to be used for recreation, such as for walking and horseback riding. Yet the recreational uses that were characteristic of James Roosevelt’s day were disappearing. Following the earlier loss of the cottage and old boathouse after the expansion of the railroad in the 1910s, the new boathouse—the last recreational building in the lower woods—was demolished in ca. 1935.\(^{116}\) The family no longer made use of the Hudson River for boating, a likely casualty of FDR’s busy political life and his paralysis. He had hoped to renew the grant of land under water where the boat landing stood, but it expired in ca. 1931.\(^{117}\) For FDR, his primarily recreational use of the lower woods and other woods on the estate was driving in his car. As Nelson Brown recalled, FDR “...loved to rest in his car in some peaceful shady nook in one of the far corners of his place, such as...in the deep glades of the hemlock woods below his place....”\(^{118}\)

Vehicular access within the River Wood Lot had always been difficult, given the rough terrain on the Wheeler Place. The easiest access was from the old Bellefield river road known as Stone Cottage Road, a short distance north of the Wheeler Place. In the early 1930s following the death of Archibald Rogers’s widow, Anne C. Rogers, and pending subdivision of Crumwold Farms, FDR apparently saw the opportunity to complete a road circuit in the River Wood Lot by acquiring a portion of the Rogers Place that would give him access to Stone Cottage Road. FDR may have initially also been interested in gaining access to the Hudson River via Crum Elbow Point, to which Stone Cottage Road led across a bridge over the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad.\(^{119}\) The Rogers land also contained mature oak woods as well as an old pasture suitable for reforestation.

FDR settled on purchasing a 53-acre parcel for $5,000, which he referred to as the “Rogers part of the place.” In April 1935, he had a survey of the tract completed that mapped the boundaries following the “margin” or inside edge of Stone Cottage Road to the north; the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad to the west; and Bellefield, then owned by Mary Newbold Morgan, to the east (fig. 2.112). The parcel did not include the western end of Stone Cottage Road or Crum Elbow Point (the point of land west of the railroad), and also excluded a quarter-acre parcel south of Stone Cottage Road, at the Rogers fish pond, that contained an ice house. The deed for property, filed on October 15, 1935, provided FDR
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with a right-of-way along Stone Cottage Road, which remained under Rogers ownership.¹²⁰

FDR’s April 1935 survey of the property documented that he had already extended the lower woods road north to Stone Cottage Road, and also had built a new road partly along an old bridle path leading north through the 1914 white pine plantation (Plot F) to Stone Cottage Road, thus completing a circuit.¹²¹ Frank Draiss, an estate employee who helped build roads on the estate, remembered building roads through this property in the early 1930s. He recalled that FDR built these roads not for hauling out timber, but rather “…just so that he could drive around and look over the woods and renew the scenes of his childhood, where he used to drive around on those bridle paths in the old days.”¹²²

In September 1935, while the papers for the Rogers Land were being filed, FDR had Nelson Brown and William Plog look over the old pasture adjoining the Stone Cottage Road at the north end of the property to see if it was suitable for reforestation. In January 1936, Brown wrote FDR, “It is a splendid planting site and we will make plans to put in Norway or red pine, if this is agreeable to you…. ”¹²³ FDR apparently disagreed with Brown’s species selection, because a plantation of white pine (Plot U) was set out instead the following spring.¹²⁴ The plot was assigned a letter to keep it consistent with the plantations west of the Post Road that were managed largely by William Plog.

In the years following his purchase of the Rogers Land, FDR began to implement his plans for the future public stewardship of Springwood, which resulted in changes both to the legal ownership of the property and to its landscape. In November 1939, a year after he first announcing plans, FDR laid the cornerstone of his presidential library. Working in close cooperation with his mother, FDR had selected a location at the west end of the North Avenue Lot, adjoining the Rose Garden and Home Garden. With Sara’s permission, he gifted the entire North Avenue Lot, encompassing 16.3 acres, to the federal government. On July 24, 1939, two deeds to the property were filed: first, a quitclaim deed in which Sara Roosevelt relinquished her right of life estate; and second, a title deed from FDR to the federal government that also designated an easement on the adjoining Wheeler Place for drainage and septic.¹²⁵

FDR worked with architect Henry Toombs, who had designed the Stone Cottage and factory at Val-Kill, in developing plans for the new library building. Working drawings were developed under the direction of federal supervisory architect Louis A. Simon, and construction was paid for through private sources by the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, Inc., which turned the completed building over to the National Archives and Records Service on July 4, 1940. The library was a simple, Dutch Colonial Revival–style building designed with a U-shaped plan around a central entrance courtyard facing east onto the North Avenue
Lot. Although somewhat related to the Springwood house through the use of the Colonial Revival style and native rough-coursed stone, the building was more evocative of vernacular Dutch colonial architecture through its broad gable roof, porch, and shed dormers. With its footprint larger than that of the Springwood house, and its prominent position within the fields bordering the Post Road, the library had a marked impact on the character of the landscape, although its style, scale, and materials fit with the surrounding rural landscape (fig. 2.113). On June 30, 1941, the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library and Museum opened to the public.126

A number of landscape features were added as part of the new building. A single, two-way asphalt drive was built through the orchard along the north side of the property, complete with a gatehouse at the Post Road, which matched the style of the library and was integrated into the stone walls along the Post Road. The drive led to a small asphalt parking lot containing twenty-eight spaces built on the north side of the library. From the parking lot, visitors followed a flagstone-paved walk to the library entrance along the east side of the building. Surrounding the library and parking lot, a narrow area was maintained as mown lawn and planted with shrubs and trees. The developed area of the library took up approximately one-quarter of the North Avenue Lot; the rest was maintained as a working hay and crop field by the estate as it had always been (see fig. 2.113). To the west of the library remained the Home Garden and Rose Garden, which FDR looked out upon from his office at the back of the library. The gardens remained largely unaffected by the addition of the library, although the water tower in the large vegetable garden was removed in 1942, probably because of water system...
improvements made as part of the library project, but perhaps also to improve the
aesthetics of the landscape.\textsuperscript{127}

The years following the opening of the library proved to be momentous ones
in the history of the estate, with the death of Sara Roosevelt on September 7,
1941 and installation of the wartime security system in September 1942. After
Sara’s death, maintenance of the Wheeler Place, along with the Home Farm,
became FDR’s responsibility. With wartime presidential pressures, the gardens
were probably not maintained at the level they had been, and the security system
resulted in the presence of numerous personnel, as well as security booths,
electric eyes, and cable barriers along the roads. Then on December 29, 1943,
FDR made good on his intention, announced in 1938, to gift Springwood to the
people of the United States. On this date, the deed to 33.2 acres encompassing
the east part of the Wheeler Place containing the house, gardens, and South
Avenue Lot, was recorded by the Dutchess County clerk. On January 3, 1944, FDR
handed over the deed to Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes, whose department
would, at a future date, be responsible for care of the property. The Library parcel
on the North Avenue Lot remained a separate federal property maintained by the
General Services Administration. Because FDR reserved the right of life estate for
himself and his family, the transfer of ownership had little immediate change on
the use of the property.\textsuperscript{128}

\textbf{Home Farm (Drawing 2.9)}

The Home Farm continued throughout most of this period as a gentleman’s
farming operation, centered on dairy, poultry, apple growing, and raising of hay
and fodder crops in the fields bordering the Post Road. There were no major built
changes to the farm complex on Farm Lane at the South Farm Lot, except for a
second-floor four-bedroom addition over the rear kitchen wing of the farmhouse
built as “help’s quarters.”\textsuperscript{129} The main barn on the South Farm Lot continued in
use as a cow and hay barn, with its hay loft and large paired doors opening north
onto Farm Road, and a row of elms shading its west side, facing the
Post Road (fig. 2.114).

On the old pastures east of the
fields and farm complex, FDR set
out the last of his own amateur
plantations in 1930 and 1931,
as involvement of the College
of Forestry got underway at the
Tompkins Farm. In 1929, FDR
ordered 12,000 trees from the
Conservation Department, followed by 8,000 in 1930, and 5,000 in 1931; none were planted in 1929, but were rather held in the Home Garden until the following year. While FDR did not record where all of these trees were planted, most were probably set out in the Locust Pasture near Bracken Pond, where FDR had begun to plant trees in ca. 1916. Under William Plog’s direction, an understory plantation of 1,500 Norway spruce (Plot R) was set out in 1930 beneath mature oaks bordering a stone wall at the eastern edge of the Locust Pasture. Around the same time, a plantation of 2,650 Norway spruce and white pine (Plot S) was established along the Road to Rogers, northwest of Bracken Pond. In ca. 1931, Plog set out a plantation of 6,000 red pine (Plot T) at the northwest intersection of Newbold Road and the Road to Rogers. Irving Isenberg documented these plantations in his 1931 forest management plan (fig. 2.115). Plots S and T, which may have been established as understory plantings, failed and were no longer extant by the early 1940s.

As William Plog was setting out these plantations, the College of Forestry was establishing several demonstration and experimental plantations on the Home Farm that were the Post Road counterparts to the Violet Avenue demonstration area at the Tompkins Farm. The Home Farm plantations were very small in comparison, probably because FDR did not want to take away any of the productive agricultural land in the fields fronting the Post Road, and he was also concerned about potential vandalism along the heavily traveled road. In April 1930, Nelson Brown wrote FDR about the college’s plans for these demonstration...
plantations, which were to be set out along the east edge of the North Parker Lot at the far north end of the Home Farm:

On the rear of the field adjoining the Albany Post Road we expect to devote this area to a plantation of red pine, 5’ x 5’ [Plot 30] and one of Norway spruce 5’ x 5’ [Plot 29]. The Norway spruce will be placed on the south so that there will be no adjoining side-road and I doubt if at this distance the trees will be molested by passers by. Altho planting plans generally call for 6’ x 6’ spacing, we feel that 5’ x 5’ will make a quicker and better demonstration.132

The two plantations were set out in April 1930 as Brown had planned, but suffered in the drought of the following summer and fall, achieving a 75 to 80 percent survival rate. Immediately east of these demonstration plots, the College of Forestry created an experimental plantation (Plot 33) within the Swamp Pasture (fig. 2.116). The area was a cleared and drained red maple swamp covering 1.4 acres that was planted in 1931 with northern white-cedar, and then in April 1932 with additional white-cedar plus tulip-poplar, European larch, and Dahurian larch. It was the counterpart of similar experimental swamp plantations (Plots 31, 32) set out near Val-Kill. The college planted the Swamp Pasture to test out species adaptability in the tight, poorly aerated clay soils, in comparison with the more rich humus soils of the Val-Kill swamp plantation.133

After these years of active planting, it would be a decade before another plantation was established on the Home Farm. In 1942, Nelson Brown oversaw the establishment of a 6,000-tree balsam fir (Christmas tree) plantation (Plot 58) on a 4-acre field within the Middle Pasture, east of a small creek bordering the Big Lot. Between 1943 and 1944, the plantation was enlarged by a small number of balsam fir and northern white-cedar trees.134 The establishment of this plot probably related to the decline of the dairy operation of the Home Farm following the death of Sara Roosevelt in 1941. By 1943, there were only five cows on the farm, down from eighteen in 1933; with fewer dairy cows, less pasture was needed and thus more land became available for reforestation. Despite the decline in the dairy herd, during the 1940s the Home Farm was still producing diary, poultry, and vegetables for use at the Springwood house and Val-Kill, including milk, cream, butter, eggs, chicken, and potatoes.135

Throughout this period, foresters from the college advised William Plog on matters relating the maintenance of the older plantations and woodlot management on the Home Farm, as they did with those on the Wheeler Place. In December 1933, for example, Professor Svend Heiberg worked with Plog to mark 4 to 5 acres of the woodlots north of Newbold Road and another half acre north of Farm Road for thinning and for harvesting fuelwood and a small amount of

---

Figure 2.116. The Swamp Pasture experimental-demonstration plot in the Swamp Pasture on the Home Farm planted in 1931–32. Plot 24 was later renumbered Plot 33; Plot 24 was never planted. Penciled in on the plan are the two demonstration plots on the adjoining North Parker Lot. (Detail, “Plantations on the Estate of Governor Franklin D. Roosevelt Established by the New York State College of Forestry,” June 1932, Hoverter Memorial Archives, SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry.)
saw timber. Heiberg reported, “Several of the oaks were quite overmature and defective, and the purpose of the cut was to encourage the better reproduction, such as ash, red oak, and hemlock.... The marking was in the nature of a thinning to encourage the better formed and most healthy oaks....” The Home Farm also contained some of FDR’s earliest plantations, which by this period required extensive pruning and thinning. In ca. 1930 prior to arrival of the college, William Plog pruned the lower limbs of the White Pine Lot (Plot C), which FDR had planted in 1912–13 (fig. 2.117). Six years later, Nelson Brown outlined the first thinning of the stand. Brown also managed the timber harvests undertaken in 1942 and 1944, and oversaw harvesting of Christmas trees in 1944 from the Norway spruce plantation (Plot O) in the East Farm Lot planted in ca. 1927.

**J. R. Roosevelt Place (Drawing 2.10)**

Although part of the family estate, the J. R. Roosevelt Place had its own distinct use and ownership throughout this period. As determined by Rosy’s will executed in 1927, the property consisted of the west half of the Boreel Place owned by FDR subject to the life estate of Rosy’s widow, Elizabeth Riley Roosevelt, and daughter, Helen Roosevelt Robinson; and the Kirchner Place owned by Helen Robinson but subject to an undetermined interest held by Mary Newbold Morgan and Elizabeth Roosevelt’s right of life estate to a 1-acre parcel surrounding the motor house. To the south of the motor house, Rosy’s teardrop-shaped trotting course most likely fell out of use following his death, but its maple-lined course remained. The lower part of the Boreel Place continued to be managed as part of Springwood, with the River Road, boathouse, and woodlots that included the virgin forest stand. Like the Wheeler Place, the J. R. Roosevelt Place was bordered along the Post Road by the white pine in Plot E planted in ca. 1914, which matured into a tall screen during this period behind the older deciduous roadside trees (fig. 2.118).

Elizabeth and Helen oversaw a number of changes to the property following the improvements to the Red House and addition of the new barn and bungalow in 1927. In 1928, a small addition was put on the new barn to
house cars, and a small wood shed and chicken house were built to the south of the new barn in ca. 1930. In the early 1930s, Elizabeth and Helen had the old barn, which may have dated back to the eighteenth or early nineteenth century, and stables north of the Red House demolished, and a walled garden put in their place using all or part of the old stone foundations. Near this garden, a spur drive off the main entrance road was laid out to bypass the circular drive in front of the Red House.

In addition to these changes, the landscape of the J. R. Roosevelt Place began to lose some of its once open and agricultural character. Although the fields fronting the Post Road continued to be worked as part of the Home Farm, the sloping field west of the Red House fell out of agricultural use and by the 1940s, perhaps due to wartime decrease in maintenance, was becoming scrubby due to lack of mowing (fig. 2.119). At the Kirchner Place, the orchard along the Post Road disappeared by this period, and the nearby small fields along the Post Road were beginning to revert to woods. Despite these changes, by 1945 32 acres of the property were still considered “tillable.”

Although FDR had focused little of his forestry work on the J. R. Roosevelt Place prior to becoming governor, he did oversee some activity there during this period following his inheritance of the Boreel Place from Rosy. In fall 1937, FDR made plans with Nelson Brown to set out two groves of American beech trees there, each covering approximately a half acre. One plot (Plot V) was located near the southern boundary of the Kirchner Place, which was owned by Helen Roosevelt, probably at the old orchard. The second beech plot, which apparently was never given a letter designation, was near the so-called red gate, perhaps at the Post Road entrance of the South River Road along the southern edge of the Boreel Place. Since the state nurseries did not stock beech trees, Brown ordered the trees from the Kelsey Nursery Company of New York City. In the spring of 1938, 500 beech trees from wild stock were planted in the two locations. Both plantations failed, but Kelsey Nursery agreed to replace the trees, and in spring 1939 the new beech trees were planted: 203 by the red gate and 297 along the south property line. At the same time, FDR also had William Plog plant fifty Norway spruce

Figure 2.119. Looking south across the J. R. Roosevelt Place from the Springwood house showing lack of agricultural use in the fields below the Red House as evidenced by early old-field succession, ca. 1945. This was the river view from Springwood, with the railroad and automobile bridges in Poughkeepsie in the distance. (Photograph NPx 75-70[17], Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.)
trees in an undetermined location on the Boreel Place that were leftover from his Christmas tree plantations. In addition to tree planting, FDR also cut timber from the woods on the Boreel Place as part of the wartime harvest of 1944. Fifty-eight trees were marked for harvesting from the woods south of River Road.

**Upland Farms**

*Bennett Farm and Tompkins Farm (Drawing 2.11)*

Outside of Val-Kill, the Bennett Farm during this period remained primarily a working dairy and poultry farm operated by FDR’s tenant, Moses Smith. At the center of the Bennett Farm on the west side of Violet Avenue was the farmhouse, Woodlawns, and the frame barn that had a capacity of twenty-four cows. The farmstead also contained a two-car garage, a frame poultry house, and a frame brooder house that may have been added by Smith. Surrounding the farmstead were several stone wall–enclosed pastures, where Smith kept his small herd of dairy cattle. With reconstruction and widening of Violet Avenue that was undertaken by the state in 1931, the stone walls that lined the west side of the road were removed. West of Violet Avenue, Smith rented out the tenant house on the north side of Val-Kill Lane, along with the adjoining garage and poultry houses, as part of his farm operation. In the fields on the east side of Violet Avenue, Smith raised vegetable and fodder crops. At either end of the farm were FDR’s woodlots and plantations. By 1945, the Bennett Farm contained approximately 63 acres of woods, 50 acres of tillable land, 45 acres of pastures, and 6 acres of plantations.

At Val-Kill, Eleanor Roosevelt, Marion Dickerman, and Nancy Cook continued to make improvements to the buildings and landscape of their 8-acre leased parcel and adjoining areas. The improvements were part of their residence and operation of Val-Kill Industries, which flourished into the early 1930s. Between 1928 and 1929, several additions were made to the furniture factory building, known as the Factory, to house the expanding business; and in 1928 a small frame building was built east of the Factory to house a garage, and later, a forge, office, and playhouse. In 1931, an orchard was planted south of Val-Kill Lane east of the Fall Kill, south of the stone wall that formed the northern boundary of the Tompkins Farm. In 1935, a new swimming pool was built on higher ground, to the south of Stone Cottage, and the old pool near the creek was removed.

East of Val-Kill was a large, seventy-year-old woodlot dominated by red, white, and chestnut oaks, and hickory. This eastern part of the Bennett Farm was accessed via a rough road farm road extending due east from Val-Kill (fig. 2.120). As FDR purchased adjoining farmland during the latter 1930s, he built connecting roads through these woods. In November 1933, in apparent anticipation of purchasing the Dumphy Farm, FDR had his staff build a road,
known as the Cross Road, through the woods leading northeast from Val-Kill toward the Dumphy Farm. Following FDR’s purchase of the farm in 1935, the Cross Road connected with a road extending west to Violet Avenue and east to Dutchess Hill, where FDR would build Top Cottage. In 1935, FDR also settled with the Rohan family to purchase a portion of their farm to the west of the Bennett Farm, and the following spring he was writing of his hope to lay out an extension of Val-Kill Lane east up Dutchess Hill and through the Rohan Farm to Cream Street. Around the same time, FDR built a second cross road within the Bennett Farm at the base of Dutchess Hill, leading north from the Val-Kill Lane extension to the Dumphy Farm. By the summer of 1936, with purchase of the Rohan Farm complete, construction of the Val-Kill Lane extension was well underway, as Eleanor Roosevelt wrote in her “My Day” column:

...at 8:00 I rode [horseback] over to see how the new road was progressing. They hope to have this road clear enough and sufficiently built up so the President can get through in his little car to a point from which he can settle the direction to be followed for the last climb up a rather steep hill...  

As these roads were being built, Val-Kill Industries declined and was dissolved in 1936 for financial and personal reasons. Eleanor Roosevelt converted the Factory into her residence, while Marion and Nancy continued to reside at the Stone Cottage. With the end of the industries, the three women made a number of additional changes to the landscape. In 1937, a rectangular flower garden, with a shed and greenhouse, and a combination garage-stable and adjoining corral were added to the east of the Factory. Nancy and Marion continued to maintain gardens around Stone Cottage, which was framed by specimen trees in the lawn.
extending down to the pond (fig. 2.121). One of the most conspicuous changes was the enlargement of the pond on the Fall Kill. Planning for the enlargement was underway in fall 1937, when FDR raised his concern about the possibility of water from an enlarged pond backing up onto the Dumphy Farm to the north, where a friend of his, Dorothy Schiff Backer, was considering the construction of a country house. FDR explained that the “…water level as maintained by the low dam at the Val-Kill cottage bridge is about right and additional depth of water for any pond or lake should come from dredging and not from raising the water level.”

FDR’s concerns were taken into account, and an area of wetlands extending to the white pine plantation (Plot D) was dredged, forming an upper pond and leaving the cottage area as a peninsula between the two ponds.

While these improvements were underway after the demise of Val-Kill Industries, the friendship among Eleanor, Nancy, and Marion began to cool, and in 1938 the three signed an agreement to divide their common interest in Val-Kill. Eleanor assumed full ownership of the Factory, while Nancy and Marion took the Stone Cottage, and the various outbuildings were divided among the three. The pool and the grounds of the 8-acre leased area were to be jointly used.

The surrounding farmland and forests were important parts of Val-Kill, especially the large white pine plantation that had become a conspicuous part of the landscape, framing the northeast side of the new upper pond. Considerable staff time had been devoted to the care of this plantation, amounting to 150 combined days of pruning and thinning carried out in September 1931. This was one of the plantations, like those at Springwood, which had recreational and aesthetic value. In a “My Day” column from 1945, Eleanor Roosevelt wrote:

I told my six-year-old guest that I would show him our “secret woods,” a wonderful pine grove where the needles have been falling for so long that you sink in and walk noiselessly and where everything around you looks mysterious. You can imagine almost anything just across the brook or behind the next tree.

A short distance southeast of Val-Kill was a collection of experimental plantations set out by the New York State College of Forestry in 1930–31, but aside from a plot of tulip-poplar (part of Plot 31), these were on the Tompkins Farm despite their access from the farm road east of Val-Kill. The only other plantation within the boundaries of the Bennett Farm was the 1926 Christmas tree plantation (Plot M), located west of the Bennett farmhouse. This plantation, managed by
William Plog, was first harvested in 1935 (fig. 2.122). It was harvested annually thereafter, and by 1943 there were approximately 400 trees left, ranging in height from 2 to 20 feet. So the following spring, under the direction of Nelson Brown, the plot was doubled in size to approximately 100 by 800 feet, and replanted with 1,410 Norway spruce, 1,407 Canadian white spruce, and 1,311 balsam fir. Brown redesignated the enlarged plantation Plot 61.158

Immediately south of the Bennett Farm, the Tompkins Farm witnessed a significant transformation during this period from an idle farm situated at a busy crossroads known as Dead Man’s Curve, to a forested landscape surrounding a farmhouse isolated within a traffic island along a busy state highway. While FDR had made some aesthetic improvements to the old farmhouse soon after he purchased the property in 1925, most of the changes began in 1929, when the barn burned down despite the best efforts of the Hyde Park fire department. FDR thought the building, which he believed was built in the late eighteenth century, had “little value as a barn,” but he had hoped to use its “hand-hewn beams” in a future cottage for one of his children. In a letter thanking the fire department for its efforts, FDR wrote that it “…was a pity that such a fine, old building should be destroyed, but at least we know that everything possible was done.”159 The adjoining granary, which may have been damaged in the fire, was probably removed at the same time.

Shortly after the loss of the barn, the State of New York began to implement plans for improving Violet Avenue and the portion of Creek Road north of the Tompkins farmhouse (later renamed Violet Avenue). One of the chief parts of the project was construction of a bypass around Dead Man’s Curve that required the state to acquire 1.07 acres west of the Tompkins farmhouse from FDR. The highway was constructed in the summer and fall of 1931, but it was not until March 1933 that the deed for the property taken for the bypass was filed in Dutchess County records.160 To build the bypass, the rise behind the Tompkins farmhouse was blasted and graded away. Construction avoided the old wagon house to the rear of the farmhouse, which was used as a two-car garage. Following the reconstruction, the new highway was designated Route 9E, and later, Route 9G.161 The Tompkins farmhouse was left in a triangular island bounded by Creek Road to the east, old Violet Avenue to the south, and the new highway bypass to...
the west. FDR had wanted to dig up the portion of the old road in front of the Tompkins farmhouse, but apparently did not receive permission to do so.162

The intersection of Creek Road and the new highway bypass created a highly visible location on the busily traveled road. Here, in the late spring of 1933 soon after FDR deeded the bypass land to the county, Eleanor Roosevelt, Marion Dickerman, and Nancy Cook erected a small workshop, a white-painted, Colonial Revival–style building that served as the Val-Kill Industries “Weaving Cottage and Center for Handicraft.” The building, erected through an informal lease of the land from FDR, provided not only much-needed work space and staff quarters, but also brought much visibility to Val-Kill Industries. Soon after doubling the size of the building in 1935, Eleanor, Marion, and Nancy opened a restaurant in it known as the Val-Kill Tea Room. Following the dissolution of Val-Kill Industries in 1936, Marion Dickerman and Nancy Cook sold their interest in the building to Eleanor, who oversaw its lease to the Val-Kill weaver, Nellie Johannsen.163 By 1945, the building also served as a gas station under the Mobilgas franchise, with two gas pumps along Creek Road (fig. 2.123).164

Unlike the Bennett Farm, FDR did not lease the Tompkins Farm as a complete farm, but rather leased portions to different people. The farm’s productive agricultural land east of Creek Road was leased beginning in 1929 to Peter Rohan, who operated the neighboring dairy farm to the east, and to Moses Smith for raising squash, probably as an extension of his fields on the Bennett Farm.165

FDR had considered reforesting portions of the Tompkins Farm for demonstration purposes when he acquired the property in the mid-1920s. However, it was not until the spring of 1930, following his meeting with Nelson Brown in September 1929, that he settled on plans to have the New York State College of Forestry at Syracuse University establish demonstration and experimental plots there. The loss of the Tompkins barn in the fall of 1929 opened up additional area for reforestation at the highly visible intersection of Dead Man’s Curve, and it was here that FDR decided to locate the college plantations. State plans for reconstruction of Violet Avenue by this time had apparently not progressed far, because FDR planned on reforesting the land that would later be taken for the bypass. On April 4, 1930, Nelson Brown wrote to FDR that he and Professor Svend Heiberg, the college’s soils expert, had spent the previous day going over the planting sites, and conveyed the following planting plans:
On the area adjacent to and on the east side of the creek road near “Dead Mans Curve” we expect to put in six plantations as follows:

a. Plantation of Norway spruce and Scotch pine, alternating, 4’ x 4’. This will occupy one-half of the road frontage.

b. Plantation of Japanese larch 4’ x 4’. This will occupy the balance of the frontage.

c. Plantation of western yellow pine 4’ x 4’.

d. Plantation of Norway spruce 5’ x 5’.

e. Plantation of white spruce 4’ x 4’.

f. Plantation of Sitka spruce 6’ x 6’.

On the east side of the road and opposite the above described plantation, we expect to put in about two to three acres of red pine extending from the road [Creek Road] to the gray birch reproduction now existent...

FDR approved the plan, and the next week Professor C. C. Delavan oversaw the planting of 13,600 trees in eight plots (Plots 1–8) with the assistance of William Plog, following the initial plan except for the substitution of European larch in the mixed plantation and addition of Dahurian (Korean) larch in the Japanese larch plantation. As Nelson Brown wrote to FDR, red pine was used for a large plantation on the old pasture west of the farmhouse (Plot 1) because it “…appears to do the very best of any tree in the state and I have a personal liking for it, I hope it will do well on your place and that you will be pleased with it.” Most of the tree species were standards in reforestation work, but the Japanese and Korean larch, Sitka spruce (native to British Columbia), and western yellow pine were experiments with species that had not been tried for reforestation purposes in New York. The planting was completed on April 12, 1930, and Nelson Brown reported to FDR that the project had gone well. The college soon produced a blueprint map of the plantations, illustrating the species and limits of the various plots. The next month, FDR had a chance to return home to Hyde Park to see the college plantations, as he wrote to Nelson Brown:

Just before leaving I stopped at Hyde Park for a few hours and had a chance to see the splendid plantation of young trees. I think that your people did a fine job on it and I suppose that in another year there will be enough visible to make it worth while for us to put up the suggested signs calling attention to the experimental planting. ... I am in entire accord with the suggestion that the College of Forestry should make this land not merely a demonstration plot for people to look at, but also an experimental plot for woodlot management.

Soon after this time, the college began to develop a number of experimental plots, while continuing to set out demonstration plantations along Creek Road. In the fall of 1930, the college set out an experimental plot (part of Plot 31) of tulip-poplar—FDR’s favorite tree but an unconventional reforestation species—in
a field south of Val-Kill along the boundary of the Tompkins Farm. Here, FDR also hoped to establish an experimental plantation of black walnuts. Professor Delavan implemented FDR’s plan in April 1931, establishing two plantations (Plots 31, 32) south and east of the tulip-poplar plot (fig. 2.124). Delavan planted both walnut seed spots and seedlings, but due to the wet nature of the soils, he interplanted with northern white-cedar (arborvitae), perhaps to test them as nurse trees for the walnuts.

While the black walnut plots were being set out in April 1931, the college was busy expanding the demonstration plantations along Creek Road and Violet Avenue, setting out approximately 15,200 additional trees. The new plantings included expansion of Plot 1 west of Creek Road, covering more than twice the area of the original planting (fig. 2.125). The college also set out six more demonstration plantations (Plots 9–15) where the old Tompkins orchard stood on the east side of Creek Road south of Dead Man’s Curve using Douglas fir, Japanese red pine, shortleaf pine, northern white-cedar, and black walnut seed spots. Soon after completing the plan of the college’s plantations on the Tompkins Farm in June 1931, the state began construction of the Violet Avenue bypass, which required removal of part of the red pine plantation (Plot 1), leaving a small grove on the east side of the new road adjoining the Tompkins farmhouse.

In the spring of 1931, FDR suggested to the college foresters that they try some experimental planting in the big wetland south of the Tompkins farmhouse and west of Creek Road known as the “Tamarack Swamp.” Covered in a dense second growth of red maple, FDR wanted to see if indeed larch (the European cousin
of the native tamarack) could grow in this swamp. The foresters agreed with FDR’s idea and planned most of the planting within the Tamarack Swamp for the college’s third season in the spring of 1932. To prepare for the work, FDR had Moses Smith clear a portion of the swamp and open the old drainage ditches that ran through the site (see fig. 1.12). During the clearing operation, tamarack (larch) stumps were uncovered, verifying the origin of the place name.175

Under the on-site direction of Ray Bower of the Extension Department, the college set out three mixed plantations (Plots 16, 17, 18) in the spring of 1932, covering 6½ acres of the Tamarack Swamp bordering Creek Road. Rather than just experimenting with larch, the college set out mixed plantations to test a variety of species. These included tulip-poplar planted at a 12-foot spacing over all three plots, and then infill plantings at 4-foot spacing of northern white-cedar, European larch, and Dahurian larch. As a check, a third plantation of the same species composition was established on non-swamp land to the west, bordering the new Violet Avenue highway (Plot 21). In total, the swamp plantings involved approximately 26,400 trees. The summer following the planting proved to be a dry one, and many of the young trees were lost.176 According to Nelson Brown, “…the cedar and larch are hanging on and the tulip poplar never had a chance.”177

In the spring of 1933, the college’s fourth season of planting at the Roosevelt Estate, over 35,000 trees were set out under the continued on-site direction of Ray Bower.178 Many of these trees were in the drought-damaged plots in the Tamarack Swamp, which were replanted, enlarged, and diversified with Sitka spruce and white pine. Two new plantations were also set out on the northern and western ends of the Tamarack Swamp: Plot 27, Scotch pine, and Plot 28, tulip-poplar of northern origin.179 The college also replanted some of the demonstration plots along the east side of the Creek Road. The walnut and shortleaf pine in Plots 14
and 15 had not done well and were replanted with Scotch pine and Corsican pine, a native of southern Europe. This Scotch pine was not standard domestic stock, but rather imported German seedlings used as part of an experiment to see if straighter growing habits could be secured. The college focused the rest of its plantings for the 1933 season on the old pastures west of Violet Avenue, using red pine, Norway spruce, and European larch in Plots 22, 25, and 26. Two small experimental plots were also established in this area: Plot 23, an underplanting of red pine beneath gray birch; and Plot 24, a direct planting of red oak stratified seed.

With its spring 1933 plantings marking the end of its cooperative relationship with FDR, the college prepared a final keyed plan showing the location of its plantations on the Tompkins Farm (fig. 2.126). At this time, Nelson Brown recommended that “...small, dignified signs be placed at the northerly and southerly approaches to plantations pointing out that the plantations were put in as demonstrations and experiments in cooperation between Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New York State College of Forestry.” While FDR had earlier thought the signs to be a good idea, by this time he was apparently concerned that they may lead to vandalism and theft in the plantations. Instead, Brown suggested only installing inconspicuous 12- by 18-inch signs placed on low stakes within each plantation indicating the species, age, and kind of stock used, and the date of planting.

Ray Bower summarized some of the achievements of the college’s four seasons of tree planting in an article published in American Forests in January 1934. Of all the experimental work, Bower was most excited about the success of the previously untested Dahurian (Korean) larch, remarking that the experiment would undoubtedly “...contribute knowledge of interest and value to the forestry profession” (fig. 2.127). Bower was also pleased with the results of the Tamarack Swamp, despite
Nelson Brown’s lament over the initial losses. The northern white-cedar and larches were growing well, and the Norway spruce and white pine were succeeding in formerly untried conditions.183

In the spring of 1934, the first planting season following the end of the cooperative relationship with the College of Forestry, FDR had more than 38,900 trees planted on the Tompkins Farm. Through the on-site supervision of Professor Svend Heiberg and Ray Bower, the Tamarack Swamp plantations (Plots 18–20) were expanded with planting of larch, Norway spruce, and Sitka spruce. Opposite the swamp on the east side of Creek Road, four large plantations of Norway spruce, Douglas fir, white pine, white spruce, and Japanese larch (Plots 35–38) were set out. Plot 38 was formerly used as a gravel pit, and Plot 37, known as the “Heiberg Plow Plantation,” was the first to be planted with a forestry plow developed by Professor Heiberg (fig. 2.128).184 It was planted with Douglas fir and white spruce for the production of Christmas trees, the first such plantation since FDR’s original experiment on the Bennett Farm in 1926. Plot 36, planted with white pine and some Norway spruce and larch, was just over the boundary of the Tompkins Farm on land belonging to the Powers family. How and why FDR arranged to plant on a neighbor’s land is not known.

In 1935, the last new plantings on the Tompkins Farm were set out along the west side of the Tamarack Swamp in Plot 28, where large numbers of red pine, white pine, and Norway spruce were used to fill in the remaining open ground. Two fields along Creek Road were not reforested, probably because they were prime cropland leased to Peter Rohan.185 Under the direction of Nelson Brown, the plantations were well maintained over the course of the next ten years, with the College of Forestry demonstration plantations apparently receiving the highest level of maintenance, such as the red pine plantation (Plot 1) along Violet Avenue (fig. 2.129). Where there was high failure in the plantations, replanting was undertaken. The most extensive replanting on the Tompkins Farm was in the experimental plantation near Val-Kill (Plots 31, 32) that Brown referred to as the Cedar Swamp. While the tulip-poplar
and northern white-cedar initially planted in 1930–31 were doing fine, the black walnuts had largely disappeared. In Plot 31, a replacement planting of Scotch pine was set out in ca. 1937, and in 1941, Plot 32 was replanted with northern white-cedar, resulting in a pure but uneven-aged plantation. In the Tamarack Swamp (Plots 16–20), there was heavy mortality by the early 1940s, despite Ray Bower’s earlier optimism. Due to the difficult conditions of the site, little replanting was undertaken. Nelson Brown attributed the losses to a lack of consistent pruning of the heavy red maple sprout growth, which shaded out the evergreens.

In addition to replanting, Brown also oversaw pruning, thinning, and harvesting of the Tompkins plantations. In 1938, for example, posts were harvested through a thinning of the demonstration Japanese larch plantation (Plot 3). In the spring of 1944, estate staff pruned the 1930 red pine plantation (Plot 1) by removing limbs up to a height of 6 feet, and cut down wolf trees, poorly shaped trees, dead trees, and brush that were impeding growth. By 1944, the first Christmas tree harvests were being made from the plantations set out in 1934–35 on the east side of the Creek Road and on the Powers property (Plots 35–38). A total of 3,487 Christmas trees were harvested from these plots in 1944 alone.

At the east end of the Tompkins Farm, east of the Fall Kill and southeast of Val-Kill beyond the Cedar Swamp were woodlots on steep land that, according to Irving Isenberg’s assessment in his 1931 forest management plan, were left in terrible condition by a previous cutting operations before FDR purchased the property in 1925. Isenberg noted that there was abundant seedling and sprout growth throughout the woods, as well as scattered big oak trees. Perhaps because these woods were not sufficiently mature by the 1940s, Nelson Brown did not direct any timber harvesting here during the operations of 1942 and 1944. Despite their immaturity for timber purposes, the woods by the 1940s provided a shaded sylvan setting that, remote from the developed areas of the estate, was one of FDR’s favorite spots. To drive here, FDR had a loop road laid out from Val-Kill in ca. 1940 that led to a small pond. Nelson Brown recalled FDR’s fondness for these woods:

One of [FDR’s] favorite rendezvous [sic] was a little pond that, strangely enough, was located near the top of a hill between his swimming pool [at Val-Kill] and the Creek Road. He outlined a road to his foreman and made a little circuit road around [sic] the pond. We often drove to that spot and rested there for half hour or more while the Secret Service cars at a respectful distance waited

![Figure 2.129. Looking north along Violet Avenue (Route 9G) showing the ten-year-old red pine plantation (Plot 1) set out by the College of Forestry in 1930, photographed 1941. Visible in the distance is the Val-Kill Tea Room and Mobilgas station. (Photograph Px 61-300[5], Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.)](image)
to see if he would drive off the road through the woods or across the fields or to some spot where the ordinary motorist would never think of driving....

*Dumphy and Hughson Farms, Wright and Jones Lands (Drawing 2.12)*

With the last of the available reforestation plots on the Tompkins Farm filling up by the mid-1930s, FDR and Nelson Brown shifted their forestry work to the farmland north of the Bennett Farm. FDR began to purchase this property beginning in 1935, and by 1938 he had acquired the whole of the 185-acre Dumphy Farm and the 90-acre Hughson Farm, and adjoining portions of the Wright and Jones Farms together encompassing 35 acres. FDR had long been interested in the Dumphy Farm due to its close proximity to the Bennett Farm, for its land on Dutchess Hill where he would build Top Cottage, and because Newbold Road—one of two estate roads connecting to Violet Avenue from the Post Road—ran through it. The 184-acre farm, probably established by David Barns in the 1820s, had been in the Dumphy family since 1867. In 1906, the family lost the farm and the property ended up in court, at which time it was purchased by Thomas Newbold, the Roosevelts’ neighbor at Bellefield. Three years later, Newbold purchased the adjoining Hughson Farm. This 90-acre farm, probably developed by the Pells family in the 1840s, had been owned by Gilbert Hughson between 1873 and 1888, and then by three different owners until it was sold as part of the estate of Percilla Simmons to Thomas Newbold in 1909.

By the late 1920s, following the death of his wife Sarah Coolidge Newbold, Thomas Newbold was considering the sale of the Hughson Farm that he had acquired in 1906. FDR wrote in September 1928 that he had a client in New York City who would be interested in purchasing the property, apparently as a country place. However, the purported buyer was interested only if the Newbolds sold both the Hughson and Dumphy farms together, since the only access to the Hughson Farm from Violet Avenue was through the Dumphy Farm. On November 21, 1929, Thomas Newbold died at the age of 80, and two months later in January 1930, FDR wrote his daughter, Mary Newbold Morgan, to solicit his own interest in purchasing the Dumphy Farm.

It was not until the spring of 1935, however, that FDR settled on a deal with the Morgans to purchase just the east half of the Dumphy Farm, encompassing 74 acres north of Val-Kill and extending east to the summit of Dutchess Hill, where FDR would build Top Cottage. The subdivision line within the Dumphy Farm ran along a diagonal following a rock ledge, east of the Fall Kill. The property contained old fields and gravel pits in its western part where FDR planned to plant trees, and oak forest in the eastern end. FDR purchased the property for $1,000 from the Trustees of Thomas Newbold’s estate on June 5, 1935. In anticipation of the purchase, FDR had already built an access road to the property from Val-Kill in the fall of 1933, known as the Cross Road. Once he purchased the
Dumphy Farm, FDR extended the Cross Road with a branch leading northeast up Dutchess Hill to the spot where he would build Top Cottage. The other branch ran northwest to connect with the existing Dumphy farm road, which ran from Violet Avenue along the northern boundary of the property still owned by the Newbold Estate. This road crossed the Fall Kill on a 12-foot-wide bridge.198

At the time FDR worked out his purchase of the east half of the Dumphy Farm in 1935, Jeff Newbold, one of the trustees, had hinted that they might be interested in selling the rest of the Dumphy Farm and the Hughson Farm. It was not until September 24, 1937, however, that the trustees finally agreed to consider an offer on the two tracts. Just over a month later on November 1, 1937, FDR completed his purchase of the property for $21,000, including the remaining 112.5 acres of the Dumphy Farm and the 90-acre Hughson Farm.199 Aside from the substantial amount of land, this purchase also included two farmsteads, orchards, active agricultural fields, woodlots, and plantations of red and white pine set out by the Newbolds in ca. 1927 on the northeast corner of the Hughson Farm.200

The Dumphy Farm was a rectangular parcel that was traversed through its middle by a farm road, an arrangement similar to that on the Bennett Farm. West of Violet Avenue, the farm road was the eastern end of Newbold Road which extended west across the Home Farm to Bellefield.201 At the intersection of Newbold Road and Violet Avenue was the Dumphy farmstead. The farmhouse, an early-nineteenth-century, three-bay, two-story building similar to the Bennett farmhouse, was set back a short distance from Violet Avenue, behind stone walls that lined the entire road (fig. 2.130). The house was shaded by mature Norway spruce and maples, and had a large, three-story, 150- by 20-foot poultry house and garage at the rear. South of the house, extending to the Bennett Farm, was a large orchard. A farm road immediately north of the house led a short distance to cultivated fields to the east covering approximately 50 acres. On the west side of Violet Avenue, across from the farmhouse on the south side of Newbold Road, was the barnyard that faced onto Violet Avenue and was framed by a main barn and two smaller outbuildings (fig. 2.131). In the state’s reconstruction of Violet Avenue in 1931, the main barn was demolished to accommodate road widening, and a new, smaller barn with novelty siding was constructed in the same general location on the north side of the barnyard (fig. 2.132). East of the barnyard to either side of Newbold Road were cultivated fields covering approximately 30 acres. Through the fields, the road was lined by fruit trees that FDR presumably had planted in ca. 1937.202

Unlike the Bennett and Tompkins Farms, the Hughson Farm was an irregularly shaped parcel that straddled the old boundary between Water Lots Six and Seven.
The farm was not contiguous with any public roads, but was rather originally accessed from Van Wagner (Haviland) Road along a road known as Pell’s Lane, named after the original owner of the farm. The Newbolds had a new entrance road built to the farm in ca. 1921 to provide access from Violet Avenue and Newbold Road to Bellefield. The new entrance road extended from Pell’s Lane and the Hughson farmhouse south and west through the Dumphy Farm to Violet Avenue.203 The Hughson farmhouse, which faced northwest across the Fall Kill, was a vernacular Greek Revival–style house most likely built by the Pells family in ca. 1850 (fig. 2.133). Due east of it was a yellow-painted English-style barn with the main doors facing northeast toward the house.

Following his purchase of the Dumphy and Hughson Farms in 1937, FDR made a number of subdivisions and acquisitions within and surrounding these properties. One of the reasons FDR acquired the west half of the Dumphy Farm was to sell a part of it to Dorothy Schiff Backer, the future owner and publisher of the New York Post, as a site for her country house. FDR had purchased the east half of the Dumphy Farm in part to assemble land on Dutchess Hill where he wished to build his own retreat, and the Backer sale was an effort to have close friends live nearby.204 On November 27, 1937, FDR sold Mrs. Backer a 40-acre parcel for $9,000 that encompassed the part of the Dumphy Farm from Violet Avenue to the boundary of the tract FDR purchased in 1935, including the Dumphy farmhouse. On this property, FDR set aside a 50-foot-wide right-of-way along the Hughson farm road to give him access to his property to the east.205 For her country house, Mrs. Backer selected a site on the east side of the Fall Kill, a short distance upstream from Val-Kill. However, within a short time she became concerned with potential flooding on the site due to the Roosevelts’ plans for enlarging the Val-Kill pond, and in the summer of 1938 told FDR she was about to give up on the project.206

Unwilling to lose Mrs. Backer as a neighbor, FDR showed her a new piece of property for her country house on a hilltop east of the Hughson Farm, a short distance northeast of Dutchess Hill where he was planning to build Top Cottage. The 42-acre property, which had views across the Hudson Valley, was a pig farm belonging to Wyatt Jones, who also ran a dance hall on the property. The farm
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contained a small house and barn, and was set back from Cream Street and accessed by a 30-foot-wide right-of-way through the neighboring farm belonging to Edward Schaffer (also spelled Schaeffer). In the middle of the Jones Farm was a 6-acre woodlot that belonged to Schaffer. FDR had approached Jones about purchasing his farm as early as 1935 because he was concerned about the pig operation being a nuisance (there were about 150 pigs on the farm fed on garbage from Poughkeepsie), and also thought the property “…would fit in beautifully between the top of the hill [Dutchess Hill] on the south and the east end of the Hughson Place.”

FDR’s purchase of the Jones Farm was delayed for nearly two years, in part because Edward Schaffer wanted $1,000 for the 6-acre woodlot and Jones wanted $3,000 for his farm, prices FDR felt were too high. By the late spring of 1938, FDR had worked out acceptable terms. On May 26, 1938, he purchased the 42-acre Jones Farm for $2,500, consisting of three parcels, and on June 20, 1938 he purchased the 6-acre Schaffer woodlot for $800. It was soon after his purchase, on July 7, 1938, that FDR took Mrs. Backer up to see the Jones Farm, and she was pleased with the site. FDR wrote Henry Hackett that Mrs. Backer “…is talking seriously of buying the whole farm east of it [Schaffer Farm] and swapping with me the Dunphy [sic] farm for the easterly two-thirds of the Jones Place.” FDR agreed to sell Mrs. Backer the 27-acre east half of the Jones Farm for $100, which included the hilltop site and the Schaffer woodlot, leaving him with the 21-acre west half of the Jones Farm that filled in the gap between the Hughson and Dumphy Farms (fig. 2.134). As part of the agreement, Mrs. Backer agreed to give back to FDR the 40 acres of the Dumphy Farm she had purchased in 1937. The sale of the Jones property to Mrs. Backer was finalized on September 30, 1938; in the deed, FDR reserved for himself a right-of-way on the Jones farm road to Cream Street leading through the Schaffer Farm, which Mrs. Backer had purchased two weeks earlier. In 1941, Mrs. Backer built her country house on the site of Wyatt Jones’s dance hall. Known as the Red Cottage, the house was designed by Henry Toombs, who had designed Val-Kill Cottage and the FDR Library.

For forestry purposes and to expand access to the estate, FDR built or improved several roads following his purchase of the Jones Farm. In ca. 1940, he extended the existing Hughson farm road, known after 1939 as the Linaka Road because it led to the old Hughson farmhouse occupied by Russell Linaka, east through the Jones Land to link up with the existing Shaffer-Jones farm road. This road,
Roosevelt estate Historic Resource study together with his right-of-way across Mrs. Backer’s property, gave FDR a route from Violet Avenue to Cream Street. FDR also created a third cross road that ran from the road to Top Cottage north through the Rohan Farm to the Jones Land. This road was known as “the Road to the Jones Lot” and was built at some point between 1938 and 1941.213

In addition to the Jones land, FDR also purchased a portion of the farm belonging to Fred Wright, which adjoined the Hughson Farm on the west. The Wright Farm consisted of 98 acres that extended north and west of the Dumphy and Hughson Farms, and bordered the Bracken Place (Home Farm) on the west. Wright had acquired the property in 1918 from the Whitwell family.214 At the time FDR purchased the Hughson Farm in 1937, Wright was beginning to develop the east end of his farm, having laid out streets and subdividing the land. He also mined gravel near the Fall Kill.215 Probably to create a buffer from this development, FDR purchased a 14-acre part of the Wright Farm for $1,960.50 on November 18, 1937, just two weeks after he acquired the Hughson Farm. The northwestern corner of the parcel had an irregular boundary that followed paper streets laid out by Wright named Devans Avenue and Sunset Avenue.216 Much of the land was swamp bordering the Fall Kill.217

As with the Tompkins Farm, FDR did not rent out the Dumphy and Hughson Farms as whole farms, but rather managed them as several different leased properties. He rented the Dumphy farmhouse to Arnold Berge, a craftsman with Val-Kill Industries, and the barns and fields on the west side of Violet Avenue to Moses Smith. As he explained to his lawyer, Henry Hackett, “They [barns and fields] will be very useful to him [Smith] because, as you know, I have taken a good deal of land away from his use by planting trees on it. He needs the extra pasture and crop land and he says he can use the barns for several cows as his

Figure 2.134. Survey of the Jones Farm and Schaffer Wood Lot showing original lots and FDR’s subdivision, ca. 1938. The portion retained by FDR was the area at left outlined in yellow; Mrs. Backer purchased the portion to the right including the Shaffer Wood Lot. Mrs. Backer also purchased the adjoining tract between the Jones Farm and Cream Street from Edward Schaffer. (O. A. D’Luhosch, untitled survey, map 15-3-1, Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.)
barn is crowded...." FDR also leased the Dumphy fields on the east side of Violet Avenue to Moses Smith, although for several years William Plog used the field north of the Dumphy farmhouse to grow corn. At the Hughson Farm, FDR leased the farmhouse first to Christian Bie, a Val-Kill craftsman, and then in 1939, to Russell Linaka, FDR’s first full-time forestry manager. The house was subsequently known as the Linaka Cottage. FDR leased the fields and barn on the Hughson Farm to Moses Smith before they were taken up by tree planting in the 1940s.

Aside from the reconstruction of the Dumphy barn with the highway widening in ca. 1931, there was little building activity on the Dumphy and Hughson Farms, or the Jones and Wright lands until November 1939, when FDR agreed to an experiment in providing low-cost housing on the estate. The project, undertaken by Eleanor’s younger brother, G. Hall Roosevelt of Jackson, Michigan, involved remodeling and new construction at the Dumphy and Hughson farmsteads, taking advantage of federal price controls. Under a signed agreement between FDR and G. Hall Roosevelt, the project leased two parcels (I, II) containing 2½ acres of the Dumphy fields west of Violet Avenue including the Dumphy barns, and two parcels (III, IV) containing 1½ acres including the Linaka (Hughson) barn.

By August 1940, G. Hall Roosevelt had built six residential units at the Dumphy Farm identified as “Projects 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8.” One was a converted outbuilding, four were apartments in the 1931 barn and an added wing, and Project 8 was a new building constructed with a steel frame (fig. 2.135, see also fig. 2.132). At the Hughson Farm, Projects 1 and 2 were built as one-story wings onto either end of the barn (fig. 2.136). No units were built in the barn, perhaps because it was being used by Moses Smith or Russell Linaka. G. Hall Roosevelt had initially wanted to build additional projects within the leased parcels, but his death in 1941 halted further development. FDR, however, continued to lease the units, which required registration with the federal Office of Price Administration.

FDR’s primary intent for his newly acquired farms was to expand land for his forestry program. With obvious excitement, he wrote Nelson Brown of the pending acquisition of the Dumphy Farm in March 1935:
By next autumn I expect to have seventy-one additional acres at Hyde Park—north of the stone cottage [Val-Kill]—nearly all of it excellent land for planting. It was in fields up to about twenty years ago and now has light brush or heavy weeds on it—not much of a job to clear it. Most of it lies higher than any planting we have done yet. When I get up to Hyde Park in the spring I hope that you and Professor Heiberg can run down and I will show it to you.225

With the higher altitude, FDR and Nelson Brown hoped to have even better success with growing balsam fir as Christmas trees than they had down on the Tompkins Farm, although they would not try out the species there for another two years. In April 1936, a total of 21,000 trees, all of them Norway spruce, were planted on the Dumphy Farm in two plantations (Plots 39, 40) in an area bordering the road to Val-Kill known as the “Gravel Lot South” (fig. 2.137). These were planted at 3½-foot spacing typical for growing Christmas trees. The following spring, 26,000 more trees were planted on the Dumphy Farm as an expansion of Plot 40 and as a new plantation in a lot near the east end of the property adjoining the woods on Dutchess Hill, known as the “Gravel Lot East” (Plot 41). This new plantation of Norway spruce was a very large one at 21,300 trees, covering about three-quarters of the 9½-acre lot. In his notes about this planting, Nelson Brown wrote: “Apparently the rows were pretty well lined up both ways so it should have a pretty pleasing effect upon the President although I do not adhere to the policy of strict lines. However, this was done in order to conform to the exact 3½ x 3½ ft. spacing.” Brown’s practice at this time was to have the trees planted at right angles to the roads.226 In the following spring of 1938, Brown and FDR continued to rely on Norway spruce for Christmas tree purposes, but added some European and Japanese larch, in total setting out more than 29,500 trees in Plots 39 and 41. Another large plantation of Norway spruce, Plot 43, totaling nearly 11,000 trees, was set out in the Gravel Pit Lot adjoining the Hughson property line.227

In 1939, with much of the Dumphy fields filling up, planting was begun on the Hughson Farm, south and east of the Hughson farmhouse. Nearly 20,000 Norway spruce were planted in four plantations (Plots 44, 45, 46, and 55), but the majority failed due to a severe drought. The next year, nearly half of the 50,000 trees planted, all Norway spruce, were replacements for those lost in this drought.
new plantations were set out in 1940: a small Douglas fir plantation (Plot 48) off the south side of the Linaka Road, and the largest single Norway spruce plantation to date (Plot 56), containing 23,330 trees. These were planted in the lot on the Dumphy Farm along the east side of the Fall Kill, where Mrs. Backer had originally planned to build her country house. Nelson Brown named this area the “Bacchus Lot,” presumably his spelling of the staff’s pronunciation of “Backer’s.”

From 1941 through 1945, FDR and Nelson Brown concentrated planting on the Hughson Farm and the Jones Land. During these four years, over 135,000 trees were set out in six plantations as expansion or new plantings in Plots 46, 49, 60, 61, 62, and 63 (fig. 2.138). These were primarily Norway spruce and white spruce, with small numbers of Douglas fir and balsam fir, all for Christmas trees. Plots 63, located on the south side of the Linaka Road in an area known as the Jones Lot, was begun in 1944 and consisted of the first planting on the Jones Land. Planting in the Jones Lot was completed in 1945 in areas known as the East Hill, West Hill, and Peach Lot. Nelson Brown also delineated several lots for planting in the fields north of the Linaka Road in the northern section of the Hughson Farm (Plots 50–54), but these remained unplanted.

Despite the emphasis on Christmas tree production, FDR and Nelson Brown continued to undertake experiments and set out traditional forest plantations on his property north of Val-Kill. This included hosting of the U.S. Department of Agriculture chestnut blight experiment in 1938. Undertaken by the department’s Bureau of Plant Industry, the experiment involved planting of 200 Asiatic chestnut saplings, including two Chinese and two Japanese strains, in Plot 44 within the Newbold Lot on the Hughson Farm. J. D. Diller, a forest pathologist at the Bureau of Plant Industry, drew up a planting plan for the trees at 8-by-8-foot spacing. The trees were set out in the northwest side of the Newbold Lot, where a dead American chestnut tree in the adjoining woods verified the existence of the disease (figs. 2.139, 2.140). Each tree was labeled with an aluminum tag. In 1939, another 100 Asiatic chestnuts were planted in the plot, most likely as replacements.

FDR and Brown also undertook their own experiment that same year for an unusual mixed-species plantation of Norway spruce, tulip-poplar, and red oak in nearby Plot 42 on the Dumphy Farm (fig. 2.141). Traditional plantings of 500 red pine and 5,600 Norway spruce were set out in the remainder of the lot the same year. In 1944, another experiment in mixed species plantations was tried in Plot 63, the Jones Lot, although the large size of the plantation (20,000 trees) suggests
Nelson Brown was confident of the outcome. He outlined a plan to plant four species—Norway spruce, balsam fir, Canadian white spruce, and Douglas fir—in alternating rows. The planters, however, were to use their discretion, putting the Douglas fir and Norway spruce on the hilltops and thinner soil slopes, and the balsam fir in the deeper-soiled lots and bottom lands.\footnote{232} FDR and Brown also experimented with different species as Christmas trees, including 600 Western firs—concolor (white) fir, grand fir, and noble fir—planted in 1944 on the Hughson Farm south of the Linaka barn (Plot 62) and in the Jones Lot (Plot 63). The roots of these trees had dried out in transit, and therefore their survival rate was not high.\footnote{233}

After the big failure from the 1939 drought, Nelson Brown was pleased with the growth of the various plantations during the 1940s, especially the balsam fir that many foresters believed would not succeed so far south of its native range. In the fall of 1941, Brown reported to FDR: “...I have been definitely impressed by the success of the balsam fir plantations which you no doubt have noticed immediately adjoining the road from Linaka’s place over to the cottage [in Jones Lot, Plot 63].... At first the trees grew very poorly and the crowds were very unsymmetrical. Now they have come through the weeds and grass and give promise of definite success.... I think we ought to plant more balsam fir next spring....”\footnote{234} In September 1944, Nelson Brown planned for the first harvest of Christmas trees in the newer plantations north of Val-Kill. He estimated that 2,000 trees would be available for cutting, including some balsam fir, based on the number of trees over 3 to 4 feet tall. The only problems that Brown recorded came from damage due to wartime security. In the spring of 1944, he wrote: “A study of the 1943 plantations on both sides of the Linaka Road west of the Jones lot indicates that there has been some loss from Army trucks and other vehicles crossing and recrossing the planted areas. The men were cautioned against this but considerable trees have been lost in spite of this.”\footnote{235}
2. Land-Use History, 1928–1945

When FDR purchased the east end of the Dumphy Farm in June 1935, one of his main interests in the property aside from its reforestation land was that it encompassed the wooded western slope of Dutchess Hill and part of its summit, an area once known as the “Chestnut Woods.” As early as 1933, FDR had eyed this land for building himself a retreat, a place similar to Eleanor’s Val-Kill where he could escape the crowds that usually greeted him at the Springwood house since becoming president.236 With his distant cousin and close companion, Daisy Suckley, FDR took frequent rides up to Dutchess Hill in the summer and fall following his purchase of the Dumphy Farm. They called the spot “Our Hill,” as Daisy wrote to FDR in September 1935: “...After much deep thought, I have come to the very definite conclusion that Our Hill is, quite without exception, the nicest Hill in Dutchess County!”237 FDR at first thought of building a simple lean-to on a terrace at the summit of the hill, but together with Daisy decided to erect a small fieldstone house, which would be known as “the Hill Cottage” or “Top Cottage.”238

One of the main attractions to the Dutchess Hill site was the view. Forming the western edge of the Lower Taconics as the land transitioned to Hudson Lowlands, Dutchess Hill was one of the highest points in the vicinity, at an elevation of 460 feet above the Hudson River. From the summit, as Nelson Brown recalled, “...one could see the highlands of the Hudson about West Point. The Catskills rose magnificently and majestically to the northwest and even the Mohonk House 16 miles east of Poughkeepsie could be seen. Thus there was a magnificent panorama of views to the south, west, and north” (fig. 2.142).239 FDR also valued the site for its woods, which had converted into an oak forest following the chestnut blight that began in the 1910s, and its remoteness from the rest of the estate. The spot was far removed from the Springwood house, but was just a short distance east of and uphill from Val-Kill. The only problem was that the best building site at the southeast corner of the Dumphy Farm extended onto two adjoining properties, the Briggs Wood Lot and the Lent Wood Lot, while the best route of access was through the adjoining Rohan Farm, none of which FDR owned.240 FDR had built a road to the site through the Dumphy Farm in ca. 1935, but it had to follow the steep northwestern slope of Dutchess Hill, and therefore had a difficult grade, as

Figure 2.141. Experimental mixed plantation of Norway spruce, tulip-poplar, and red oak set out in 1938 on Plot 42 on the Dumphy Farm, view probably looking northeast, ca. 1942. (Photograph Px61-300(7), Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.)
well as numerous tight curves and a switchback. According to Nelson Brown, a ride up this drive took “...the breath away from so many of his [FDR’s] distinguished visitors.”

In the summer of 1935, shortly after he purchased the east half of the Dumphy Farm, Henry Hackett, FDR’s lawyer, began negotiations to purchase parcels adjoining the Top Cottage site, including the 7-acre Briggs Wood Lot and the 133-acre Rohan Farm that straddled Cream Street. Both properties had been owned by the Conklin, Wood, and Gregg families in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Pete Rohan had purchased the 133-acre farm in 1920, and Margaret and Theodore Briggs had acquired the woodlot in 1924. Both Pete Rohan and Margaret Briggs quickly agreed to sell to FDR, but not without conditions. FDR completed his purchase of the Briggs Wood Lot for $500 on November 6, 1935; in the deed, Margaret Briggs reserved her right to “…cut and remove as much fire wood as she may desire for her personal use at any time from said premises during her lifetime.” Soon after the purchase, FDR had part of the wooded hillside cleared to open views from the top of the hill across the valley to the west and southwest.

On the same day that he purchased the woodlot, FDR signed a purchase agreement with Pete Rohan for his 133-acre parcel, which FDR also called the Gregg Farm to distinguish it from the adjoining farm to the south that was also owned by the Rohan family. Pete Rohan did not want to lose use of the fertile fields on the property, on which he grew corn for his dairy cattle. Henry Hackett wrote FDR, “As we know, it [the Rohan Farm] is in a very good state of cultivation, having been used as a dairy farm for a number of years.” FDR suggested only purchasing the west end of the farm adjoining the Top Cottage site, but despite his concern about continuing to use the fields, Pete Rohan preferred selling the entire 133-acre parcel. As a compromise, FDR agreed to rent the farm fields back to Rohan. By this time, FDR was certainly familiar with having Rohan as a tenant, since he had leased land along Creek Road...
on the Tompkins Farm to him since the late 1920s. On November 7, 1935, Rohan signed a purchase contract in the amount of $24,500, but it was not until April 1, 1936 that the sale was finalized. The farm consisted of two parcels: the 122-acre main farm parcel, and an 11-acre woodlot parcel along the north boundary, extending due east of the Briggs Wood Lot. At the time of FDR’s purchase, the woodlot parcel was mostly open fields.

The Rohan Farm was arranged in a similar manner to the Bennett, Dumphy, and Tompkins Farms. The farm was a rectangular parcel, occupying the northern half of Water Lot Five, situated due east of the Bennett Farm on a plateau with Cream Street forming the center spine. At the south end, Cream Street forked with Dutchess Hill Road. Immediately north of the fork and on the west side of Cream Street was the farmstead, consisting of a two-story, vernacular Italianate-style gable-front house built or substantially altered in ca. 1875 (fig. 2.143). Directly across the street were the barns, which included a main barn with the gable end facing the street, unpainted hemlock siding, and stanchions for twenty-five cows (fig. 2.144). To the south was a free-standing frame silo with crane wrapping; and a poured-concrete milk and ice house with a hipped roof. East of Cream Street, behind the barns, was a large marshy area that was apparently cultivated, and pasture covering 50 acres. West of Cream Street, behind the house, were 47 acres of cultivated fields, which were divided in half by a farm road that FDR called “Pete Rohan’s Lane” (fig. 2.145). West of the fields, on sloping land along the west side of Dutchess Hill, was a 36-acre lot divided by two stone walls. The eastern part was old pasture grown to gray birch, while the western end contiguous with the Bennett Farm had mature oak woods.

In April 1938, following completion of the Rohan Farm purchase, FDR began to look into acquiring the Lent Wood Lot, a wooded 8-acre rectangular lot that adjoined the eastern boundary of the Dumphy Farm, just several feet away...
from where FDR planned to build Top Cottage. By the end of April, FDR was eager to settle on a purchase, because, as he wrote Henry Hackett, “...it is sure to leak out toward the end of May [1938] that I am thinking of putting up a small stone house on top of the hill.... The site of the house in the woods on top of the hill is so very close to the wood lot that it would be better if we could get the wood lot before people know about the house.”

The woodlot had been owned by Franklin Townsend Lent of Ganonogue, Ontario, in the Thousand Islands region, but upon his death in 1919, the property was left to his six children. Finding the six Lent heirs, and getting each to agree to sell for a reasonable price, became a long, drawn-out effort. By April 1940, FDR had acquired interest in the property from three of the heirs for $200 each, giving him majority interest; Henry Hackett reported at the time, however, that the remaining three “do not seem anxious to sell.” In September 1942, another heir, Mrs. Rose D. Lewis, agreed to sell her interest to FDR, but by January 1943, the sale had not yet been finalized. By 1945, however, another one of the heirs had agreed to sell, giving FDR four-sixths interest in the Lent Wood Lot, but not full ownership.

Despite his trouble in acquiring the Lent Wood Lot, FDR went ahead with building Top Cottage in 1938. He had already begun building his new access road to the building site two years earlier. In March 1936, he wrote that he hoped when he returned home at the end of April to lay out the “...road to Cream Street from the Val-Kill cottage.” This road, completed by 1937, was partly a reconstruction of the old Bennett farm road and an extension east to connect with Pete Rohan’s Lane, thus providing a direct connection from Springwood via the Farm Road to Cream Street. From this new road, FDR built a new entrance drive to the Top Cottage site that extended north along the west side of a stone wall. Construction of the entrance drive was substantially complete along with the main road by February 1937.

In February 1938, FDR and Daisy Suckley settled on a design for Top Cottage, and sent a sketch to Henry Toombs, the same architect who designed the cottage at Val-Kill and would soon design the FDR Library and Red Cottage for Mrs. Backer. By May, Toombs had finished the plans and specifications, and construction was begun in the summer of 1938 and completed in June 1939. The footprint of the building straddled the boundary between the Dumphy Farm and the Briggs Wood Lot, and was approximately 10 feet west of the boundary of the Lent Wood Lot. Top Cottage was a one-and-one-half-story stone cottage with large flanking wings built in FDR’s favorite Dutch Colonial Revival style. The building faced west with a broad front porch and large windows that took advantage of the expansive views into the Hudson Valley through the earlier viewshed clearing to the south and west, and filtered through the forest understory to the northwest (fig. 2.146). FDR maintained as many trees as possible on the site to retain the wooded setting. In addition to the western views, FDR could see across the fields of the Rohan...
Farm to the highlands in the east from the entrance drive. The entrance drive led up to the east side of the cottage, forming a loop that served as a turn-around and connection to the earlier Dutchess Hill road on the Dumphy Farm. Although FDR had only partial ownership in the Lent Wood Lot, the east side of the loop extended along the boundary of the Lent property.

While FDR’s main interest in the Rohan Farm was related to Top Cottage, he and Nelson Brown did not pass up the opportunity to reforest some of its old pastures that had grown up in gray birch, south and west of the fields Pete Rohan farmed and due south of Top Cottage. Nelson Brown called this area the “birch lot.” In the fall of 1938, Brown proposed that 3 acres be cleared for planting Norway spruce as Christmas trees, set out at 3½-foot spacing. FDR agreed to the plan, but suggested that some of the best gray birch be left. In preparing for the planting, Professor Sven Heiberg visited the partially cleared fields in March 1939. He recommended changing the planting from slow-starting Norway spruce to faster-growing white pine, European larch, and red pine due to the competition he anticipated from sprouting of the cut-over gray birch. Brown and FDR agreed to abandon the lot as a Christmas tree plantation, and that spring 2,000 each of red pine, white pine, and European larch were planted as Plot 57. The following summer turned out to be a drought, and only about 40 percent of the trees survived into the fall, mostly the red and white pine. For the spring of 1940, Norway spruce seedlings were planted as replacements. The next year, Nelson Brown recommended additional plantings of Norway spruce and white pine for Plot 57, but these were never planted. Plot 57 remained the only plantation on the Rohan Farm.

FDR’s Death

On April 12, 1945, FDR died unexpectedly of a cerebral hemorrhage at his Southern cottage, known as the Little White House, in Warm Springs, Georgia. His body was transported by train to Washington for a funeral service in the White House, and then to Hyde Park for burial on April 15, 1945. His coffin was brought...
by military guard on a horse-drawn caisson from the Roosevelt railroad siding, up River Road, to his specified burial site in the Rose Garden to waiting family, friends, and dignitaries (fig. 2.147).

FDR’s death occurred while planting of 20,000 trees was underway on the Jones lot (Plot 63). FDR had urged Nelson Brown the previous fall to keep up the record of tree planting despite steep wartime nursery prices and limited stocks, and he probably was looking forward to planting some of the remaining old fields on the Hughson Farm and Jones land in the years ahead, and to continue to harvest and restock his plantations of Christmas trees. FDR also had hoped to improve other parts of the estate, particularly the Home Farm, which he wanted to see run on a business-like basis and become an asset to the community. Lili Réthi and Frederick L. Rath, Jr., who published a book on FDR and Hyde Park in 1947, recalled:

Franklin Roosevelt often spoke about his wish to retire to Hyde Park. He had in mind several definite plans. Since the death of his mother he had watched with aching heart the decline of home and farm, to which he could no longer attend because of the pressure of public duties. He liked to think that by personal management he could build up the land again and make the farm pay. He wanted to take care of his trees, which were his greatest personal interest even when his mother was active manager of the home. He had planted thousands of trees and was proud that some of the timber was used for defense purposes during the war. He wanted to continue his planting and to experiment still further with the farm itself. He also wanted to finish Top Cottage, which he had built on a hill overlooking the Hudson River Valley, and to use it as a sanctuary where he could write history... He looked forward to
SUMMARY, 1928–1945

At the time of FDR’s death, the Roosevelt Estate—Crum Elbow as FDR liked to call it, and Springwood or Hyde Park as his mother had preferred—was a varied and complex property by any account. Much of this complexity had developed since FDR’s management had begun around 1911 but more so since 1928. Numerous people and entities had an interest in the family estate, either through outright ownership, life estate, or lease. Although after his mother’s death in 1941 FDR had assumed clear ownership of much of the original estate, the Kirchner Place remained separately owned by his niece, Helen Roosevelt Robinson, with a partial interest held by Mary Newbold Morgan. FDR had deeded over half of the Wheeler Place including the Springwood house to the federal government, although his family retained the right to life estate there. FDR owned the Boreel Place including the Red House, but Helen Robinson and her mother, Elizabeth Roosevelt, retained a right to life estate there. On the upland farms, FDR owned nearly all of the property outright, except for the Lent Wood Lot, in which he had been able to acquire majority but not full interest, and the buildings and other improvements at Val-Kill, which were owned by Eleanor Roosevelt, Nancy Cook, Marion Dickerman. A large part of the upland farms was leased, including the 8-acre Val-Kill lot and most of cultivated land on the Bennett, Dumphy, and Rohan Farms. FDR also leased all of the buildings outside of Val-Kill except for Top Cottage to various people, including Moses Smith, Peter Rohan, and former staff of Val-Kill Industries. There were also the rented price-controlled housing units at the Dumphy and Hughson Farms developed by G. Hall Roosevelt. Still others had interest in some of the estate buildings because they lived in them as part of their positions as estate staff. These included the head gardener William Plog who lived in the gardener’s cottage on the Wheeler Place (for nearly fifty years by 1945), the farm manager Gilbert Logan and his family at the farmhouse on the Home Farm, and the forestry supervisor Russell Linaka in the Hughson farmhouse.

The complexity of the Roosevelt Estate in 1945 was also due in large part to its varied land uses that were domestic, industrial, educational, recreational, commercial, and above all, agricultural. The domestic uses ranged from the formal setting of the Springwood house and Red House and their associated formal gardens, to rustic settings of Val-Kill and Top Cottage and the agricultural settings of the Tompkins, Bennett, Dumphy, Hughson, and Rohan farmhouses. There was even some commercial activity on the estate at the Val-Kill Tea Room and Mobilgas station on the Tompkins Farm. Educational land use was a recent introduction that began in 1941 with the opening of the Franklin D. Roosevelt
Library, but FDR had planned for further expansion of this use through his gift of the Springwood house to the federal government as a national historic site. This gift would also expand the recreational uses of the estate, building upon the mostly restful uses exemplified by the numerous drives, bridle paths, and trails. Agriculture remained a dominant land use, despite the decline of the Home Farm following Sara Roosevelt’s death in 1941.

As an agricultural land use, forestry dominated much of the estate landscape. Still underway in 1945 through the informal management of Nelson Brown and the on-site supervision of Russell Linaka, FDR’s forestry program encompassed approximately eighty-one plantations in which more than 551,810 trees had been planted since 1912. While the plantations set out for traditional reforestation and timber purposes still had not reached maturity, many of the Christmas tree plantations that characterized plantings after 1934 were reaching marketable age. A number of experimental plantations, including the 1938 Asian chestnut plantation and several experimental plantations set out by the College of Forestry, were still being studied, while the plantations along Violet Avenue and the Post Road were still serving the demonstration purposes for which they had been established. Lastly, the hundreds of acres of woodlots on the estate, while partially harvested in 1942 and 1944, still had significant amounts of maturing timber that needed continued management.

FDR’s forestry program was thus still a work in progress—what Nelson Brown considered a unique example of private American forestry practice that he hoped the Roosevelt children might carry on. FDR’s forestry was unique among private efforts in the sense of its association with a president, as well as the involvement of the New York State College of Forestry. While FDR had not been a pioneer in forestry, he was an early practitioner who closely followed advances in the state program that dominated the profession in New York. FDR’s forestry bridged the late nineteenth-century origins of the profession at country estates with the maturation and institutionalization of the profession that developed through the 1920s and 1930s. Paralleling the efforts of pioneering practitioners such as Frederick Billings and expansive state programs such as New York’s, FDR had hoped to illustrate that forestry could make farming in the Hudson Valley a profitable enterprise once again through experimentation, demonstration, and production. Despite its inherent soundness, FDR’s forestry program would not be able to support the perpetuation of the estate as an agricultural property, due in large part to the way in which it was subdivided by his estate trustees in the context of sprawling suburban development that occurred in the years after 1945.
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SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT, 1945–1970

FDR’s death in April 1945 began a tumultuous period in the history of the Roosevelt Estate that witnessed the transformation of much of its landscape through subdivision and development. Although most of these changes occurred during the 1950s and 1960s, the transformation traced back to FDR’s lifetime, beginning with his division of the estate in 1939 for the FDR Library and his 1943 gift of the Springwood house to the federal government, which opened to the public as the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site in 1946. Most of all, FDR’s will and its instructions for the disposition of his real estate laid the foundation for the transformation: between 1947 and 1963, his estate trustees directed the sale of all Roosevelt Estate lands with the exception of a portion of the Kirchner Place, which did not belong to FDR. Family ownership fell from 1,381 acres to 179 acres, and the estate changed from a rural landscape to a suburban patchwork. While agriculture and forestry were replaced by commercial and residential land uses, roughly half of the land remained undeveloped, some of it preserved as additions to the national historic site.

The transformation of the Roosevelt Estate landscape was also due to changes in the regional economy and land use, family dynamics, and the loss of FDR’s guiding vision for the property, where he hoped to continue his farming and forestry, and live at Top Cottage. Soon after FDR’s death, the National Park Service tried unsuccessfully to prevent development that would impact the historic rural setting of the national historic site at Springwood, but the estate trustees did not share this concern. The original estate lands were soon sold out of the family, while on the upland farms, Eleanor Roosevelt and her son, Elliott, retained ownership and continued farming and forestry there as Val-Kill Farms. This enterprise failed within a few years and Elliott sold most of the land to developers by 1952.

Two parts of the estate continued to serve as residences for the Roosevelt family during much of this period. The Red House was Elizabeth Riley Roosevelt’s country home until her death in 1948, and was retained by her daughter, Helen Roosevelt Robinson, until her death in 1962. Eleanor Roosevelt made Val-Kill her permanent home, and Roosevelts continued to live on the property through 1965, following Eleanor’s death in 1962. Val-Kill, which included 179 acres on the Bennett and Tompkins Farms, remained the last family-owned part of the estate until 1970, when John Roosevelt sold the property to developers.¹
SUBURBAN DEVELOPMENT

In the quarter decade following FDR’s death, Hyde Park was dramatically changed from a rural community with an economy dependent on agriculture and the river estates, to a suburban community dependent largely on new industrial jobs in the Poughkeepsie area and retail and construction work within Hyde Park. By the 1970s, numerous housing developments, encompassing thousands of single-family houses, were built throughout the town on farm fields and in wooded areas (fig. 2.148). The Post Road from Teller’s Hill south to Poughkeepsie was widened to four lanes, and a new connector road, Saint Andrews Road, was built in ca. 1968 to the south of the Roosevelt Estate between the Post Road and Violet Avenue through the land once owned by the Saint Andrew-on-Hudson Seminary and Novitiate (formerly Novitiate of Saint Andrew), which closed in 1969. Much of the Post Road became lined with commercial strip development extending south from the old village center of Hyde Park through the Roosevelt Estate. Population growth in Hyde Park reflected the postwar suburban development. In 1940, the town had 4,056 residents, a third of whom lived in the unincorporated village center. Following the war, the population jumped to 6,136 by 1950, and by 1960 had more than doubled to 12,681. By 1970, when Roosevelt family ownership ended in Hyde Park, the population had quadrupled to 16,697.2

Much of this growth was fueled by the development of an IBM factory in Poughkeepsie, as well as by tourist trade based in large part on the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Vanderbuilt Mansion National Historic Sites. Across the country, many working and middle-class people chose to live outside of traditional urban centers such as Poughkeepsie in the postwar years due to a complex set of influences, including suburban economic and land-use incentives.

Figure 2.148. Suburban development in Hyde Park within and surrounding the Roosevelt Estate on a 1964 USGS survey map updated to 1980. Compare with the 1934 USGS survey (fig. 2.83). Most of the pink areas were developed by 1970. (Detail, 1964 U.S. Geological Survey Rhinebeck quadrangle updated to 1980, annotated by SUNY ESF.)
at the local, state, and federal levels, and expansion of the highway network, all fueled by a postwar economic boom. Suburban development was also backed by a longstanding idealization of rural living in American culture. This was evident in the marketing strategy of the real estate firm of Joseph P. Day, which was hired by FDR’s estate trustees to sell off portions of the estate. In a suggested advertising campaign, Day described the Hyde Park as “...the place to develop an ideal rural community.”

Despite the marked changes that occurred after World War II in Hyde Park, suburban development patterns had begun well before the war, as evident in the residential subdivision begun on the Wright Farm north of Val-Kill in the 1930s. FDR had apparently felt that suburban development was appropriate for Hyde Park, at least in part. He had struggled with how to preserve some of the river estates, such as the Vanderbilt’s Hyde Park, but he and many others probably felt that keeping the estates intact was simply no longer feasible. As Eleanor Roosevelt wrote in her “My Day” column for August 1, 1945: “...The custom which existed for a time in this country, of having large places which cost a great deal of money and produced nothing beyond what one family used on their table, has always seemed to me a very wasteful tradition, and I am glad that it is rapidly disappearing.”

The Rogers Estate, Crumwold Farms, due north of the Roosevelt Estate, was one of the river estates that FDR felt should be redeveloped for suburban housing. In 1941, just before the Army took over the estate as part of wartime security in Hyde Park, FDR wrote: “...I am saying very little about it but I hope that the Rogers’ place can eventually become an experimental demonstration place for suburban housing, gardening, etc.” Owners of estates and other large tracts of countryside looked forward to profits that such development could bring. An article from the November 24, 1945 edition of the New York Times, entitled “Subdividing Lifts Value of Estates,” reported on the financial benefits that owners of several large estates on Long Island had received through selling their property based on planned suburban subdivisions.

By the mid-1950s, a substantial portion of the Rogers Estate had been subdivided and developed into tracts of single-family homes through an entity known as Crumwold Acres Development Corporation. This development first occurred on the estate’s polo fields west of the Post Road adjoining the mansion, and then by 1960 had extended onto the farm on the east side of the road adjoining the Roosevelt Home Farm and through the woods east toward Violet Avenue.
Although the mansion at the Vanderbilt Estate had been preserved as a national historic site, its farm component on the east side of the Post Road, surrounding St. James Church, was also subdivided for suburban housing during this period. The much smaller Bellefield remained intact as the private residence of Mary Newbold Morgan and her husband Gerald Morgan, who left the property to their son, Gerald Morgan, Jr. The Morgans maintained the rural setting of Bellefield through acquisition of a large field to their north from the Rogers Estate in 1935 and the wooded tract to the west from FDR’s estate in 1949.

**FORESTRY AND CONSERVATION**

While forestry at the Roosevelt Estate largely ceased after World War II, reforestation in the Northeast reached high annual rates of planting from the late 1940s through the 1950s, due in part to continued farmland abandonment and state and federal incentives to encourage private landowners to plant trees. These postwar years, however, were characterized by decreasing state involvement in forestry and reforestation in particular. This contrasted with the decades prior to World War II in which there was heavy public investment, in part to demonstrate the benefits of forestry for private landowners. As the Society of American Foresters published in its 1960 account, *American Forestry: Six Decades of Growth*, “The evangelical period is largely over. Forest management is an accepted thing.” In the decade following this account, however, traditional forestry in the Northeast, including reforestation and management of native woodlands, was being challenged in a number of ways, including decline in governmental support, and increasing interest in wilderness and farmland preservation.

For several years immediately following World War II, reforestation in New York State was depressed due to lack of tree stock stemming from curtailment of production at the state nurseries during the war. In 1947, however, the state revived its Enlarged Reforestation Program, begun almost two decades earlier during FDR’s term as governor but suspended during the war years. While the state expended more than a million dollars a year for the program through 1957, it put an increasing percentage of this money into maintenance of its existing plantations and natural stands, and operation of the nurseries, rather than in establishing new plantations. Despite the smaller state reforestation and land acquisition program, tree planting on private land, particularly farms, was reaching an all-time high in the postwar years. During the 1950s, the state nurseries distributed 162.5 million trees to individuals, compared with only 27.2 million used for state reforestation purposes. While this was the second lowest rate of planting by the state per decade (the 1920s were slightly lower), it was more than twice the largest previous distribution to individuals since recordkeeping began in 1900 (table 2.2). By 1960, total private planting statewide was expected
to reach 60 million trees per year. This substantial private effort was due in large part to financial incentives provided through the federal Soil Bank Program, which ended in 1961. After this time, total reforestation began to gradually decline. By 1967, reforestation on private land in New York State had fallen, but still amounted to a substantial 15,259,000 trees annually. In comparison, state reforestation work declined markedly, with only 1,976,000 trees planted that year.

Following FDR’s practices of the late 1930s and 1940s, an increasing percentage of planting by farmers after World War II was for the production of Christmas trees, rather than for long-term timber production. By 1959, much of the roughly 40,000 acres being reforested per year on private lands in New York was for Christmas tree production. Scotch pine and white spruce, both highly preferred for Christmas trees in the 1950s, became the leading species distributed from state nurseries during this time. Balsam fir was difficult to grow for many farmers because it required colder climates typical of higher elevations in New York, and the Norway spruce had probably become unpopular because it tended to lose needles once cut.

The high rate of private reforestation and Christmas tree planting through the 1950s also reflected the continuing rapid abandonment of farmland in New York State for traditional agriculture. By 1959, commercial farm acreage in the state was reported at 13.5 million acres—a decrease of 4.5 million acres since 1930, equivalent to an annual yearly decline of 150,000 acres per year. Since 1880, 9.5 million acres of farmland had been abandoned—roughly a third of the state land area. The continued loss of farmland following World War II did not, however, raise the same level of concern for the state as it had earlier in the century. The reasons for this were varied, but had much to do with the decreasing importance of agriculture both to the economy and communities of the state; advancing agricultural technologies that increased productivity, thus requiring fewer acres; the increasing value of farmland for non-productive uses, such as suburban residential and commercial development; and the continued shift of population and political power to metropolitan areas. The abandonment of productive farmland and resulting natural regeneration of woodlands was also increasingly viewed as a positive development that restored wildlife habitat and native ecosystems. Such thinking was in keeping with a gradual shift in conservation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Percent of Total Tree Distributed</th>
<th>Total trees in millions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-10</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910-20</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-30</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-40</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-50</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-55</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-55</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-59</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled from Annual Reports of Conservation Department. The breakdown for Non-State distribution for 1956-59 is not available in the Reports.
values in the mid- and late twentieth century from the earlier wise-use philosophy toward ecological preservation and less intense management of natural resources.

**THE ROOSEVELT ESTATE, 1945–1970**

During the year following FDR’s death on April 12, 1945 and his subsequent burial ceremony in the Rose Garden, many of the functions of the estate continued on, including tree planting and agriculture at the Home Farm and tenant farms. The wartime security system was reduced soon after his funeral, and most of the features were removed following the end of the National Emergency on September 11, 1945. At the time, the government relinquished ownership to 139 poles, 44 posts, 17 anchors, and 46 guys, most of which were removed and salvaged, but some were abandoned in place.18

The transformation of the Roosevelt Estate lands during this period began with opening of the Springwood house and surrounding 33 acres of the Wheeler Place as the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site on April 12, 1946, exactly one year after FDR’s death (fig. 2.150). The site, previously designated by the Secretary of the Interior on January 27, 1944, was based on the gift of the land by FDR to the people of the United States in November 1943, and enabling legislation passed through a Joint Resolution of Congress in 1939. The main attraction of the site was the Springwood house, FDR’s birthplace and lifelong home, and his gravesite in the hedge-enclosed Rose Garden. A large white Vermont marble gravestone, which FDR designed himself, was installed in October 1945 (fig. 2.151). The Home of FDR became a pilgrimage for many thousands of visitors every year, with total visitation reaching 4 million by 1962.19

In 1947, a year after the opening of the national historic site, the Roosevelt family decided not to retain ownership of all of FDR’s Hyde Park real estate. This set into motion a marketing campaign by the trustees of FDR’s legal estate to sell off the property. Elliott Roosevelt, Eleanor’s favorite child and widely seen as a flamboyant personality stemming from his multiple marriages and many business enterprises, took the family lead in sale and development of much of the estate, including the frontage along the Post Road across from the national historic
Following his brief stint with farming under the business entitled Val-Kill Farms, a large part of the upland farms was developed with single-family houses. Despite this, a substantial part of the estate was not developed due in part to efforts by the National Park Service and preservation organizations, as well as the rough topography of the land which made development difficult.

**Disposition of FDR’s Hyde Park Real Estate**

At the time of FDR’s death on April 12, 1945, his Hyde Park real estate amounted to 1,283 acres. This included all of the Roosevelt Estate except for three parcels: the Library parcel (16.3 acres belonging to the National Archives), the national historic site (33.2 acres belonging to the National Park Service, but still occupied by the Roosevelt family), and the Kirchner Place (97.52 acres owned by FDR’s niece, Helen Roosevelt Robinson). Although FDR owned the Boreel Place west of the Post Road containing the Red House, Elizabeth Riley Roosevelt and her daughter, Helen Robinson, held the right to successive life estate on the property.

The disposition of all of the rest of FDR’s Hyde Park real estate was turned over to the trustees of his legal estate in 1947, per the provisions of his will. FDR had appointed his son, James Roosevelt, and two friends and former law partners, Basil O’Connor and Henry T. Hackett, as his trustees and executors, who served through the New York City law firm of O’Connor and Farber. Under article ten of his will, FDR authorized them to “…sell at public or private sale or sales and to lease, mortgage or exchange all of any part of my estate, wheresoever situate, at such times and such terms and conditions as they, in their sole discretion, may deem advisable…” The trustees were charged by FDR to “…hold, manage, sell, exchange, invest, and reinvest the same, and every part thereof, and to collect, recover and receive the rents, issues, profits, interest and income thereof…”

Income from the estate went to Eleanor Roosevelt and presumably other family members, and was not used to support the FDR Library or national historic site. The trustees interpreted the will to exclude the possibility of gifting any of the real estate, and thus Roosevelt family members could only purchase property, rather than inherit it without cost. This interpretation contrasted with intentions that FDR had expressed in 1943 when he gifted 33 acres of the Wheeler Place as a national historic site. At the time, FDR wrote that he would bequeath all of the remaining estate lands to his family, and if they wished to sell the lands, they would first offer them for sale to the United States government.

One of the trustees’ first acts in disposing of FDR’s Hyde Park real estate was to complete an appraisal that itemized fair market value for each of the parcels as of April 12, 1945, the day FDR died. For the year following FDR’s death, the trustees made little other movement on the Hyde Park real estate as they dealt with matters such as settling financial resources and estate taxes. They were also
Roosevelt estate Historic Resource study responsible for the continued operation of the farm and maintenance of the property. After this first year, however, the trustees began to research possible uses for the land to optimize financial returns. An accountant from the Fulton Trust Company provided his assessment in May 1946 that a small-scale agricultural operation could be kept up at the Home Farm, possibly including a Christmas tree operation. For the upland farms, however, the bank advised Earle Koons, the real estate consultant for the trustees, that “...there is a long road to be traveled before those farm properties could be placed on a paying basis and that considerable money will be required for cleaning up purposes alone.”

Despite these findings, Eleanor Roosevelt’s initial inclination was to retain all of the estate lands in family ownership, including the land west of the Post Road surrounding the national historic site, as FDR had originally intended. On April 1, 1946, the trustees reached an agreement with her for a one-year lease of all of the estate lands until March 31, 1947, providing for an option to buy at not less than the appraised value. On May 3, 1946, Eleanor wrote the estate trustees to clarify that she would be given this option: “When you are ready to sell, I understand that before offering the property for sale to anyone else, you will accord me the opportunity to purchase all of the property East of the Albany Post Road [Home Farm and upland farms] and below the hill to the River [west end of Wheeler Place, Rogers Land]....” Eleanor, however, soon reduced the scope of her potential purchase, probably based on discussions with her son, Elliott Roosevelt, who was devising a farming business for the upland farms and speculative real estate development for the Post Road corridor. On May 15, 1946, Eleanor wrote to the trustees’ real estate consultant Earle Koons that she would only be interested in buying the upland farms, not the remainder of the Wheeler Place and Rogers Land, or the Home Farm. Nine months later, on February 18, 1947, Eleanor confirmed her offer to purchase all of the real estate east of the Maritje Kill (including Val-Kill and Top Cottage), amounting to 842.20 acres (fig. 2.152). The trustees approved a contract for sale of this property to Eleanor on April 1, 1947 at a price of $85,000, $680 less than the appraised value as of April 12, 1945. On August 15, 1947, title to the property was closed, and Eleanor immediately signed an agreement to sell the same parcel to Elliott Roosevelt, subject to a $37,000 mortgage that she took out for him, for the purposes of “...entering into the business of farming said property.” As part of this agreement, Eleanor retained the right of life estate at Val-Kill.

With Eleanor Roosevelt’s purchase of the upland farms, the estate trustees soon began to advertise the rest of the property for sale. Despite her concern that such advertisement would make it appear that the family was trying to maximize profits, the trustees decided to proceed as planned. They interpreted FDR’s will as requiring them to seek the highest bidder, together confiding that they were “...under a duty to try to realize the best price obtainable for the property.”
apparently did not first offer the land to the United States government as FDR had once intended. By March 8, 1947, the month after Eleanor had confirmed her offer to purchase the upland farms, a purchase offer for the lands to the west surrounding the national historic site was made by a group of local developers, identified by the trustees as the Nisonger-Boos offer. This offer, amounting to $100,000 for 420 acres on the Wheeler Place, Rogers Land, and Home Farm, was for a proposed “high-class” residential and hotel development. Two other purchase offers were also made at this time for portions of the property.30

The prospect of development surrounding the national historic site quickly raised the concern of the National Park Service. Park superintendent George Palmer presented to the trustees with the park’s desire to have all of the property to the rear of the historic site west of the Post Road, and all the property along the east side of the Post Road to a depth of 800 feet, maintained in its then-present condition.31 On March 15, 1947, estate trustee Basil O’Connor wrote to Secretary of the Interior Julius H. Krug concerning these restrictions, and suggested that the federal government acquire the subject land as the best way to protect the park. Secretary Krug wrote back to O’Connor on April 11 that federal acquisition would only be possible through donation, since it was unlikely Congress would appropriate funds for purchasing the property. Krug argued that the trustees should make use of “scenic easement deeds,” similar to those used upon lands along national parkways, or place restrictive covenants in the deeds to prevent all forms of industrial and commercial uses, and to prohibit power lines, signs, and the removal of mature trees. Krug recommended that only farm or residential uses be allowed, and that development proposals be subject to review by the National
Park Service. He wrote to O'Connor: “Such restrictions, I agree, would seriously affect the sale value of the property. I believe it is understood, however, that the potentialities for commercial development, brought about by the establishment of the Historic Site and its great attraction to the public since the late President’s death, have increased the value of the lands and created the situation which it is sought to avoid...” 32 (The complete letter is found in Appendix D.)

Basil O’Connor forwarded Secretary Krug’s letter to Eleanor or Elliott Roosevelt, apparently asking if the beneficiaries and guardians of the estate (meaning the family) would consider giving the unspecified lands to the government, but given the trustees’ stated intent to maximize returns, it is doubtful this option was seriously considered. The National Park Service’s proposed restrictions on development, however, apparently dissuaded the Nisonger-Boos group from purchasing the property. The trustees noted, “If restrictions on use requested by Secretary of the Interior Krug were placed on the property they [Nisonger-Boos] would not be interested in purchasing it...the land would not be worth more than $10,000 with the Department of the Interior restrictions.”33

To better manage the planned sale of property, the trustees hired a New York City real estate company, Joseph P. Day, Inc., in the spring of 1947 to assess and market the property. The trustees also turned to the company for its advice on the restrictions proposed by the Secretary of the Interior. The company recommended that the trustees should agree to some limited restrictions, but apparently did not endorse the idea of selling scenic easement deeds or inserting restrictions on commercial development. Based on a report by the Day company, the trustees agreed to include restrictions against industrial and manufacturing establishments, machine shops, slaughterhouses, and public garages for the storage or repair of vehicles, and also included a 100-foot setback from the Post Road where buildings, signs, and structures would be prohibited, purportedly to preserve the roadside trees.34 As trustee James Roosevelt wrote, “I have read over the report from Mr. Bernard P. Day with great care. After considerable thought and some feeling of personal unhappiness, I am inclined to agree that it is not our business to place restrictions beyond those suggested in the requirements of the sale.”35

The trustees soon moved ahead with only these minimal restrictions, apparently not again considering the Secretary of the Interior’s recommendations. The park had threatened to take the issue to the Surrogate Court (which had final approval for settlement of the estate) for a definite ruling, but it apparently did not pursue this option. In September 1947, Joseph P. Day, Inc. produced a report for the trustees with the objective “…to develop a plan for a sales campaign, and make recommendations on the specific areas...so that they may be offered for sale to the best advantage...”36 In its report, Day proposed a subdivision plan, which the trustees accepted (fig. 2.153). The Home Farm was marketed as the “East Tract,”
consisting of 258.54 acres with an assessed value of $44,630 but to be marketed for $55,000. The Post Road frontage was subdivided into six lots, and the interior lands to the east were subdivided into four tracts laid out along the existing woods roads according to a survey completed in May 1948. According to Day, “...it is obvious that the frontage on the Albany Post Road has the greatest potential use, not only because of the possibility of commercial development, but also because it is well cleared land, the cost of development is lower than other portions of the tract.” Day’s plan also proposed widening Newbold Road and Farm Road to make possible “complete development of interior land” (land east of the Post Road parcels), although the company noted that development there “...will be very difficult because of the swampy nature of much of the terrain and the numerous rock outcroppings.”

From the property comprising the Wheeler Place west of the national historic site (Gravel Lot and River Wood Lot) and the Rogers Land, the Day company assembled the “West Tract,” consisting of 113.10 acres assessed at $6,470, but to be marketed for $15,000. Day reported that this was “...fairly good building land, but heavily overgrown with second growth timber. The proximity to the main line of the New York Central Railroad is a definite drawback, as is the fact that this tract is low lying as compared with the plateau along the Post Road. Approximately 1000’ from the Railroad there is an escarpment, to the east of which there are many building sites.” The report noted that the only existing access was through a right-of-way along the separately owned Stone Cottage Road, which Day described as being unsuitable because it was “narrow, twisting, and uneven.” In addition to the West Tract, the 6.4-acre strip of land along the

---

Figure 2.153. Sketch map by Joseph P. Day, Inc. showing proposed subdivision of FDR’s real estate west of the Maritje Kill (labeled as Mariches Creek), September 1947. This plan was subsequently transcribed into a subdivision plan for the property. (O’Connor and Farber Papers, Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.)
northern boundary of the Boreel Place (drainage lot originally subdivided per James Roosevelt’s will of 1900) bordering the national historic site was offered for sale as a right-of-way from the Post Road to the Hudson River. Day recommended that the West Tract be offered for sale in its entirety with the 6.4-acre strip, noting that the property overall posed “...a very real problem and it is doubtful that a purchaser can be found who would buy it (excepting an adjoining owner) unless the strip of 6.9 acres to the south is included.”

Joseph P. Day, Inc. also proposed immediately beginning an “intensive private sales campaign” to last until the spring of 1948, using direct mailing and general advertising. In March 1948, the company proposed advertising the West Tract as “Ideal for Summer Camp,” having “...all of the beauty nature and the lovely Hudson Valley can provide.” For the Post Road frontage of the East Tract, Day’s suggested text was that the land was “A most unusual opportunity for development into high-volume, big-profit business!... Ideal location for modern tourist accommodations, restaurants, large retail sales outlets.” Day suggested the interior parcels be developed as a “rural community, perhaps for seasonal use.” The trustees apparently decided not to run this text, perhaps based on Eleanor Roosevelt’s earlier objections, instead choosing subdued advertisements that directed people to Joseph P. Day, Inc. for further details (fig. 2.154). On April 14, 1948, Day wrote the trustees that it had ordered a sign to be erected directly opposite the entrance to the library, advertising the property for sale.

The first buyer in the Day sales campaign was Elliott Roosevelt, who purchased the entire East Tract (Home Farm) through his New York City–based business named “Val-Kill Company” (fig. 2.155). Under this same company, Elliott would run his farming operation, Val-Kill Farms (see following section on the upland farms). He signed a contract of sale on May 17, 1948, which the trustees approved at their meeting on June 10, noting: “It was unanimously agreed that the contract price of $115,000 for that property was a fair price and in accordance with the recommendations of Joseph P. Day, Inc. probably the best price that could be realized for the property.” The deed for the 258.54 acres, executed on July 6, 1948, contained the limited restrictions agreed to by the trustees, including the 100-foot setback, and they made no further stipulations about how the property should be subdivided and developed.

As anticipated, the West Tract proved to be a more difficult sale for the trustees. Unlike the East Tract, the trustees were not able to sell it in its entirety. On January 18, 1949, they decided to sell a portion of it to Mary Newbold Morgan. She signed a contract of sale with the Day company for the Rogers Land that FDR had purchased in 1935, due west of her home, Bellefield (see fig. 2.155). Consisting of 52.64 acres with a right-of-way along Stone Cottage Road from the Post Road to the Hudson River, Morgan finalized her purchase on January 21, 1949, for a cost of $7,000.

Figure 2.154. Newspaper advertisement by Joseph P. Day, Inc. for sale of the Roosevelt Estate lands west of the Maritje Kill. (New York Times, May 2, 1948.)

60.46 acres, the Day company was not successful in finding any buyers, either to develop it for housing or as a summer camp with access through the 6.4-acre right-of-way along the drainage lot. Even if a developer had voiced interest in purchasing this property, the National Park Service was undoubtedly putting pressure on the trustees not to develop this land or the right-of-way given the proximity to the national historic site and viewshed from the Springwood house. In August 1950, the trustees received a report from park superintendent George Palmer that there was a “group in Washington” interested in purchasing the remaining land in the West Tract as an addition to the national historic site.46 This group was the Franklin D. Roosevelt Foundation, established in 1939 by the president’s friends for building the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, and later merged with several other organizations to form the Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Institute. In ca. 1952, the foundation purchased the 60.46-acre property from the trustees for an unknown amount, but not the 6.4-acre right-of-way. The foundation presented the property as a gift to the National Park Service on December 29, 1952 as the first addition to the national historic site.47

The 6.4-acre right-of-way parcel (drainage lot) was apparently held by the trustees for some time, perhaps in anticipation of the future sale of the Boreel Place (J. R. Roosevelt Place), which, although owned by the trustees, remained subject to the life estate of Helen Roosevelt Robinson following the death of her mother, Elizabeth Riley Roosevelt, on July 19, 1948. Under the terms of FDR’s will, the Boreel Place would pass to the control of the trustees upon the death of Helen Robinson or her failure to use or occupy the property. At their annual meeting of July 20, 1948, the trustees acknowledged Elizabeth’s death and calculated that Helen Robinson, then aged sixty-seven, had a life expectancy of another ten years. Henry T. Hackett reported that he would “keep in close touch with the situation.”48 Although on September 24, 1948 Helen Robinson sold a portion of the adjoining Kirchner Place, which she owned outright, she retained the rest of the property and continued to use the Red House as her seasonal home for another fifteen years. On July 8, 1962, Helen Robinson died and the Boreel Place reverted to the trustees, whose affairs were still managed through the law firm of
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Figure 2.155. Map of the estate parcels (shaded in gray) sold through the trustees of FDR’s estate between 1948 and 1952. (SUNY ESF)
O’Connor and Farber. Helen Robinson at the time of her death still owned the northern half of the Kirchner Place, amounting to 37 acres.

Upon Helen’s death, the trustees decided to combine the still-unsold 6.4-acre right-of-way parcel (drainage lot) with the rest of the Boreel Place, and also acquired Helen’s 37 acres of the Kirchner Place, together forming a 144.5-acre parcel (fig. 2.156). As with the earlier land sales of the late 1940s and early 1950s, the estate trustees saw their role being “...to get the best price obtainable for the property.”49 Although FDR had once expressed the hope that the property would remain in the family, the Roosevelt family was either not approached by the trustees, or exhibited no interest in owning the Boreel Place.50 In December 1962, the trustees completed a survey of the entire Robinson property and then began marketing the property, which raised the concern of the National Park Service. On January 9, 1963, James K. Carr, Undersecretary of the Interior, wrote to O’Connor and Farber: “The Department of the Interior is vitally interested in preventing the use of this property in a manner which would be detrimental to the historic site, either through acquisition by the United States Government or some other means.”51 James Roosevelt, recently elected to Congress and still an estate trustee, worked this time in support of the government’s acquisition of the property. However, he faced strong local opposition to removing additional property from the tax rolls, especially since there were developers interested in the property for commercial purposes (it was zoned for general business purposes to a depth of 300 feet from the Post Road).52 On February 15, 1963, developer Bernard Kessler, together with his brother Sidney, submitted a purchase offer for the 144.5-acre parcel for $151,500. In response, the Department of the Interior, with the assistance of James Roosevelt, offered $180,000 for the property on March 15, 1963. James Roosevelt recommended the trustees accept this offer. However, later that same week, the trustees received a bid by Patrick & Lavery Real Estate of Poughkeepsie for $185,000, and then on April 5, 1963, the Kesslers upped their offer to $190,000. The trustees apparently gave in to the higher bids and local opposition to federal ownership, and accepted the Kesslers’ offer on May 8, 1963.53 Congressman James Roosevelt continued to assist with the Department of the Interior’s interest in the property, and within a year, federal legislation was passed allowing the National
Park Service to take ownership of the west part of the Kessler property through condemnation. This property, consisting of 94 acres, formed the viewshed from the Springwood house (see fig. 2.156).\textsuperscript{54} The Kessler brothers retained the Red House and Post Road frontage, where they planned commercial and residential development.

With the sale of the Boreel and Kirchner Places to Bernard and Sidney Kessler in 1963, the trustees had completed their final disposition of FDR’s Hyde Park real estate. These transactions from the trustees were, however, only the first of many subsequent subdivisions on the Roosevelt Estate lands that would result in substantial commercial and residential development beginning in the late 1940s.

Val-Kill Farms and the Fate of FDR’s Forestry Program

Nelson C. Brown, FDR’s longtime forestry consultant, cared deeply about the fate of the Roosevelt Estate plantations and managed forests, and was aware of the threat posed by the pending sale and subdivision of the estate lands. Soon after FDR’s death in April 1945, Brown wrote to Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes suggesting that he consider establishing a memorial forest at the estate to commemorate FDR’s interest in forest conservation. Ickes wrote to Brown on July 6, 1945 giving his full concurrence for the idea, but Brown wrote back two weeks later stating that the memorial forest would not be necessary, since he had recently learned that FDR’s son, Elliott Roosevelt, planned on continuing FDR’s forestry program.\textsuperscript{55} 

Nelson Brown and his wife, Alice V. Baker, had spent a weekend with Elliott and Eleanor discussing FDR’s forestry program and making plans for its continued operation and his continued assistance. On June 30, 1945, Brown wrote to Eleanor:

...We were also delighted to learn that you are sending one of the President’s compasses that will serve as a very nice keepsake of a most happy and pleasant relationship with him since the Fall of 1929. You have no idea how I miss those pleasant drives we took and the many stimulating conversations together in the woods. As stated when we enjoyed the very pleasant weekend with you and the General [Elliott], I shall be very glad to follow through with my interest in continuance of the President’s forestry plans at Hyde Park. I was particularly delighted to know that Elliott wants to carry on with the family tradition and I hope that I can be helpful in making further plans and in assisting him in his forestry work.\textsuperscript{56}

Brown soon began making plans for the next planting season, spring of 1946, coordinating with Eleanor and Elliott, as well as with FDR’s forest manager, Russell Linaka, who was staying on. Eleanor’s main interest in the plantations was for producing revenue. In her “My Day” column of August 1, 1945, she wrote:
“The results of the years during which my husband bought woodland and planted trees are now beginning to show. While trees are never a spectacularly profitable crop, they certainly are an interesting one, and I think ours should begin now to produce some more adequate returns.” For the 1946 season, Eleanor and Brown agreed to continue an emphasis on Christmas tree production, in keeping not only with the emphasis of FDR’s reforestation work in his latter years, but also with statewide trends in private forestry. On July 30, 1945, Nelson Brown wrote the New York State Conservation Department to inquire about placing an order for “about 20,000” trees, writing: “...General Elliott Roosevelt is going to carry on the work of his father on the place and he is very keenly interested in developments there. We would prefer the have Douglas fir, balsam fir and Canadian white spruce [Christmas tree species].... Both Douglas fir and balsam fir have done very well according to past experience at Hyde Park....”

In October 1945, Brown met with Eleanor at Hyde Park to go over planting for the spring 1946 season, and she approved an order for 500 Nikko fir, 5,000 Canadian white spruce, and 500 concolor (white) fir. Russell Linaka and a number of hired hands began to clear the fields on the Jones Land for planting. In keeping with his role under FDR, Brown also made arrangements for harvesting and marketing Christmas trees, as well as management of the other plantations. In December 1945, he wrote to Eleanor stating his plans to “…spend a short while looking over the cutting of trees for Christmas to obtain the number we have secured from each plot, together with prices and other conditions, and also to lay out the white pine thinning job in the woods that you and I looked over briefly when I was last with you....” A total of 40,000 Christmas trees were harvested that year and marketed largely in New York City.

The 6,500 trees for the spring planting arrived in March 1946 from the nurseries of the New York State College of Forestry, rather than from the state Conservation Department nurseries, whose stock had become depleted during the war years. Brown noted that this was the smallest amount planted for “…a good many years and we are very fortunate to get these...trees. There are no trees available for Christmas tree planting from the large State nursery where we usually obtain them, such as from the Saratoga Nurseries.” Brown came to Hyde Park to assist Russell Linaka with the planting on April 11 and 12. He followed up with a letter to Elliott Roosevelt to submit the bill for planting and to make plans for meeting “…to explain some of the things in detail. In following out these forestry plans, I want to keep down expenses to a minimum, as overhead must be accounted for. I also want to demonstrate, if possible, that we can make a little money out of Christmas trees.” At the time, the condition of the forest plantations was not good, owing to lack of maintenance that had probably occurred not only since FDR’s death, but also during the war years. In the spring of 1946, a report by the
Fulton Trust Company to the estate trustees on the running of the estate provided the following assessment of the plantations:

...This entire project [forest plantations], as far as I could determine, has been neglected insofar as care is concerned; weeds and various types of bushes have grown in which would need, according to Mr. [Russell] Linaka, two or three men working a couple of years to get back into shape. He also stated that a large number of trees would never be fit to use or sell as Christmas trees, and that it would take some number of years to get any sizeable amount of money from sales.62

Despite the negative economic report, Elliott Roosevelt, with Eleanor’s support, continued to develop plans for expanding the forestry program as part of his planned Val-Kill Farms operation. Elliott’s plans for Val-Kill Farms were probably set by May 1946, when Eleanor announced to the trustees that she would purchase the 842 acres east of the Maritje Kill. She also inquired at the same time about terminating the leases of the renters on that property, “...since the farmer who is at the Postroad [sic] farm [Home Farm] will have to be moved with all the equipment, cattle, chickens, etc., which we will own, to Moses Smith’s farm....”63

Although Eleanor’s purchase of the upland farms and her immediate transfer of the land to Elliott would not be finalized until August 15, 1947, Elliott began to make improvements for the new farm operation in the summer of 1946 with fencing of cattle pasture.64 Perhaps because of preoccupation with planning the farm operation, or due to low tree stocks, no tree planting was undertaken in the spring of 1947. Elliott did, however, harvest more than 50,000 Christmas trees for the 1946 Christmas season.65

With finalization of their purchase of the estate land in August 1947, Eleanor and Elliott publicized their expansive plans for Val-Kill Farms, which called for transforming the small-scale tenant agricultural operations on the Bennett, Dumphy, and Hughson Farms into a high-production, commercial enterprise. Eleanor Roosevelt announced that she and Elliott were launching a new era of business: “...We cannot afford to keep it just as a country place in the way that my husband’s mother did.... We now hope to run the farm on a large enough scale to make it a real business.... Elliott and I feel strongly that one should not own land unless it produces.... Perhaps the reason I enjoy this idea is that there always seems to be a certain stability about farming....”66 In addition to Christmas trees, plans called for beef, pork, poultry, dairy, and grain production. The centerpiece of the farm was to be 500 head of Texas beef cattle, which were to be pastured on 300 acres of cleared woodland fenced by larch (tamarack) posts harvested from the estate. The Bennett Farm, to be vacated by Moses Smith, was to become the center of the dairy and poultry operation. By the spring of 1948, Elliott had stocked the barns there with 1,200 hens and 6,000 broilers, with plans for 135 Guernsey cattle and 500 turkeys. Forty sows would also be raised at the Rohan Farm at the east end of the estate, and 265 acres throughout the property were to be planted
in corn, wheat, oats, rye, clover, timothy, and soybeans.\textsuperscript{57} Within a year, Elliott Roosevelt was publicizing his five-year plan for the development of Val-Kill Farms, which in addition to the earlier plans, called for the production of processed meat products and cheese, the operation of an inn with a restaurant, and a significant expansion in Christmas tree production, calling for the annual harvesting of 50,000 trees and a capacity of 900,000 trees in rotation, more than tripling the existing stock.\textsuperscript{58}

Elliott Roosevelt planned on increasing Christmas tree production with the spring planting of 1948. The timing, however, was not good, since state nursery stocks remained depressed and prices were high due to the wartime slowdown. In the winter of 1948, behind the usual planting schedule, Elliott had Nelson Brown desperately searching for tree stock. Brown wrote Elliott in February 1948 that he had written at least forty different letters in an attempt to get stock. Brown was finally able to piece together an order for 21,000 trees, including Norway spruce and balsam fir from the New York State College of Forestry nurseries near Syracuse, white spruce from the Nekoosa-Edwards Paper Company of Port Edwards, Wisconsin, and Douglas fir from the Nordstrom Nurseries in Gallitzin, Pennsylvania.\textsuperscript{69} These trees were partially planted in the summer of 1948; about half were kept in nursery rows near the Val-Kill orchard.\textsuperscript{70}

Despite the limited success of the 1948 planting, Elliott intended to retain Nelson Brown, who had apparently been serving without fee as he had for FDR. Elliott wrote Brown in March 1948: “...I would be interested...in hearing from you as to what ideas you might have regarding an annual retainer to serve in an advisory capacity to the Val-Kill Farms on its forestry program and Christmas tree plantation program. I believe that we should go ahead and come to some understanding on this matter, as we intend to operate this place, not as an experimental proposition, but as a commercial one.”\textsuperscript{71} Nelson Brown quickly responded with the ways he could assist, without mention of his fees, including (1) securing planting stock; (2) monitoring for insects and diseases; (3) assisting in marketing the Christmas trees, saw timber, poles, piling or other products; (4) providing silvicultural treatment for the Christmas tree plantations; and (5) “miscellaneous advice whenever needed.”\textsuperscript{72}

In June 1948, Nelson Brown suggested that they begin securing tree orders for the spring 1949 planting season, because he anticipated that the shortage would be worse due to the closing of many nurseries. By August, Brown reported to Elliott that he could perhaps find 20,000 or 30,000 trees, but that they might have to defer planting on a “big scale” until 1950. Elliott was apparently not satisfied with this number, and had Brown search for more, eventually placing orders for a total of 120,000 trees (more than twice the highest annual planting under FDR) from several private nurseries, plus the College of Forestry and state Conservation
Department nurseries. Three of the private nurseries ultimately failed to supply 70,000 trees, and this apparently caused Elliott to give up on the spring 1949 planting altogether.\textsuperscript{73} As with previous seasons, however, he harvested a large number of Christmas trees for the 1948 season, which he advertised for sale in New York City (fig. 2.157).

In June 1949, Brown wrote Elliott regarding continuation of his consulting services, but Elliott was losing interest in the forestry operation, as well as the rest of the Val-Kill Farms operation. He made another Christmas tree harvest for the 1949 season, but by 1950 Elliott had decided to give up on the entire enterprise. Nelson Brown, however, continued to encourage him to keep up the forestry work. On June 15, 1950, he wrote Elliott:

\textit{...Although you may not care to continue your interest in developing the forestry phases of you[r] place, I still think that it has, financially speaking, even better possibilities in many respects than the development of farm crops, chickens, cattle or other phases of agricultural pursuits. Aside from the increase in real estate values, I really feel that the most profitable operations are to grow Xmas trees. I regret exceedingly that you did not check with me first in going into the trucking costs to get your trees to the New York markets during the past two years.... In any event, I shall continue my professional interest in those plantations as I think there are large possibilities for profits, not only for Xmas trees, but some of the other products that may be secured from these plantations. I hope to get down to Hyde Park to see you and if I can be of any further service, I shall be very happy to do so....}\textsuperscript{74}

This letter was probably Nelson Brown’s last contact with the Roosevelt forestry program. At the time, Elliott had begun to sell off the Val-Kill Farms assets, beginning with the Weaving Cottage (Val-Kill Tea Room) in May 1949. Within a year, Val-Kill Farms was out of business. Elliott had lost interest in the operation during a time when real estate offered the prospect of quicker and larger profits, and had become preoccupied with other ventures including book writing and publicity. In his personal life, Elliott divorced his third wife, actress Faye Emerson, in 1950, and remarried Minnewa Bell in spring 1951, a time when his relationship with his mother and brother John, who moved into Stone Cottage at Val-Kill in 1951, was fraying.\textsuperscript{75}

After the demise of Val-Kill Farms, Elliott sold off most of the property between November 1951 and December 1952, ending with his sale of the Rohan Farm and Top Cottage, his home of the past seven years. Elliot retained half interest in Val-Kill and its surrounding 179 acres on the Bennett and Tompkins Farms,
selling the other half to his brother, John. None of the buyers were interested in continuing the forestry or agricultural operations. Some, however, did liquidate the plantations on their newly purchased property. William Kay, a Poughkeepsie developer who purchased most of the Dumphy and Hughson Farms in 1952, harvested Christmas trees there in 1953. Many others were cleared as the land was developed during the 1950s and 1960s. Along Creek Road on the Tompkins Farm, the College of Forestry’s demonstration plots were cleared for housing developments in the 1950s, although those in the Tamarack Swamp remained undeveloped but were naturally reverting to deciduous woods. The plantations west of Violet Avenue, including those on the Home Farm as well as the few on the Bennett Farm and at Val-Kill, remained intact, but received no silvicultural maintenance such as thinning and pruning after 1946.

The Original Estate

The original portion of the Roosevelt Estate, including the Wheeler Place and Rogers Land, Home Farm, and the J. R. Roosevelt Place, witnessed relatively little development between 1945 and 1970 compared with the upland farms in terms of overall acreage. The visual impact of the change, however, had a significant effect on the character of the landscape since it consisted primarily of suburban commercial and residential development along the Post Road, bordering the library and national historic site that were visited by thousands yearly.

Wheeler Place and Rogers Land (Drawing 2.14)

In late 1945, Eleanor Roosevelt and each of the children signed a quitclaim deed relinquishing their right to life estate on the 33.2-acre parcel containing the Springwood house and gardens, South Avenue Lot, and part of the Paddock Lot that had been conveyed to the government in December 1943. On January 1, 1946, the National Park Service took control of the property, which it administered jointly with Vanderbilt Mansion as the Roosevelt-Vanderbilt National Historic Sites. The park shared visitor facilities with the adjoining Franklin D. Roosevelt Library Museum, which was operated by the National Archives on its separate federal property comprising 16.2 acres on the North Avenue Lot. Park visitors entered by the library entrance drive off the Post Road, which ran through the North Avenue Lot orchard, and parked in the library’s lot and adjoining grass fields. The Home Road, the old entrance to the Springwood house, was closed.

In the deed conveying the property to the federal government, FDR inserted stipulations calling for the site, including the river views, to be maintained:

...in a condition as nearly possible approximating the condition of the residence and grounds prevailing at the expiration of the life estate of Franklin D. Roosevelt.... In the maintenance of the property as such national historic
Within a year of taking over the site, however, the National Park Service determined that it did need to make a substantial change to the grounds, not for the stipulated protection or preservation, but rather to accommodate the large number of visitors to the FDR home and gravesite. In November 1946, the Park Service, working with the National Archives, approved a development plan for adding a second road on the library property, and for building a new parking lot in the Home Garden. Work began in 1947 and was completed in 1948. The new road, to serve as an exit, paralleled the original drive through the apple orchard, and matched the design of original road, with Colonial-style lights flanking the entrances (fig. 2.158). A new entrance sign was built into the wall fronting the Post Road. The new parking lot covered most of the Home Garden and required realignment of the River Road east of the gardener’s cottage (fig. 2.159).

Aside from minor alterations to walkways and buildings, the parking area and exit drive were the only significant built change to the landscape of the Wheeler Place during this period. In keeping with FDR’s stipulations, specimen trees were replaced in-kind, with the notable exception of American elms lost to Dutch elm disease. Yet lack of management on adjoining lands not owned by the park resulted in a number of substantial shifts in landscape.
character. Helen Robinson, FDR’s niece, had ceased to maintain the large field below the Red House, which led to growth of scrub and trees through old-field succession. Along with growth of the lower woods on the Kirchner Place, these changes in vegetation soon obscured much of the river view from the Springwood house (figure 2.160). In 1959, the National Park Service invoked its right contained in the deed of conveyance from FDR to enter upon the Boreel and Kirchner Places to remove obstructing vegetation.\textsuperscript{83} The park did not restore the once expansive view, but rather created a narrow vista clearing roughly parallel and south of the River Road, cutting through the so-called virgin forest stand, and also cleared a small area below the Red House on the Boreel Place, presumably with Helen Robinson’s permission. Most of the field below the Red House subsequently became heavily wooded. Only with its acquisition of the west half of the J. R. Roosevelt Place in 1964 did the National Park Service begin to plan for restoring the river view to its character in 1945. In 1966, the agency completed a plan for the restoration of the view, but it would not be implemented until after 1970.\textsuperscript{84}

FDR’s plantations on the Wheeler Place and Rogers Land languished during ownership by the estate trustees between 1945 and 1952. With incorporation of the remaining Wheeler Place into the national historic site in 1952, the park took some initial interest in the conifer plantations (Plots A and B) close to the house in the Gravel Lot (the park apparently did not recognize the tulip-poplar in Plot K as a plantation). Realizing the historic significance and interpretive value of the plantations, the park requested the advice of Fred H. Arnold, the regional National Park Service forester, in February 1954. He recommended that a simple loop trail be constructed through the plantations (River Road at the time was not on Park Service property), and that portions adjoining this loop be cleared of undergrowth and vines to allow visitors to see 50 to 75 feet into the plantations. For the rest of the plantations, however, he recommended that the park leave the natural growth, so as not to encourage visitors to trample through the plantations, which Arnold felt would compact the soil and cause harm to the trees. He noted that his recommendations, which also included leaving dead trees on the ground, were “...more restrained than is sometimes applied to strictly commercial forest plantations.”\textsuperscript{85} The recommendations were also more in line with a less intensive management approach for natural resources that was gaining acceptance in the National Park Service at the time, and reflected growing ecological sensibilities in
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**Figure 2.160. River view looking southwest from the Springwood house, 1960. The view had become obscured by succession in the field below the Red House in the middle ground, and by growth of woods on the Kirchner Place in the distance. (Uncatalogued photograph, Roosevelt-Vanderbilt National Historic Sites.)**
conservation. Despite the initial interest in the plantations, the park never built the loop trail, and undertook no known management of the stands, which allowed for continued natural hardwood succession and eventual loss of many of the plantation trees.86

To the north of the Wheeler Place, the single plantation on the Rogers Land (Plot U) also received little care during its ownership by the trustees and, after 1949, by Mary Newbold Morgan. During her ownership of the Rogers Land through the remainder of this period, the landscape was largely unmanaged. The open field next to the plantation was abandoned, and the clearing along the edge of the terrace was not maintained, leading to loss of the river view from Bellefield house. A carriage road south of the Rogers fish pond disappeared, although its stone arched bridge remained. The Morgans held a right-of-way along Stone Cottage Road, but the road was probably not well maintained because of its ownership by the Crumwold Acres Development Corporation, which was developing a housing subdivision on the old Rogers Estate a short distance to the north.

Home Farm (Drawing 2.15)

For the year following FDR’s death, the Home Farm operation continued under the supervision of the estate trustees, with dairy cattle, chickens, apple orchard, milk house, and the fields along the Post Road cultivated for hay and grains.87 The Home Farm, however, quickly succumbed to suburban development upon Elliott Roosevelt’s purchase of the tract in July 1948 through his Val-Kill Company. Through lease arrangements, Elliott oversaw the transformation of the Post Road frontage into a commercial strip and a housing development replaced the fields and farm building complex with single-family houses, apartment houses, and a variety of commercial buildings (fig. 2.161). This development, along with increasing traffic volumes, widening of the road, and loss of roadside trees, isolated Springwood from its historic farm component.

Even before Elliott Roosevelt had signed a contract with the trustees to purchase the Home Farm on May 17, 1948, he was soliciting development proposals as part of what he called his “five-year plan” to
provide tourist accommodations and other services for people visiting the library and national historic site. The first proposed development was for a Howard Johnson’s restaurant, the pending plans for which were announced on May 2, 1948 by Joseph P. Day, Inc., the New York City real-estate consulting company hired by the estate trustees that also served as Val-Kill Company’s real estate broker. Although the Val-Kill Company had not yet closed on the property, Joseph P. Day provided a New York newspaper with details of the pending development:

The Howard Johnson chain is on the verge of buying from the Franklin D. Roosevelt estate a restaurant site on the Albany Post Road in Hyde Park opposite the shrine of the late President, it was learned today.... Bernard P. Day, head of the real estate firm, said that it was offering several plots around the Roosevelt mansion, library and grave, to which he referred collectively as the shrine. The land fronting on the Post Road, he said, is available for restaurants, inns, tourist courts—a variety of commercial enterprises which could do business with the tourists who visit the late President’s home. No industrial enterprise will be allowed, and purchasers will have to describe their plans so as to exclude the “cheap,” Day said. Also, a 100 foot setback from the road will be stipulated, in part to preserve some fine old trees.... For sale are sixty-one acres along the Post Road, divided into plots of from seven to twelve acres; four wooded parcels totaling 150 acres behind the sixty-one.

Elliott did not wait for closing of his Home Farm purchase on July 6, 1948 to proceed with signing lease agreements for commercial development. He began with the lots fronting on the Post Road that roughly corresponded with the historic farm lots as Joseph P. Day, Inc. had earlier outlined for the estate trustees (see fig. 2.153). On June 30, 1948, the Val-Kill Company signed its first lease with Cities Services Oil Company for a parcel at the north end of the Big Lot adjoining Newbold Road, to erect a service station. Next, on July 1, 1948, the lease with Howard Johnson’s was signed for a parcel directly south of the service station within the Big Lot and opposite the library entrance, followed by a lease with Hyde Park Gift Shop, Inc. for a parcel on the north side of Newbold Road. Construction of these developments was scheduled to begin in the summer of 1948. Around the same time, the North Parker Lot and northern half of the South Parker Lot were proposed for a drive-in movie theater. A year later on May 3, 1949, park superintendent George A. Palmer reported, “…East of the Post Road, we have shown four units that are either in operation or under
These included the drive-in, gift shop, gas station, and Howard Johnson’s (figs. 2.162, 2.163). In September 1950, Val-Kill Company signed a lease with Hyde Park Theater (subsequently known as Roosevelt Theater) to build an indoor movie theater south of the Howard Johnson’s, within the Big Lot (see fig. 1.161). In January 1954, Val-Kill Company leased a parcel in the South Parker Lot next to the gift shop to J. Roger and Irma Golden for construction of the Golden Manor Motel, which was completed by 1955.

In addition to these privately developed businesses, Elliott was also planning a large-scale development of his own at the Home Farm through the Val-Kill Company. Soon after he purchased the Home Farm in July 1948, he announced plans for a mixed-used development that would include private housing, an inn, hotel, and commercial retail establishments. The hotel component of this plan, conceived as the official hostelry for the library and national historic site where important visitors would stay, was to be built by the J. M. Goddard Company working in close association with Elliott. Plans for the building, designed by Reisner & Urbahn Architects, called for a modern, two-story wood and fieldstone structure with forty-eight rooms, representing each of the states, located in the wooded area to the rear of the Post Road parcels. This land was to be accessed from Farm Road and Newbold Road, where Elliott reserved rights-of-way. An adjoining recreational area of 50 acres was also planned. As a first phase of this project, Elliott embarked on the residential development at the North and South Farm Lots, known as Springwood Village and built under a subsidiary known as Springwood Village, Inc. (see fig. 2.161). As a part of the development, all of the farm buildings were demolished except for the farmhouse, which was retained and subsequently converted into rental units. Early on in the estate settlement process, Eleanor Roosevelt had requested that the farm buildings be salvaged for use elsewhere on the estate, but apparently only the chicken house was saved and relocated to the Bennett Farm. In a May 1949 memorandum, park superintendent George A. Palmer noted:

...We cannot be sure of any of the Val Kill [Val-Kill Company] units until the foundations are in but to the best of our knowledge, we have shown the location of the proposed hotel and the proposed location of the
motel. Lots in the proposed real estate development are now on sale in the area around the old dairy farm. The first unit calls for 60 cottages and an apartment house of unknown size. There is a promise of store facilities for this housing development but their location is too indefinite to predict.96

Springwood Village, set back 100 feet from the Post Road in accordance with the deed restrictions, was built to either side of Farm Road, which was renamed Farm Lane. To the south of the road were sixty single-family detached houses built on two new roads, Red Barn Road and Apple Tree Lane in the old South and East Farm Lots. North of Farm Lane was a seven-building apartment complex with detached garages in the North Farm Lot on a new road called Springwood Circle. While the single-family homes were sold to private owners, Springwood Village, Inc. retained ownership of the apartments. Although the company purchased additional land on May 26, 1955, the project was never extended beyond the initial development on the North, South, and East Farm Lots.97

The proposed hotel and recreational area Elliott devised for the wooded interior of the Home Farm was also never built. In December 1951, Elliott transferred from Val-Kill Company to himself the title for all of the interior land on the Home Farm amounting to 149.8 acres, excluding a 13.5-acre parcel earlier sold to Val-Kill Water Company adjoining the east side of Springwood Village within the old Farm Wood Lot. On June 12, 1952, after Val-Kill Farms went out of business and as part of his larger sell-off of the upland farms, Elliott sold his interior Home Farm property together with the adjoining western portions of the Bennett and Dumphy Farms to William Kay, a partner in the Poughkeepsie development firm Kay-Reifler. The deed of sale for the 334.26-acre property included provision for a 50-foot right-of-way along Newbold Road, plus a right-of-way of undetermined width over Farm Road from the Val-Kill Water Company parcel to Violet Avenue. These two rights-of-way had been included in the initial deed from the estate trustees to Val-Kill Company.98

In 1952, Elliott Roosevelt moved away from Hyde Park, and development on the Home Farm along the Post Road largely ceased with the exception of the Golden Manor Motel. Val-Kill Company continued to lease and own land along the Post Road through 1967, working out of an office at Springwood Village. Whether Elliott Roosevelt was still involved in the company by this time is not known. By January 1968, Springwood Village had been sold to a company known as Hyde Park Estates, which was represented by Bernard Kessler, the developer and lawyer who had purchased the J. R. Roosevelt Place from the estate trustees in 1963.99 In June 1968, Val-Kill Company sold the commercial properties it leased along the Post Road to a company called “Hy-Sid, Inc.,” thus apparently divesting itself of its remaining ownership on the Home Farm, and ending the remaining link of the Home Farm lands with the Roosevelt family.100 By 1970, when John Roosevelt sold the last of the family-owned land at Val-Kill, there had been no additional
development at the Home Farm along the Post Road. The only undeveloped land was the south half of the Big Lot, between the Roosevelt Theater and Springwood Village, and a portion of the South Parker Lot between the drive-in and Golden Manor Motel (see fig. 2.161). The interior lands on the Home Farm, with plantations, woods roads, and woodlots, also remained undeveloped.

**J. R. Roosevelt Place (Drawing 2.16)**

For seventeen years following FDR’s death, Helen Roosevelt Robinson and her husband, Theodore, maintained the Red House as their country home, together with Helen’s mother Elizabeth Roosevelt until her death in 1948. However, as the estate trustees were selling off property, Helen decided to also sell part of the Kirchner Place, the 98-acre part of the J. R. Roosevelt Place she had inherited from her father in 1927, subject to an undefined interest held by Mary Newbold Morgan. In 1947, Morgan signed a quitclaim deed relinquishing her interest to Mrs. Robinson, who in turn had a subdivision plan completed in April of that year (fig. 2.164). The plan created an irregularly shaped 60.6-acre tract that excluded her father’s trotting course, but included most of the Post Road frontage along the Kirchner Place; perhaps Helen had hoped to market the land for commercial development, much as her cousin Elliott Roosevelt was planning at the Home Farm. She retained the north part of the Kirchner Place adjoining the Boreel Place, amounting to 37.5 acres. On September 24, 1948, Helen Robinson sold the 60.6-acre tract to John P. Punchar and Jesse D. Storr of Poughkeepsie. She inserted into the deed restrictions similar to those the estate trustees included for the Home Farm, prohibiting industrial uses, slaughterhouses, public garages, tractors, trailers, trucks or milk trucks, trailer camps, and road stands, and excluding buildings, signs, or structures within 100 feet of the Post Road. The deed also recognized the right of the owners of the Wheeler Place (National Park Service) to enter the
property to “secure and preserve the River and Mountain Views” by removing trees.102

Punchar and Storr immediately sold the 60.6-acre property to Fred Hertlein, who with his wife Elsie developed a picnic area along a narrow strip of the land bordering the Post Road, and after 1951 built concrete tourist cabins there in violation of the 100-foot setback restriction.103 The Hertleins retained ownership of the entire parcel and did not develop any other part outside of the picnic area. By the late 1950s, however, the setting of their picnic area began to change when the state widened the Post Road to four lanes from the Boreel Place south across Teller’s Hill to Poughkeepsie.104 Plans, as announced in 1959, called for removal of the stone wall and mature trees (including a portion of the white pine plantation, Plot E), plus additional acreage belonging to the Hertleins on the Kirchner Place.105 Helen Robinson, concerned over the impact of the widening on her place, hired a real estate consultant to assess the full cost and impact of the widening, which apparently convinced the state to rebuild the stone wall on the Boreel Place and avoid the white pine plantation.106

At the time of Helen Robinson’s death on July 9, 1962, the J. R. Roosevelt Place still remained undeveloped and with much of its earlier character despite the road widening and Hertlein picnic area. An appraisal of the estate undertaken in 1962 by the trustees of FDR’s legal estate, to whom the Boreel Place reverted upon Helen Robinson’s death, showed that the core of the estate around the Red House remained little changed from FDR’s day (fig. 2.165). All of the buildings on the estate that were standing in 1945 remained, except for one part of the greenhouse in the formal garden. The remaining potting shed and greenhouse wing, as with the other outbuildings including the Teamster’s House, had not, however, been well maintained in recent years (fig 2.166). Rosy’s trotting course, which was situated on Helen Roosevelt’s remaining portion of the Kirchner Place, had become overgrown by this time, as had the field below the Red House to the point where it was obstructing the river view from the Springwood house (see fig. 2.161). The fields along the Post Road, however, were maintained through mowing.107
Following the sale of the property by the trustees of FDR’s estate to Bernard and Sidney Kessler on August 12, 1963, and the subsequent taking of the west half of the property by the National Park Service in 1964, the Kessler brothers began to implement their development plans. They converted the Red House into offices, adding a small concrete-block wing on the north end and building an adjoining parking lot. They erected a small shopping center on the Post Road frontage of the Kirchner Place in ca. 1965, just south of the boundary of the Boreel Place north of the Hertlein picnic area. Following this development, the Kesslers planned a much large shopping center for the rest of their Post Road frontage. Presumably in response to concerns from the National Park Service, the Kesslers did not develop the entire frontage, instead planning the shopping center, known as the Hyde Park Mall, for the fields south of the entrance road to the Red House on the Boreel and Kirchner Places, leaving the field to the north adjoining the national historic site undeveloped. The mall, which was completed by 1970, extended from the Kesslers’ south boundary on the Kirchner Place to the rear of their earlier shopping center, north to the entrance drive to the Red House (see fig. 2.161). The development featured a large main building with a department store and smaller retail stores set back from the Post Road behind an expansive parking lot, and a detached bank building at the northeast corner of the parking lot. The 1927 barn and east service road were demolished for construction of the mall, but the Kesslers retained the Teamster’s House and bungalow, as well as the white pine border (Plot E) along the Post Road and most of the stone walls. Trees along the boundary of the Wheeler Place and on the Red House entrance road screened most of the mall from view of the national historic site. Springwood was now hemmed in by development to the east and south; only Bellefield and the adjoining field to the north retained their rural character.

By the time the Hyde Park Mall was completed, additional commercial development had occurred to the south on the Kirchner Place. In 1964, a year after the Kesslers purchased Helen Robinson’s property, Fred and Elsie Hertlein sold their entire 60.6-acre parcel at the south end of the Kirchner Place, including the tourist cabins, to a development group known as Starbar (Starpoli and Baratta) Realty Corporation. Starbar in turn subdivided two commercial lots along the Post Road at the site of the tourist cabins, where a small shopping center (on three parcels) and a detached restaurant building (on one parcel) were erected between ca. 1966 and 1968 (see fig. 2.161). By 1970, Starbar Realty had made no further subdivisions on the Kirchner Place, and most of the property remained heavily wooded as it had been in FDR’s day.

**Upland Farms**

When Elliott Roosevelt purchased the upland farms in August 15, 1947 from Eleanor Roosevelt, he acquired all of the estate lands east of the Maritje Kill
(842 acres) that included the Tompkins, Bennett, Dumphy, Hughson, and Rohan Farms, the Wright and Jones Lands, and the Briggs and Lent Wood Lots, plus the very eastern end of the Boreel Place on the Home Farm. Here, Elliott developed Val-Kill Farms and lived at Top Cottage, while Eleanor retained Val-Kill as her primary residence through a legal agreement with Elliott. With the end of the business in ca. 1950, Elliott sold off all of the property within two years, except for half interest he retained in a 179-acre parcel on the Bennett and Tompkins Farms that included Val-Kill. The remaining 663 acres went to real estate developers, who transformed a large part of the property into suburban housing tracts in an area known as Haviland or East Park. In 1970 following Elliott’s sale of his half interest, John and Anne Roosevelt sold Val-Kill to developers, ending ownership of the Roosevelt family’s Hyde Park estate.

*Val-Kill, Bennett and Tompkins Farms (Drawing 2.17)*

For several years after FDR’s death, the Bennett and Tompkins Farms were a busy place as Elliott Roosevelt began to implement his plans for Val-Kill Farms. These plans included making the Bennett farmstead—Moses Smith’s longtime home—the center of the farm’s extensive dairy and poultry operations. On May 6, 1947, Elliott had Smith vacate his home as work began on expanding and modernizing the farmstead. Smith was not the only one to go as part of the restructuring. On August 25, 1947, Eleanor Roosevelt purchased the interest in Val-Kill belonging to Nancy Cook and Marion Dickerman through an agreement that altered the lease originally signed with FDR in 1926; the two women then moved out of their home of twenty years at Stone Cottage. Eleanor wrote that the reason for this change was that increasing family use of Val-Kill would be disruptive for Nancy and Marion, but personal issues and the vast scale of Elliott’s proposed Val-Kill Farms were most likely the primary factors.

At the Bennett farmstead, Elliott’s improvements included relocation of the old chicken coop from the Home Farm to a site just north of the Bennett farmhouse, and construction of a concrete-block dairy barn extending off the east side of the old frame barn. This new barn, described in the press as the “transformation of a century-old barn into a modern dairy,” was a long, one-story structure with a gable roof and an adjoining silo completed by the spring of 1948 (fig. 2.167). Aside from “extensive remodeling” of the Bennett farmhouse, Elliott apparently made few other changes to the Bennett and Tompkins Farms as part of the development of Val-Kill Farms. These few
changes had mostly to do with tree planting and harvesting.\textsuperscript{113} For Val-Kill Farms’ only season of tree planting in 1948, for which Nelson Brown had secured 21,000 trees, Elliott planned to clear 20 acres of woodland at the east end of the Tompkins Farm, near the loop road south of Val-Kill.\textsuperscript{114} He never had this land cleared and instead apparently planted some of the trees on the remaining open fields on the Hughson Farm. Many of the trees, however, were never set out and were instead kept in nursery rows at the Val-Kill apple orchard. Elliott still hoped to make money from these small trees by allowing them to grow a year, and then potting them for sale in the gift shop at the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.\textsuperscript{115}

In addition to the farming and forestry operations, Elliott announced plans in April 1948 to convert the defunct Val-Kill Tea Room (former Weaving Cottage) at the intersection of Violet Avenue and Creek Road on the Tompkins Farm, into an inn (fig. 2.168). Elliott’s plan was for the inn to have twenty-two rooms and the restaurant, which would use the products of the farm, capable of serving one hundred meals at a time.\textsuperscript{116} The small size of the building, which Eleanor called “Nel’s” at the time after its tenant, Nellie Johannsen, and the tiny parcel on which it was located suggest that the scope of this scheme, like many other proposals for Val-Kill Farms, was exaggerated. A year later, Elliott decided to convey the still unrealized project and the real estate to a separate entity known as 644 East 14\textsuperscript{th} Street Corporation. In May 1949, the deed of transfer for the half-acre lot with the Weaving Cottage, plus a quarter-acre parcel across Creek Road straddling the Tompkins–Bennett boundary apparently intended as a parking lot, was transferred to the corporation. At an undetermined time after this transfer, the Weaving Cottage became a restaurant.\textsuperscript{117}

Elliott continued to sell additional estate land as the Val-Kill Farms operation faltered during the next few years. In 1950, he sold a three-quarter-acre parcel on the east side of Creek Road to George A. Fox, and the next year he sold the Tompkins farmhouse on a half-acre parcel to Richard Harrity, a friend of Eleanor Roosevelt.\textsuperscript{118} Soon thereafter, he began to sell large tracts to developers. On April 1, 1952, Elliott sold two tracts on the west side of Creek Road on the Tompkins Farm: a 7-acre tract to Fred Greene and William F. Jones, and a 26-acre tract to Charles Patrick, a developer who also purchased two tracts on the Dumphy Farm. The Greene-Jones tract, located due south of the Tompkins farmhouse, was

Figure 2.168. Front-page newspaper feature on Elliott Roosevelt’s proposed inn at the Val-Kill Weaving Cottage on the Tompkins Farm, April 1948. The reference to the building as an old farmhouse was incorrect, since the building at the time was just fifteen years old. In the background are the red pines of Plot 1. (\textit{New York Sun}, April 8, 1948.)
entirely developed by 1960 with eight detached houses fronting on Creek Road and a trailer park to the rear, accessed through a new loop road, Hanley Drive (fig. 2.169). The Patrick tract, which contained the Tamarack Swamp, was only developed with two single-family houses completed by 1960, and underwent no further development, most likely due to its wetlands. Three weeks after Elliott sold these tracts in 1952, he sold a 48-acre tract on the east side of Creek Road to Clarence Lyon. This property, extending from Creek Road east to the Fall Kill, was almost entirely developed for residential housing by 1960, except for some of the interior land. The development included forty detached single-family houses laid out along Creek Road and three cul-de-sacs named Surico Drive, Lyons Drive, and Sucato Drive. At some point during the 1960s, a dam was erected on the Fall Kill at the south end of the Lyon tract where a World War II jeep road crossed the creek, creating a narrow pond that bordered several of the residential lots.

In June 1952, Elliott Roosevelt sold all of the land west of Violet Avenue on the Tompkins and Bennett Farms to William Kay, of the Poughkeepsie development firm, Kay-Reifler. This property, which included the Bennett farmstead and the College of Forestry plantations west of Violet Avenue, was part of a 334-acre tract that also included portions of the Dumphy Farm and the Home Farm, extending west to the commercial developments along the Post Road. Two weeks after this purchase, Elliott sold Kay another large tract, consisting of 216 acres to the north and west of Val-Kill, east of Violet Avenue. Although primarily on the Dumphy and Hughson Farms, this parcel also included the eastern end of the Bennett Farm.
As Elliott was selling off this land, Eleanor Roosevelt renewed her legal rights to Val-Kill, which had been referenced in her sale of the original Val-Kill Farms tract of 842 acres to Elliott in 1947. On July 18, 1952, Elliott signed a legal agreement with Eleanor codifying her sole rights to the 8-acre leased parcel on the Bennett Farm as originally outlined in the informal 1926 agreement with FDR, as amended through her 1947 purchase of the interests belonging to Marion Dickerman and Nancy Cook. The agreement guaranteed Eleanor life estate to Val-Kill and the surrounding 8 acres, in return for her yearly lease payment equal to the taxes and assessments. Eleanor was also responsible for the maintenance of the property, including Val-Kill Lane to Violet Avenue. On September 18, 1952, two months after the signing of this agreement, Elliott sold half of his interest in the 179-acre tract that included Val-Kill to his brother, John Roosevelt, who with his family had moved into the Stone Cottage in 1951. This tract included all of the Bennett Farm east of Violet Avenue except for those parts previously purchased by William Kay and 644 East 14th Street Associates, and all of the Tompkins Farm east of the Fall Kill except for the Val-Kill orchard. Around the time of this transaction, Elliott moved out of his home at Top Cottage and sold the property on December 23, 1952. Finally, Elliott sold his remaining half interest in the 174-acre Val-Kill property to John’s wife, Anne Clark Roosevelt, in 1960, ending his ownership in the upland farms.

Eleanor Roosevelt continued to live at her home in the former Val-Kill furniture factory until her death in 1962. During this time, John and Anne Roosevelt retained ownership of the 179-acre property, and together with Eleanor made few major changes to the landscape, except for the addition of a wing and dormer on the Stone Cottage and the addition of a tennis court. A notable change occurred in ca. 1955, when Central Hudson erected an electrical transmission line running north through the west end of the property, and then east along the northern boundary. A wide swath of the oak forest was cleared beneath and alongside the power line (see fig. 2.169). The east end of the Bennett Farm, which William Kay had purchased in 1952, was subdivided in the mid-1950s as part of an extensive suburban development known as Harbourd Hills, begun in ca. 1953, that extended north onto the Dumphy and Hughson Farms and beyond. Unlike FDR’s practice, the names chosen by the developers for the subdivision and its roads had no connection to the land’s history, with the exception of Roosevelt Road. Lot No. 1 of the development, a three-quarter-acre parcel within the Dumphy Farm on the boundary of the Bennett Farm, was acquired by John Roosevelt in ca. 1955 to secure access from the rear drive at Val-Kill (Cross Road) to Roosevelt Road. Kay’s other tract at the west end of the Bennett and Tompkins Farms (west of Violet Avenue) remained undeveloped. Here, the Bennett farmstead was rented out as a two-family house, but the property was apparently not farmed in any significant way. The Jones family, who rented in the 1960s, kept some animals on the property, including chickens, sheep, and horses. Kay and subsequent owners
did not maintain the Bennett farmstead; by the late 1960s, the silo had collapsed along with part of the roof on the old barn.\textsuperscript{128}

Following Eleanor Roosevelt’s death in 1962, John and Anne Roosevelt converted Mrs. Roosevelt’s cottage and the playhouse (former foundry) into apartments. Most likely as part of this conversion, an addition was put on the back of the Stone Cottage to house a laundry that had only an exterior entrance, accessible to the tenants. Around this time, the old tenant farmhouse on the north side of Val-Kill Lane, where the Roosevelts’ hired hand Charles Curnan lived, was destroyed by fire. In 1964, John and Anne Roosevelt sold Curnan and his wife Mildred a 3-acre parcel north of the site of the tenant farmhouse as a place to build a new house, which they completed shortly thereafter.\textsuperscript{129} The Curnans also built a chicken coop, pheasant coop, and dog pen on their property.\textsuperscript{130} During the 1960s, the Curnans and Roosevelts continued to farm the Val-Kill property, including hay and cultivated crops on the field south of Val-Kill Lane. They began a sheep operation in the wet pasture north of Val-Kill Lane, and there built a sheep pond and sheep barn.\textsuperscript{131} In 1965, John and Anne Roosevelt divorced and moved out of Stone Cottage, ending Roosevelt family residency on the estate lands. John converted the house into additional rental apartments.\textsuperscript{132}

In 1970, John and Anne Roosevelt put Val-Kill and the entire 179-acre tract up for sale, including the 3-acre Curnan parcel that John Roosevelt reacquired at the same time.\textsuperscript{133} The Poughkeepsie Journal published on August 30, 1970, that the tract “…contains a small lake and four buildings, including Mrs. Roosevelt’s Cottage, which was converted into four apartments; her former office converted into one apartment, a stone cottage in which John Roosevelt and his wife have resided; a small horse barn and stable, and a swimming pool.”\textsuperscript{134} Despite the prominence of its former inhabitant, John and Anne Roosevelt sold the property to speculative developers, Doctors Rosario G. Dolce and William J. Squires of Long Island, on December 16, 1970.\textsuperscript{135} With this sale, Roosevelt family ownership of lands within the former estate came to an end, with the exception of John Roosevelt’s Lot No. 1 in the Harboured Hills development (within the former Dumphy Farm), which he would retain for another decade.\textsuperscript{136}

\textit{Dumphy and Hughson Farms, Wright and Jones Lands (Drawing 2.18)}

For a year after FDR’s death, the landscape of the upland farms north of Val-Kill continued to be used primarily for forestry purposes. The tree planting that took place in the spring of 1946 under Nelson Brown’s guidance occurred on the Jones Land and Hughson Farm, where the bulk of the trees during the previous five years had been planted. On May 24, 1946, Russell Linaka reported the results to Nelson Brown:
Planting operations were started on the afternoon of April 11 by Russell Linaka, Frank Draiss and Harry. Put in 500 Douglas fir firsts at 3½ foot intervals along a cable stretched across the front line with markers to indicate the location of trees. The trees were kept in a pail of water and laid out along the cable line prior to planting. Excellent soil for Douglas fir on sloping hillside. This will be followed with 5,000 white spruce, 500 balsam fir and 500 Nikko fir. All planting to be done in upper Jones lot [Plot 64] next to boundary line and also some for refilling in Linaka lot East of the Linaka home [probably Plot 46].

Under the operation of Val-Kill Farms, Elliott Roosevelt made additional tree planting on the Hughson Farm in 1948, the only year in which trees were set out following the 1946 season. About half of the 21,000 trees ordered that year by Nelson Brown, including Norway spruce, white spruce, Douglas fir, and balsam fir, plus red pine that may have been held over from previous years, were planted. Elliott had initially planned to plant these trees on the east end of the Tompkins Farm near FDR’s loop road, but Brown probably persuaded Elliott that the plantations would have better success if they were planted on the remaining old fields on the Hughson Farm. These trees were planted during the summer of 1948, probably on the empty Plots 50, 52, and 54. On November 23, 1948, Nelson Brown wrote Elliott Roosevelt:

...I looked over the trees and transplant rows [near Val-Kill orchard] and planting results last summer with your mother. I found the planted trees coming along very well and many of the trees including weeds, had enjoyed exceptionally good growth. There are some spots which need cleaning out of severe weed competition, particularly from the sumach [sic], wild or pin cherry, aspen, etc., which occur largely in a few isolated clumps or groups....

Elsewhere on the Hughson and Dumphy Farms, Elliott Roosevelt continued to rent out the two farmhouses and the nearby rental units built by G. Hall Roosevelt. For a time, some of the fields were probably cultivated as part of the Val-Kill Farms operation. With the demise of this business came Elliott’s sell-off of all of the Dumphy and Hughson Farms and the Wright and Jones Lands between 1951 and 1952. His first sale was the Hughson farmhouse, which had been Russell Linaka’s home and known as the Linaka Cottage. On December 6, 1951, Elliott sold the farmhouse together with 17 surrounding acres, including most of the Wright Land and a small part of the Hughson Farm, to Joseph and Trude Lash, longtime friends of the Roosevelt family. A newspaper reported: “The property is situated in Hyde Park township near Roosevelt High school and it adjoins the late President’s reforestation plantings of evergreen trees.... [The property] includes a bungalow, a barn and one other building.... Mr. Lash said he planned to use the property for a weekend residence.... This was the third sale of Roosevelt property reported this week.”

The other sales, all on the Dumphy Farm along and west of Violet Avenue, included the Dumphy farmhouse and a surrounding acre to Arthur Mansolillo; a quarter-acre parcel on the west side of Violet Avenue to the Cities Services Oil
Company; and a 16-acre tract encompassing most of the Dumphy fields west of Violet Avenue to Charles Patrick. Soon after this, Elliott sold a one-third-acre parcel within the Patrick tract on December 13, 1951 to Henry Ackert, including a small house that had been built as one of the G. Hall Roosevelt projects in ca. 1939. On January 24, 1952, Elliott sold an acre on the west side of Violet Avenue bordering the Bennett Farm to Nanzio Valentino, and on March 7, 1952 the last of the Violet Avenue frontage to Charles Patrick as part of a 14.5-acre tract surrounding the Dumphy farmhouse. The remaining wooded west end of the Dumphy Farm Elliott sold to the developer William Kay on June 12, 1952 as part of the 334-acre tract that included land on the Tompkins and Bennett Farms, and on the Home Farm.  

Aside from a gas station erected by Cities Services Oil Company and a single house erected by Nanzio Valentino, the bulk of the development along Violet Avenue was undertaken by Charles Patrick. On his tract west of Violet Avenue, twenty single-family houses were built along a realigned portion of Newbold Road (renamed Newbold Drive) and two new roads, Morgan Circle and Cronk Place (fig. 2.170). On Patrick’s land east of Violet Avenue surrounding the Dumphy farmhouse, thirty-four single-family houses were erected by 1960 that faced Violet Avenue and lined two new roads, Franklin Road and Roosevelt Road. Several additional commercial buildings were erected along Patrick’s land on the east side of Violet Avenue by 1970.

On June 24, 1952, Elliott Roosevelt sold the remaining east half of the Dumphy Farm (excluding the very eastern end purchased by Agnes Potter in 1952 along with Top Cottage) and all of the Hughson Farm and Jones and Wright Lands to William Kay in a tract of 216 acres that also extended onto the eastern end of the

Figure 2.170. A 1960 aerial photograph of the Dumphy and Hughson Farms, and the Wright and Jones Lands showing extent of development within earlier estate and farm boundaries. The Harbord Hills development extended north and east of the original Roosevelt Estate lands. (Aerial photograph ERC-5V-85, June 6, 1960, Roosevelt-Vanderbilt National Historic Sites, annotated by SUNY ESF.)
Bennett Farm. Through his Poughkeepsie construction firm of Kay-Reifler, William Kay laid out his extensive housing development known as Harbourd Hills. He soon put pressure on Joseph and Trude Lash to sell their adjoining weekend country retreat at the Hughson farmhouse, apparently because their 17 acres was key to accessing the Harbourd Hills development. On July 21, 1953, Kay wrote to Joseph Lash:

...As you know we are starting to sell lots on my East Park holdings behind your property. I think you further understand that legally a right-of-way through your land can be granted to each purchaser of these lots [apparently across Pell’s Lane, the driveway off Haviland Road]. ... [We should] get together...to discuss this matter as well as the possibility of selling your land to me in view of the fact that the development around your property will continue to grow most prolifically.

William Kay continued to make the Lashes uncomfortable on their property. In addition to disturbance from construction machinery, he cleared and harvested large parts of FDR’s plantations, which had been one of the Lashes’ attractions to the property. Kay even encroached onto their property as part of a Christmas tree harvest he made in 1953, as Joseph Lash angrily wrote him: “…I want to express my irritation at the fact that in your Xmas tree sales this year you permitted trees to be cut or dug from my land. I had no desire to have any more trees removed, moreover, you had no right to collect for such trees. I made a survey of the number of trees cut, and giving it every benefit of a doubt some 75 to 100 trees were taken out this year.” Kay’s pressure was apparently too much, and in the winter of 1955, the Lashes decided to sell out, with the sale contract for their 17 acres finalized in August 1955.

Within the Roosevelt Estate lands, Kay’s Harbourd Hills development was well underway by 1960, with several roads laid out and about thirty houses constructed (see fig. 2.170). Within ten years, about 275 of the 300 lots of the subdivision within the Roosevelt Estate lands had been developed with single-family houses. The subdivision encompassed all of the Dumphy and Hughson Farms, and the Wright and Jones Lands, but also extended onto the eastern end of the Bennett Farm downhill from Top Cottage, and onto adjoining lands, including farms north to Haviland Road, as well as a portion of Dorothy Schiff Backer’s Red Cottage property on the east. The main road through Harbourd Hills was Roosevelt Road, which partially followed the alignment of one of FDR’s woods roads. Roosevelt Road turned south along a new alignment into the old Bennett Farm, and then looped north through the Jones Land and Hughson Farm to Haviland Road. Ten additional roads were built off Roosevelt Road on curvilinear alignments to access all parts of the land, including four cul-de-sacs. While Kay had harvested many of FDR’s Christmas trees and many were undoubtedly removed for construction, many were left on the lots, forming rows or thinned as specimens in the suburban landscape (fig. 2.171). The only portions of the property that William Kay did not
develop were the wetlands along the Fall Kill on the Dumphy Farm and Wright Land, and a hilltop on the Jones Land where Plot 63 was located. Lot No. 1 of the development, a narrow lot containing the rear access road to Val-Kill, was sold in ca. 1953 to John Roosevelt.

Top Cottage, Rohan Farm, and Briggs and Lent Wood Lots (Drawing 2.19)

The landscape of the Rohan Farm and the adjoining Briggs and Lent Wood Lots, including Top Cottage, remained intact for the longest following FDR’s death outside of Val-Kill. In 1945, Elliott Roosevelt made Top Cottage his home while he oversaw development of Val-Kill Farms. Over the next few years, he made some changes to Top Cottage to accommodate his family, including the addition of dormers and a porch on the north side, and removal of some of the surrounding trees (fig. 2.172).146 To the south and east on the Rohan Farm, Pete Rohan continued to lease the fields for one or two years following FDR’s death, but this relationship ended upon Elliot’s acquisition of the property in 1947. The Rohan barns, on the east side of Cream Street, became the site of the Val-Kill Farms pig operation. Although FDR had earlier objected to pig farming near Top Cottage, this was probably an ideal site with its large muck field to the east of the barns. By the spring of 1948, Elliott reported that he had twenty Berkshire sows and two boars there, a slaughterhouse and freezing facility, and planned to increase production to 200 pigs annually.147 On the field east of Cream Street, Elliott also kept horses, using the old barn as a stable.148 There was apparently little forestry work done on the Rohan Farm under Val-Kill Farms, although a small plantation of Norway spruce (Plot W) was planted in ca. 1948 on the north side of the road to Val-Kill. Its designation suggests it may have been planted by William Plog.149

Once Elliott gave up on Val-Kill Farms in ca. 1950, he quickly began to sell off the Rohan Farm and adjoining land. However, since he lived at Top Cottage, it remained the last parcel he sold, following his disposition of the Bennett, Tompkins, Dumphy, and Hughson Farms. Aside from the western corners of the Rohan Farm and Briggs Wood Lot that Elliott sold as part of the 216-acre tract to William Kay in June 1952, his first sale within the Rohan Farm was made on October 27, 1952 to Clifford and Cosmelia Pitcher. This sale was for four parcels amounting to 49
acres, including the Rohan farmhouse and surrounding 2 acres on the west side of Cream Street; the land south the intersection of Cream Street and Dutchess Hill Road containing 5 acres; and all of the land east of Cream Street, amounting to 42 acres.\textsuperscript{150} Two months later, on December 23, 1952, Elliott sold Top Cottage to Agnes Potter as part of a 118-acre tract.\textsuperscript{151} This included all of the Rohan Farm west of Cream Street except for the 2 acres sold to the Pitchers and the western edge sold to William Kay; all of the Briggs Wood Lot except for the western part previously sold to William Kay; all of the Lent Wood Lot; and the eastern end of the Dumphy Farm, including Top Cottage. Five years after her purchase, Agnes Potter conveyed the property to her sons, Robert and Gary Potter, on September 24, 1957.\textsuperscript{152}

Whether Agnes Potter intended to eventually develop the property is not known, but for the next decade, the Potters built little. Top Cottage remained in its wooded setting, although the Potters constructed a new loop road south of the house, and in the adjoining field erected a stable, greenhouse, and swimming pool in the 1950s and 1960s behind a screen of Norway spruce.\textsuperscript{153} The Rohan fields were kept cut, probably through leasing to a local farmer. The subdivision of the property from the adjoining estate lands and ensuing development, however, broke the connection of the property with estate lands to the east, notably through the termination of the road to Val-Kill, and the rough road to the Dumphy Farm to the north of Top Cottage. Both of these roads remained as traces, but dead-ended at the Harbourd Hills subdivision then being constructed at the foot of Dutchess Hill along Roosevelt Road. One significant change that the Potters made to the landscape of the Rohan Farm at some point between 1952 and 1965 was the construction of a new house for one of the family members in the middle of the fields southeast of Top Cottage and north of Pete Rohan’s Lane (fig. 2.173).\textsuperscript{154}

This new house may have been the first lot in a subdivision being planned by Robert and Gary Potter. It was not until July 1965, however, that they had a full subdivision plan drawn up, for a development called Val-Kill Heights, apparently planned to extend to the adjoining farms to the north and south. Phase one of the plan was filed with the county in March 1966, calling for fifty-eight lots laid out along three roads through the Rohan Farm and Briggs Wood Lot. The main road, Val-Kill Drive, was laid out partially along the old entrance drive to Top Cottage and the road to Val-Kill, with two new roads, Potter’s Bend and Dill Lane, laid out on new alignments. Pete Rohan’s Lane, the old farm road, was scheduled for removal under the subdivision plan.\textsuperscript{155} Top Cottage was left on a 38-acre parcel at the west end of the Potters’ land, accessible from the intersection of Val-Kill Drive and Potter’s Bend.

Despite the subdivision plan, no houses were built in Val-Kill Heights by 1970, the year that John and Anne Roosevelt sold Val-Kill. The roads by this date had, however, been built, but Pete Rohan’s Lane remained, as well as the old-field
patterns and hedgerows (see fig. 2.173). The mixed plantation of pines, spruce, and larch (Plot 57) in the Rohan Birch Lot, the only plantation established on the Rohan Farm by FDR, had not been cleared, nor had the later Norway spruce plantation to the east (Plot W).\textsuperscript{156}

Across Cream Street from Val-Kill Heights, the Pitchers, who had purchased their property from Elliott Roosevelt in 1952, maintained the Rohan farmhouse, but demolished the barn complex on the opposite side of Cream Street. On the fields east of Cream Street, a residential subdivision, called Greenfields, was being developed beginning in the late 1960s, extending onto the farms to the north formerly belonging to the Jacobs and Schaffer families. Within the Rohan Farm, forty-three lots were laid out at the east end of the property, along four streets: Wagonwheel Road, Fenway Drive, Abbey Drive, and Buttermilk Drive. By 1970, fourteen houses had been constructed along Wagonwheel Road at the northeast corner of the Rohan Farm (see fig. 2.173).\textsuperscript{157} The west end of the tract, bordering Cream Street and containing the former pig farm and muck field, had not been platted as part of the subdivision.

**SUMMARY, 1945–1970**

The Roosevelt family’s last twenty-five years of land ownership in Hyde Park between 1945 and 1970 witnessed dramatic changes in the character and use of the family estate. While regional suburban development pressures and economic changes were responsible in large part for this change, much of it was also attributed to Roosevelt family dynamics, most importantly the loss of FDR’s guiding vision for the property. Through his establishment of the library and national historic site and the workings of his will and legal estate, FDR had set up competing development and preservation interests. This was most noticeable at the original estate lands along the Post Road, where the National Park Service tried to control development, but with minimal success as the trustees and
Elliott Roosevelt along with the Town of Hyde Park favored economic returns from commercial and residential development. On the upland farms, continued Roosevelt family presence at Val-Kill preserved a part of the landscape, but much of it succumbed to suburban development, facilitated in large part by Elliott Roosevelt.

The end of FDR’s forestry program, which had played a central role in his concept of conservation and rural improvement, paralleled similar developments across New York. Private reforestation, centered on the short-term returns of Christmas tree growing, grew to all-time highs after World War II, and Elliott Roosevelt tried to profit from those trends, building off the early work of his father. Yet with only economic returns in mind, Elliott’s forestry program could not compete with rising land values brought on by the market for suburban development. The collapse of FDR’s forestry program after his death also reflected the state government’s declining interest in using reforestation for demonstration purposes and as a means to address the still-rapid rate of farmland abandonment, as the state’s economy continued to shift away from agriculture. Suburban development increasingly became the most profitable land use not only in Hyde Park, but throughout many rural areas in the state adjoining cities small and large alike.
Although many were saddened by the change in the rural landscape, many others also saw suburban development as a positive force that brought country living and home ownership to an increasingly large percentage of the population.

By the 1970s, development was still spreading across Hyde Park, but had begun to slow from the rapid pace of the 1950s and 1960s. Most of the suburban development on the Roosevelt Estate lands had occurred during the late 1940s through the 1960s, with the construction of commercial and residential buildings along the Post Road, and large tracts of single-family houses centered in four areas: on the Tompkins Farm along Creek Road, along Violet Avenue on the Dumphy Farm, in the interior lands of the Dumphy and Hughson Farms, and at the east end of the Rohan Farm. Although laid out by 1970, Val-Kill Heights on the Rohan Farm and completion of the Greenfields development would be the only major new development to occur on the Roosevelt Estate lands after 1970. The years after 1970 would instead witness increasing interest in preserving land, both for its historic and natural values.
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EPILOGUE, POST-1970

In the years after John and Anne Roosevelt sold Val-Kill in 1970—the last part of the Roosevelt Estate to be owned by the family—the pattern of largely unchallenged suburban development began to shift, initially at Val-Kill and then later at Top Cottage, the J. R. Roosevelt Place, and the large parcel of undeveloped estate lands between the Post Road and Violet Avenue. While preservation and interpretation had long focused on the FDR Home and gravesite, there was growing interest in Eleanor Roosevelt, as well as FDR’s conservation legacy that remained in the larger landscape of the estate. Many throughout the Hudson Valley were also recognizing the need to safeguard the region’s dwindling natural resources in the face of ever-spreading sprawl. Although the park had acquired historic estate lands in the past, such efforts had been difficult because the original 1939 park legislation allowed only for donations of property. By the late 1990s, however, Congress enacted legislation providing the park with blanket authority to acquire estate lands historically owned by the Roosevelt family. Passed in 1998, the Roosevelt Family Lands Act (Public Law 105-364) specifically gave the Secretary of the Interior the authority “...to acquire, by purchase with donated or appropriate funds, by donation, or otherwise, lands and interests in lands located in Hyde Park, New York, that were owned by Franklin D. Roosevelt or his family at the time of his death...”

By the time of the 1998 legislation, development activity on Roosevelt Estate lands had slowed since the 1950s and 1960s, although there were still active proposals for new development both within and surrounding the estate. After 1970, new construction was concentrated primarily within existing subdivisions (fig. 2.174). These included Harbourd Hills on the Dumphy and Hughson Farms, and Val-
Kill Heights and Greenfields on the Rohan Farm. Along the main road corridors through the estate lands, there was some new commercial development along the Post Road, as well as loss of open space along Violet Avenue due to old-field succession on the old Bennett Farm.

After 1970, the most significant land-use changes occurred through conservation of estate lands for recreation, historic preservation, and ecological protection, resulting in major acquisitions and park additions (fig. 2.175). These included most of the remaining estate lands west of the Post Road, 117.57 acres (Rogers Land and J. R. Roosevelt Place); establishment of the Eleanor Roosevelt National Historic Site at Val-Kill, 180.50 acres (east parts of the Bennett and Tompkins Farms); Top Cottage, 40.59 acres (Rohan and Dumphy Farms, Lent and Briggs Wood Lots); and most recently, the undeveloped land between the Post Road and Violet Avenue and several parcels along the Post Road, 384.63 acres (Home Farm and the west half of the Tompkins, Bennett, and Dumphy Farms). The park also acquired 18 acres along the Fall-Kill, as well as the 24-acre Bellefield estate outside of the Roosevelt Estate boundaries. Due to limitations of the park’s 1939 enabling legislation and financial constraints, acquisitions prior to 1998 occurred through private land trusts, including the National Park Foundation, the national charitable partner of the National Park Service chartered by Congress in 1967; Beaverkill Conservancy, the land acquisition affiliate of the New York City–based Open Space Institute founded in 1964; the San Francisco–based Trust for Public Land established in 1972; and Scenic Hudson, a regional land trust established in 1963.3
The parcels acquired by the land trusts were all transferred to park ownership, mostly through the 1998 Roosevelt Family Lands Act. All of the land outside of the Val-Kill site was incorporated into the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site, which as of 2011 contains 771.94 acres, of which 747.82 acres are within the limits of the historic Roosevelt Estate (excluding Bellefield and Crum Elbow Point). Together with the 180.50 acres at Eleanor Roosevelt National Historic Site, approximately 540 acres of the estate remain outside of Park Service ownership. Most of this property consists of private commercial and residential development, or vacant lots, except for the 16-acre Franklin D. Roosevelt Library and Museum administered by the National Archives and Records Administration. The only remaining large parcels of undeveloped estate lands are a 13.5-acre tract on the Home Farm east of Springwood Village owned by the Hyde Park Fire and Water District, a 20.56-acre tract at the southeast part of the Kirchner Place owned by the Culinary Institute of America, and two tracts encompassing 25.5 acres in and adjoining the Tamarack Swamp on the Tompkins Farm (see fig. 2.175).

Aside from land acquisition, management of Roosevelt Estate during the four decades since 1970 has focused on preserving historic buildings and gardens, orchards, specimen trees, and agricultural fields, while providing for public access and interpretation. In addition to maintenance, major projects included rehabilitation of the buildings and grounds at Val-Kill, enlargement of the presidential library, partial reestablishment of the Springwood river view, designation of the regional Hyde Park Trail, restoration of Top Cottage, removal of the visitor parking lot on the Home Garden, construction of a curatorial storage building at the J. R. Roosevelt Place, addition of a building for the Eleanor Roosevelt Center at Val-Kill, and improvement of historic roads linking Springwood and Val-Kill.

**Original Estate**

**Wheeler Place and Rogers Land (Drawing 2.20)**

In the early 1970s, major changes in the Wheeler Place occurred at the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library and Museum, where two large wings were completed on the north and south sides of the building in 1972. Known as the Eleanor Roosevelt wings, these additions required reconfiguration of surrounding walks and removal of a sunken garden on the south side of the building. The wings, envisioned by FDR in 1942 as a place for Mrs. Roosevelt’s papers, were built in the same style and materials as the original building.

In the mid-1970s, the National Park Service added three parcels to the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site through donations by Gerald
Morgan, Jr., the son of Mary Newbold Morgan and a resident of Richmond, Virginia. In 1973 and 1975, he donated the 52-acre Rogers Land tract, which FDR had purchased in 1935, and a 0.12-acre parcel at Crum Elbow Point to the National Park Foundation with the intent that the property eventually be incorporated into the park (see fig. 2.175). The Crum Elbow tract, accessible by a bridge over the railroad at the end of Stone Cottage Road, was historically part of the Rogers Estate during FDR’s lifetime. In 1974, Gerald Morgan, Jr. gave his family’s home, Bellefield, including the main house and surrounding 24 acres, directly to the National Park Service. This gift also included a second parcel at Crum Elbow Point consisting of approximately 0.4 acre. The Bellefield property, along with Morgan’s two donations to the National Park Foundation, were incorporated into the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site in April 1975 through an amendment to the original 1939 enabling legislation for the park. This legal action was necessary due to the original legislation that did not allow for incorporation of non-Roosevelt land into the park.

Following the addition of the Morgan donations, the National Park Service completed a master plan for the national historic site in 1977. Part of this plan called for moving parking and visitor services to the Bellefield property, where park administrative offices had already been relocated. The plan was not implemented until 2003, when the Henry A. Wallace Visitor and Education Center was opened on the rear part of the Bellefield property as a collaborative project by the National Park Service and the National Archives and Records Administration. As part of the project, completed in 2004, the park built a new entrance drive off the Post Road that followed the northern boundary of Bellefield and terminated at a new visitor parking lot on the former Bellefield vegetable garden, west of the Wallace Center (fig. 2.176). The park removed the old parking lot completed in 1948 on the Roosevelt Home Garden, and the library removed the 1948 exit drive and closed the original drive to traffic. A new walk was built at the same time through the North Avenue Lot to connect the visitor center with the library and Home Road.

*Home Farm (Drawing 2.21)*

In the decades after 1970, development pressure on the Home Farm continued, but it was countered through an effective conservation partnership between
the park and Scenic Hudson. In the 1990s, big-box commercial development, including a possible Wal-Mart, was proposed for the Hyde Park Drive-In and adjoining property at the north end of the Home Farm. In response, Scenic Hudson proposed acquisition of the Post Road frontage containing the drive-in and adjoining lots surrounding the Golden Manor Motel. This acquisition included the parcel where the Hyde Park Gift Shop had stood up until ca. 1980, and the west end of Newbold Road, the main access into the interior of the Home Farm. With federal assistance, Scenic Hudson closed on the 34.2-acre property in 2000. At the same time, the land trust also acquired a 15.6-acre undeveloped parcel on the Big Lot south of the Roosevelt Theater. To address concerns of Hyde Park town officials over lost tax revenue and limitations on economic development, Scenic Hudson agreed to development of the property for a proposed Hudson Valley Welcome Center as a joint venture with the National Park Service and the town. Scenic Hudson subsequently sold 20.9 acres of its Home Farm property (Big Lot) to the park in 2010, followed by the remaining drive-in property of 28.9 acres in 2011. Earlier, the park and Scenic Hudson did not block a smaller development along the Post Road between the former Howard Johnson’s and the Roosevelt Theater on the Big Lot. Here, a new commercial-professional building was constructed in ca. 2001, directly across from the Springwood house and the FDR Library (fig. 2.177). Another development, a senior housing complex on the old Night Pasture to the east of Springwood Village, (Stone Ledge) was completed in 2009.

The large tract of undeveloped land to the east of the Post Road, where Elliott Roosevelt had proposed a hotel as part of his Springwood Village development in the late 1940s, posed an even greater development threat. The 334-acre tract, which extended east to Violet Avenue across the former Dumphy, Bennett, and Tompkins Farms, still contained the historic estate roads connecting Val-Kill and Springwood, as well as extensive oak woods and a number of FDR’s forest plantations. The property was owned by an entity known as Poughkeepsie Shopping Center, successor to the developers Kay-Reifler who had bought the property from Elliott Roosevelt in 1952. The owners had done little over the years to maintain or secure the property, which became a favorite place for all-terrain vehicles (ATVs) and dumping. The forest plantations on the tract were suffering from crowding, blow-downs, and competition from successional hardwoods that had resulted since management ceased in ca. 1947.
Interest in conserving the property gained a significant boost in 1991, when the Hyde Park Trail—a recreational trail linking the three national historic sites—was designated along the west half of Newbold Road, Cross Road, and the eastern part of Farm Road through a voluntary agreement with the private property owner. The trail continued west through the Wheeler Place and Rogers Land, and east to Val-Kill. The trail was developed through an entity known as the Hyde Park Trail Management Committee, composed of Scenic Hudson, the Town of Hyde Park, the Adirondack Mountain Club, the Boy Scouts of America, and the Winnakee Land Trust, and coordinated by the National Park Service Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance Program. Over the next decade, the trail was maintained and improved while questions over the fate of the surrounding property continued. Finally, in December 2003, Scenic Hudson secured an option on the 334-acre tract, and completed the purchase in November 2004. Three years later in April 2007, Scenic Hudson sold the land to the National Park Service, publishing that “Once again visitors will experience the property as the Roosevelts did and connect with land that was very personal to one of America’s great families.” The Park Service soon implemented plans for improving the Hyde Park Trail, renamed Roosevelt Farm Lane, through the 334-acre tract, to accommodate pedestrians and an electric tram connecting the FDR Home and Val-Kill (fig. 2.178). Trailheads with parking were built at the west end of Newbold Road off the Post Road, and at the east end on the Bennett Farm off Violet Avenue.

**J. R. Roosevelt Place (Drawing 2.22)**

The remaining undeveloped portions of the J. R. Roosevelt Place fronting on the Post Road immediately south of the Springwood house were nearly lost in the early 1980s with development of a condominium apartment complex. The land had been acquired from FDR’s estate in 1963 by Bernard and Sidney Kessler, who developed the Hyde Park Mall south of the original entrance road. Construction of the condominiums was underway by ca. 1982 with excavation and building of the foundations. The developer went broke and Marine Midland Realty Credit Corporation foreclosed on the 26.33-acre property, which extended west and south of the Red House, including the site of the formal garden and trotting course. Seeing an opportunity to prevent completion of the project and preserve the site, the Park Service worked with the Trust for Public Land, which purchased the property from the bank in 1984 and conveyed it to the Home of Franklin D.
Roosevelt National Historic site the same year.\textsuperscript{14} The sale to the trust excluded 1.5 acres surrounding the Red House, the remaining service complex behind the Hyde Park Mall (1927 bungalow and ca. 1890 Teamster’s House), the entry drive (renamed Kessler Drive) that the Kesslers had given to the town as a public road, and a 2.54-acre parcel containing the remaining frontage along the Post Road. Three years later in 1987, the Trust for Public Land purchased this road frontage from the Kessler brothers and conveyed it to the National Park Service in 1989. That year, the park began work on removing the condominium foundations and restoring the historic character of the field.\textsuperscript{15}

In the late 1990s, Sidney Kessler decided to sell the Red House, where he and his brother Bernard had maintained their real estate and legal offices during the time they had developed the Hyde Park Mall and other nearby projects. In 2000, he sold the house and surrounding 1.5 acres to Barbara Love through an entity named Red House LLC. Several months later, Love sold the house to the Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Institute, the successor organization to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Foundation, which had purchased the west end of the Wheeler Place in ca. 1952. The institute purchased the Red House to preserve it in the absence of Park Service action on the property, and soon completed an historic structure report and made preliminary renovations to provide a residence for the institute’s president, including removal of incompatible additions made by the Kessler brothers. The institute ceased using the Red House as a residence, and in 2011, the National Park Service acquired the property.\textsuperscript{16}

The park’s acquisitions around the Red House left the south half of the Kirchner Place as the only large undeveloped estate parcel west of the Post Road that was not under park ownership. Although largely inaccessible from the core of the national historic site, the property included a large part of the Big Cove shoreline and woods within the river view from the Springwood house (fig 2.79). In May 2002, the Beaverkill Conservancy, which had recently been involved in preserving Top Cottage, acquired the western 35 acres of the Kirchner Place including the shoreline and viewshed, and then donated it to the National Park Service.\textsuperscript{17} This was part of a 55-acre parcel that had been subdivided by Starbar Realty for commercial development during the 1960s and 1970s. The remaining 20 acres fronting on the Post Road was marketed for commercial sale before being acquired by the Culinary Institute of America, which owned the adjoining land to the south,
formerly owned by Saint Andrew-on-Hudson Seminary and Novitiate, which had closed in 1969.

Since acquiring the J. R. Roosevelt Place property, the Park Service has maintained most of the landscape as part of the rural setting of the site, with fields surrounding the Red House and woods interspersed with hiking trails along the lower and southern part of the property. Plans are underway to manage these woods to reopen the river view from the Springwood house. At present, the park does not interpret the Red House and adjoining grounds. The site of the hemlock-hedge-enclosed formal garden, garage, and trotting course south of the house function as a park utility area. In the 1990s, the park converted J. R. Roosevelt’s teardrop-shaped trotting course into a grounds maintenance area, and in 2007 built a large single-story, steel-frame building within the old formal garden as a central curatorial facility. The overgrown hemlock hedge and remains of the greenhouse and potting shed were retained during the project.

**Upland Farms**

*Bennett and Tompkins Farms (Drawing 2.23)*

Land preservation efforts within the former Roosevelt Estate during the 1970s were focused in large part on preventing the loss of Eleanor Roosevelt’s longtime country home. Funds had been raised for preserving Val-Kill following Mrs. Roosevelt’s death in 1962, but the money was devoted to construction of the Eleanor Roosevelt wings built on the FDR Library in 1972. The developers who purchased Val-Kill in 1970, Rosario Dolce and William Squires, submitted a proposal in 1972 to build a retirement community there, but the town turned down the proposal. Two years later, the developers submitted a second proposal to rezone the property to build a nursing home and single-family houses, but their application was again turned down. Soon after this time, preservationists came together to urge the federal government to acquire Val-Kill. Members of the Hyde Park Visual Environment Committee, a local planning group formed by residents and the Cornell Cooperative Extension, together with the Cottage Committee formed by Mrs. Roosevelt’s grandchildren, Curtis Roosevelt and Eleanor Roosevelt Seagraves, received a grant in 1973 to advocate for the preservation of Val-Kill. Out of this effort, Eleanor Roosevelt’s Val-Kill (ERVK) was formed by 1976 to formalize the work of the Cottage Committee and advocate for the designation of Val-Kill as a memorial to Eleanor Roosevelt. With the support of such notable figures as the actress Jean Stapleton, ERVK approached the National Park Service and FDR Library about entering a partnership to acquire and preserve Val-Kill. While the library was not able to assist, the park worked with ERVK to develop federal legislation to designate Val-Kill a national historic site, the first in the nation commemorating a first lady.18
On May 26, 1977, Congress passed legislation establishing Eleanor Roosevelt National Historic Site that included an appropriation for land acquisition and site development, and identified ERVK as an official partner. In 1978, the federal government acquired the 179.77-acre Val-Kill property through eminent domain due to the unwillingness of the owners, Dolce and Squires, to sell. Two years later, the park acquired the undeveloped lot #1 in the adjoining Harbord Hills subdivision from John Roosevelt to provide a rear entry to the site from Roosevelt Road. Although a separate National Park System unit, the new national historic site was administered jointly with the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Vanderbilt Mansion as part of the Roosevelt-Vanderbilt National Historic Sites. The park entered into a cooperative agreement with ERVK to outline responsibilities for the new site, through which the nonprofit organization assumed the lead on educational programming, while the park was responsible for interpretation, maintenance, and stewardship.19

Eleanor Roosevelt National Historic Site remained closed to the public for seven years while plans were developed for rehabilitation of the buildings and grounds, finalized in a general management plan completed in 1980. The plan called for the park and ERVK to “Manage and preserve the historic resources and ambience of Val-Kill for public enrichment and to provide a setting for programs and studies on issues that were of particular interest to Mrs. Roosevelt.”20 Restoration of Mrs. Roosevelt’s Cottage, once the Val-Kill Industries furniture factory, was the major focus of work, along with reconstruction of the bridge over the Fall Kill and repair of the overgrown and deteriorated landscape. Farm buildings north of the entry road, last used by the former groundskeeper Charles Curnan, were removed, but the Curnan house built in 1964 was kept as a staff residence. ERVK occupied Stone Cottage for its offices. In 1984, the major work was completed and the site opened to the public. In the first couple years, a contractor, Gettysburg Tours, operated a shuttle bus to bring visitors to the site from the Home. Due to financial losses, the shuttle was abandoned in favor of private vehicles, which were accommodated by two small parking lots completed in 1985, one in the orchard and the other along the rear entry drive (Cross Road).21 Since its public opening, the character of the landscape changed due in large part to growth of woods on the former fields north of the entrance road, and siltation in the upper pond. Built changes included expansion of the orchard parking lot to accommodate buses, paving of the entry road, and construction of a new building for ERVK at the site of the 1964 Curnan residence. In 2007, the Top Cottage Trail opened through the eastern corner of the Bennett Farm, following in part the historic road between Val-Kill and Top Cottage.

Outside of Val-Kill, the estate lands on the former Bennett and Tompkins Farms underwent no further new development during this period, but there were several notable changes. At the intersection of Violet Avenue and Creek Road, the
Tompkins farmhouse still looked much as it had in FDR’s day, but the adjoining former Val-Kill Tea Room, which had housed a succession of restaurants over the years, went through a number of major renovations that left its historic character largely unrecognizable. Across Violet Avenue, the Bennett Farm property stood abandoned while plans languished for development of a shopping center there. The Bennett farmhouse was rented for a time, but was demolished in 1974 along with most of the barns, leaving foundations and the concrete-block dairy barn built in ca. 1947 as part of Val-Kill Farms.22

Most of the Bennett fields along the west side of Violet Avenue, across from the maintained fields at Val-Kill, disappeared in successional woods during this time.

Following establishment of the Hyde Park Trail easement along Farm Road in 1991, the fortunes of the west part of the Bennett and Tompkins Farms changed in 2004, when Scenic Hudson acquired the 334-acre property from Poughkeepsie Shopping Center. A year after sale of the property to the park in 2007, the Roosevelt Farm Lane project resulted in the first built changes on the property in decades. The project cleared part of the old Bennett fields to create a trailhead with a new loop road and parking area north of the farmhouse and barns, with fencing surrounding building remains (fig. 2.180).

**Dumphy and Hughson Farms, Wright and Jones Lands (Drawing 2.24)**

At the former estate lands north of Val-Kill, development after 1970s consisted mostly of houses built on remaining empty lots within the Harbourd Hills and Patrick subdivisions that were begun in the 1950s. By the 1980s, both subdivisions were built out, with Harbourd Hill containing approximately three hundred houses within the Dumphy, Hughson, and Jones parcels (and on the east end of the Bennett Farm), and approximately thirty-five houses in the Patrick subdivision on the west side of the Dumphy Farm. Both the Dumphy and Hughson farmhouses still stood as private residences, and the Hughson farmhouse retained its nearby barn, with its 1939 wings built as affordable housing by G. Hall Roosevelt. Many conifers from FDR’s plantations remained as specimen trees, screens, and groves scattered throughout the Harbourd Hills subdivision (fig. 2.181).

Figure 2.180. The newly cleared site of the Bennett farmstead looking east toward Violet Avenue and Val-Kill from Roosevelt Farm Lane, 2009. The concrete pad is the remains of the 1947 Val-Kill Farms chicken house; the Bennett farmhouse was behind the trees at right. (SUNY ESF.)
The only large undeveloped parcels were along the Fall Kill north of Val-Kill, and the west end of the Dumphy Farm that was part of the Poughkeepsie Shopping Center tract between the Post Road and Violet Avenue. The Fall Kill tract, which was not visible from the core of Val-Kill, consisted largely of wetlands, while the west end of the Dumphy Farm contained part of the historically managed forest, remnants of wartime jeep roads, and the east end of Newbold Road (fig. 2.182). The Fall Kill parcel was proposed for residential development, but the project was halted due to wetland regulations. In 2002, the Beaverkill Conservancy (Open Space Institute) acquired the 18.34-acre parcel and conveyed it to the park as part of the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site. The west end of the Dumphy Farm was acquired.
by Scenic Hudson in 2004 as part of the larger 334-acre property, which was purchased by the park in 2007.

**Rohan Farm, and Briggs and Lent Wood Lots (Drawing 2.25)**

Most development on the Rohan Farm and its adjoining woodlots after 1970 occurred within the two subdivisions that had been laid out during the previous decade, Val-Kill Heights west of Cream Street and Greenfields to the east. Greenfields was almost fully developed by 1980s, with approximately forty-five single-family houses on the old Rohan Farm, and more than a hundred others on adjoining farms. Development progressed more slowly at Val-Kill Heights, where most of the forty single-family houses within the subdivision were built after 1980.24 The originally proposed extensions to the farms north and south were never undertaken. A number of lots at the west and north sides of Val-Kill Heights remained vacant, including three along Val-Kill Drive. These and the adjoining 30-acre parcel containing Top Cottage were owned through the 1980s by Phillip and Jean Potter, descendants of Agnes Potter who had acquired the property from Elliott Roosevelt in 1952. The Potter family had also laid out the Val-Kill Heights subdivision.

Jean Potter retained ownership of Top Cottage and its 26-acre parcel following Phillip’s death in 1982, along with several adjoining Val-Kill Heights lots along Val-Kill Drive and Potters Bend. In ca. 1989, she sold two lots along Val-Kill Drive containing parts of the old road to Val-Kill and Top Cottage, and houses were built there soon after. In 1993, Jean Potter died and her estate put the Top Cottage property on the market along with four adjoining Val-Kill Heights lots, totaling 33.68 acres.25 In May 1996, the Beaverkill Conservancy acquired Top Cottage and the four adjoining lots from Potter’s estate (fig. 2.183).26 Beaverkill’s purchase of these lands was made possible by a grant from the Lila Acheson and DeWitt Wallace Fund, a philanthropy devoted to educational and cultural issues established by the founders of Reader’s Digest. Beaverkill did not acquire several undeveloped lots along the east side of Val-Kill Drive on the approach to Top Cottage, which were not owned by Potter’s estate. On December 9, 1997, Top Cottage was designated a National Historic Landmark.27

---

Figure 2.183. The Top Cottage property (I) and seven other parcels (II–VIII) acquired by Beaverkill Conservancy between 1996 and 1998, showing alignment of the Top Cottage Trail that reestablished the historic connection to Val-Kill. The eight parcels were conveyed to the National Park Service in 2002. (SUNY ESF.)
Soon after the Beaverkill Conservancy acquired Top Cottage, the Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Institute began planning for the restoration of the building and its surrounding landscape. Part of the restoration plan included the reestablishment of a road connection with Val-Kill, located downhill to the west. The Harbourd Hills development on Roosevelt Road and the houses along Val-Kill Drive had eliminated sections of the road to Val-Kill built by FDR, and the location of the development made a connection within the historic estate lands impossible without removal of individual single-family properties. The park instead planned to construct a road on a new alignment to reestablish the historic connection between Top Cottage and Val-Kill, going south of the residential development. To acquire the property, the Beaverkill Conservancy worked with local property owners, Matthew and Loretta Lahey and Michael Hayden, to subdivide their two deep residential lots off Roosevelt Road to allow for the connecting road. The conservancy acquired these properties in May 1997, and a year later acquired the final piece that was subdivided from the Redl tract east of the Tompkins Farm, outside the boundary of the historic Roosevelt Estate (see fig. 2.183). Due to the rough topography, the park abandoned plans for a road through the Beaverkill parcels and instead built a foot trail. Opened in 2007, the Top Cottage Trail followed part of the original road to Top Cottage on the Bennett Farm, newly laid-out segments, a non-historic road behind Roosevelt Road, and finally, FDR’s first road to Top Cottage that ascended the north side of Dutchess Hill. Vehicular access to the site remained possible only through the Val-Kill Heights subdivision.

Restoration of Top Cottage, designed by architects John G. Waite and Associates and funded by the Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Institute, was begun in 1999, and the building was opened to the public in 2001. On the exterior, the project removed the front porch enclosure, a porch on the north side of the house, and dormers that were added after 1945 (fig. 2.184). The following year, the Beaverkill Conservancy conveyed Top Cottage and the entire 40.37-acre property to the National Park Service for incorporation into the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site. By this time, the landscape surrounding Top Cottage had been partially restored through removal of a swimming pool and greenhouse constructed by the Potters, and opening of the forest understory to reveal the
views looking northeast into the Hudson Valley (fig. 2.185). The original view to
the southwest, looking down the Hudson Valley, was not reestablished.

CONCLUSION

Seven decades after FDR established his vision of public stewardship for his
Hyde Park land, the major components of the Roosevelt Estate are reunited,
making accessible additional forested land that was once FDR’s passion. Visitors
can today walk from the presidential library and FDR Home, with its soon-
to-be-reestablished view of the Hudson River, through fields and historically
managed woods and forest plantations to Eleanor Roosevelt’s Val-Kill, and then
up Dutchess Hill to FDR’s retreat, Top Cottage, with its distant mountain views.
Although there have been notable losses to the landscape since 1945, including
numerous farm buildings and fields, and the addition of hundreds of suburban
houses and commercial buildings, FDR would recognize the estate’s overall
character, organization, and circulation. Post-1945 changes to the landscape
detract from the story of FDR’s management of the estate and his conservation
practices, but nonetheless reflect implications of subsequent family management
and changing regional land uses. Much of the suburban development surrounding
Val-Kill occurred prior to 1962 while Eleanor Roosevelt was still alive, and
therefore represents the historic setting of the Eleanor Roosevelt National
Historic Site.

The story of the Roosevelt Estate as a nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century
Hudson Valley country place is well illustrated at the Wheeler Place through the
FDR Home (Springwood), outbuildings, gardens, and rustic wooded pleasure
grounds, with agricultural fields bordering the Post Road. The neighboring J. R.
Roosevelt Place mirrors this same development, although it has lost some of its
historic character through commercial development along the Post Road and
park development in the formal garden and trotting course. The characteristic
estate farm associated with Springwood, the Home Farm on east side of the Post
Road, retains much of its wooded landscape, but only fragments of its farm fields
and farm complex that were lost to commercial and residential development
along the Post Road. The largely intact landscapes at Val-Kill and Top Cottage
represent the retreats of Eleanor Roosevelt and FDR from traditional country
life, tied to the context of family and political careers, as well as their interests
in rural improvement. This latter context, representing a progressive overlay on
the traditional country place, is most notable at Val-Kill and remnants of the
surrounding upland farms purchased by FDR.

FDR’s passion for addressing conservation and rural issues through forestry
remains well illustrated in portions of the landscape despite post-1945
development and natural dynamics that have largely erased the fundamental
agricultural context and setting. FDR’s reforestation practices are evident in the surviving twenty-three forest plantations within the park boundaries, although they are often difficult to identify through competing hardwoods (fig. 2.186). These plantations, now grown to maturity yet in incipient decline due to lack of management and natural succession, still reflect characteristics of early-twentieth-century reforestation practice, mirroring larger trends of the reforestation movement in New York State. The plantations also span the full history of FDR’s forestry work, from his first plots set out in 1912 on the Wheeler Place, to the experimental and demonstration plots established by the New York State College of Forestry on the Tompkins Farm in the 1930s during his years as governor and president, when he made significant contributions to conservation and rural policy. Remnants of FDR’s Christmas tree plantations from the late 1930s and 1940s, although not on park land, are still found in many residential landscapes of the Harbourd Hills subdivision north of Val-Kill.

Based on a general management plan finalized in 2010, the National Park Service is embarking on a new period of stewardship for the Roosevelt Estate based on greater understanding and appreciation of FDR’s relationship to the land. Plans call for continued emphasis on preservation, expansion of recreational and educational opportunities, and perpetuation of historic silvicultural and agricultural land uses. At the core of this plan, designed to make the Roosevelt story meaningful to new generations, is a reinvigoration of FDR’s conservation philosophy that the “history of every Nation is eventually written in the way in which it cares for its soil.”

To FDR, his Hyde Park land was a working landscape shaped by its natural systems and cultural history, by colonial boundaries of the water lots, architecture of the early Dutch settlers, parcels acquired by the Wheeler, Boreel, Bracken, and Kirchner families, and farms long tended by the Bennetts, Tompkins, Dumphys, Hughsons, and Rohans. FDR cherished the scenic views of the Hudson River and distant mountains, the birds and other wildlife, oak woods and old-growth stands of hemlock, and his farm and estate neighbors. Where others wearied from worn-out farm fields and decline of the countryside, FDR was hopeful in the future of rural America: forestry, he believed, could not only revive the fortunes of farmers and rural communities, but also protect and improve natural resources and the economy—an idea he began to practice at Hyde Park and later expanded at the state and federal levels. While today few visitors to FDR’s home are farmers, all are land stewards at some level. To a nation increasingly concerned with sustaining our natural and cultural environment for future generations, FDR left many relevant lessons in the landscape of the Roosevelt Estate.
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**APPENDIX A**

**ROOSEVELT ESTATE PROPERTY ACQUISITION AND DISPOSITION, 1867–1970**

**Graphic Key**
- Light gray: Roosevelt land acquisition or interfamily transfer
- Dark gray: Roosevelt land disposition
- White/italic: Related event

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PARCEL NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Wheeler Place</td>
<td>Josiah and Mary Wheeler to James R. Roosevelt, 110 acres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>Boreel Place</td>
<td>Robert and Sarah Boreel to James Roosevelt, 234 acres (north part of James R. Roosevelt Place and south part of Home Farm).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Bracken Place</td>
<td>Estate of Timothy Bracken to James Roosevelt, 182.7 acres (north part of Home Farm; former Bellefield farm).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Kirchner Place</td>
<td>Charles and Caroline Kirchner to James Roosevelt, 97.5 acres (south part of J. R. Roosevelt Place).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Death of James Roosevelt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Wheeler, Bracken, and Boreel (east) Places</td>
<td>James Roosevelt to Franklin D. Roosevelt, by will, subject to life estate of Sara D. Roosevelt, including 7-acre strip (drainage lot) along northern boundary of the Boreel Place (west), 415.2 acres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Boreel (west) and Kirchner Places</td>
<td>James Roosevelt to James Roosevelt Roosevelt, by will, excepting 7-acre strip (drainage lot) along northern boundary of Boreel Place (west), 209 acres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Bennett Farm</td>
<td>Willet E. Bennett and wife to Franklin D. Roosevelt, 194 acres (includes Val-Kill).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Tompkins Farm</td>
<td>Sarah C. Tompkins to Franklin D. Roosevelt, 192 acres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Death of James Roosevelt Roosevelt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Boreel Place (west)</td>
<td>James Roosevelt Roosevelt to Franklin D. Roosevelt, by will, subject to life estate of Elizabeth R. Roosevelt and Helen Roosevelt Robinson, excepting 7-acre strip (drainage lot) along northern boundary of the Boreel Place, 111 acres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>PARCEL NAME</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Kirchner Place</td>
<td>James Roosevelt Roosevelt to Helen Roosevelt Robinson, subject to life estate of Elizabeth R. Roosevelt on 1-acre plot surrounding the motor house, and interest for undetermined interest to Mary Newbold Morgan, 97.5 acres. (Only parcel within Roosevelt Estate never owned by FDR.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Dumphy Farm (east)</td>
<td>Estate of Thomas Newbold to Franklin D. Roosevelt, 74.2 acres (identified in tax records as location of Top Cottage).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Rogers Land</td>
<td>Estate of Anne C. Rogers to Franklin D. Roosevelt, 52.6 acres (land west of Bellefield formerly part of Rogers Estate, Crumwold Farms).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Briggs Wood Lot</td>
<td>Margaret Briggs to Franklin D. Roosevelt, 7 acres (portion of Top Cottage site).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Rohan Farm and Wood Lot</td>
<td>Peter C. Rohan and wife to Franklin D. Roosevelt, 133.2 acres (122+/- acre farm, 11+/- acre woodlot).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Dumphy Farm (west) and Hughson Farm</td>
<td>Estate of Thomas Newbold to Franklin D. Roosevelt, 201.6 acres (Dumphy Farm west, 112.5 acres including 10-acre parcel covering right-of-way over Newbold Road; Hughson Farm, 90.1 acres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Wright Land</td>
<td>Fred E. Wright and wife to Franklin D. Roosevelt, 13.7 acres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Dumphy Farm (portion)</td>
<td>Franklin D. Roosevelt to Dorothy Schiff Backer, 40+/- acres (Violet Avenue east to FDR’s east end of the Dumphy Farm purchased in 1935).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Dumphy Farm (portion)</td>
<td>Dorothy Schiff Backer to Franklin D. Roosevelt, 40+/- acres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Jones Farm</td>
<td>Wyatt Jones and wife to Franklin D. Roosevelt, 42+/- acres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Schaffer Wood Lot</td>
<td>Edward Schaffer and wife to Franklin D. Roosevelt, 6 acres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Schaffer Wood Lot and part of Jones Farm</td>
<td>Franklin D. Roosevelt to Dorothy Schiff Backer, 27 acres (east half of combined Schaffer Wood Lot and Jones Farm). This leaves FDR with 21 acres of the Jones Farm (Jones Land).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938-</td>
<td>Lent Wood Lot (partial title)</td>
<td>Four of six heirs of Franklin Townsend Lent to Franklin D. Roosevelt, 8 acres (lot immediately east of Top Cottage). FDR never acquired full title to the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Part of Wheeler Place (Library)</td>
<td>Quitclaim deed, Sarah Delano Roosevelt to Franklin D. Roosevelt, 16.3 acres; Franklin D. Roosevelt to U.S.A., 16.3 acres.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1942**  
*Death of Sara Delano Roosevelt (relinquishment of life estate at Wheeler Place and Home Farm)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>PARCEL NAME</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Part of Wheeler Place (national historic site)</td>
<td>Franklin D. and Anna Eleanor Roosevelt to U.S.A., 33.2 acres, with right to life estate by the Roosevelt family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>April 12, 1945</strong></td>
<td><strong>Death of Franklin D. Roosevelt; Roosevelt family relinquishes life estate to Wheeler Place (national historic site) by January 1, 1946</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Roosevelt Estate east of Maritje Kill</td>
<td>Estate of Franklin D. Roosevelt to Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, 842.20 acres; to Elliott Roosevelt, 842.20 acres (Home Farm east of Maritje Kill; Bennett, Tompkins, Dumphy, Hughson, and Rohan Farms; Wright and Jones Lands; Briggs and Lent Wood Lots).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Mary Newbold Morgan relinquishes interest in Kirchner Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Kirchner Place (part)</td>
<td>Helen Roosevelt Robinson to Puchar/Storr, 60.6 acres (south part of Kirchner Place/J. R. Roosevelt Place.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Home Farm</td>
<td>Estate of Franklin D. Roosevelt to Val-Kill Company (Elliott Roosevelt), 258.54 acres, 1948 (Home Farm except for Boreel Place east of Maritje Kill).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Rogers Land</td>
<td>Estate of Franklin D. Roosevelt to Mary Newbold Morgan (owner of Bellefield), 52.64 acres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Part of Wheeler Place</td>
<td>Estate of Franklin D. Roosevelt to Franklin D. Roosevelt Foundation, 60.46 acres; to U.S.A., 60.46 acres (western part of Wheeler Place).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Val-Kill</td>
<td>Elliott Roosevelt, half interest to John Roosevelt, 179.77 acres (mistakenly surveyed at 134, later as 174 acres, comprising part of Bennett and Tompkins Farms).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Val-Kill</td>
<td>Elliott Roosevelt half interest to Anne Roosevelt, 1960, 179.77 acres (second half remains with husband John Roosevelt).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td><strong>Death of Eleanor Roosevelt; death of Helen Roosevelt Robinson (relinquishment of life estate on west half of Boreel Place/Red House).</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca. 1963</td>
<td>Part of Kirchner Place</td>
<td>Estate of Helen Roosevelt Robinson to Estate of Franklin D. Roosevelt, 37 acres (north part of Kirchner Place).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Part of Boreel and Kirchner Places</td>
<td>Estate of Franklin D. Roosevelt to Bernard and Sidney Kessler, 144.5 acres (west half of Boreel Place with Red House and north part of Kirchner Place).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Val-Kill</td>
<td>John and Anne Roosevelt to Rosario Dolce and William Squires, 179.77 acres (part of Bennett and Tompkins Farms).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**

1. Table only shows primary property transfers within the Roosevelt Estate between 1867 and 1970; secondary sales and subdivisions are not shown. (continued next page)
Notes (continued)

2. Original (Springwood) estate total acreage: 624.20 (Wheeler, Boreel, Bracken, and Kirchner Places).

3. Maximum acreage of Roosevelt Estate, 1939: 1,521.60 acres (prior to subdivision of library and national historic site).

4. Total estate acreage owned by FDR, 1945: 1,374.60 (97.5-acre Kirchner Place owned by Helen Roosevelt Robinson; library and national historic site property owned by the federal government).

5. John Roosevelt’s sale of Harbourd Hill Lot #1 in 1980, 0.73 acre within the former Dumphy Farm, to the National Park Service is not shown in the table because it was a secondary property transfer, not the sale of an estate parcel.
APPENDICES

APPENDIX B

FOREST PLANTATION TALLY BY PLOT, 1912–CA. 1948

Key
Plot # = Numbered plots (by College of Forestry or Nelson Brown)
Plot A = Lettered plots (not numbered by College of Forestry or Nelson Brown)
date = Planting date, tree quantity (where known)
? = Plot location unknown
r = Replacement planting due to failure
d = College of Forestry demonstration plot
e = Experimental plot
c = Christmas tree plot
s = Planted as seeds

Other Species Key
1. American beech
2. White ash
3. Shortleaf pine
4. Japanese red pine
5. Corsican pine
6. Western yellow pine
7. Jack pine
8. White (concolor) fir
9. Nikko fir
10. Asiatic chestnut
11. Grand fir
12. Noble fir

Plot Names
16-20, 28 = Tamarack Swamp
31 & 32 = Black Walnut Planting Near Val Kill Shop
32 = Swamp Lot
36 = Powers Lot (not owned by FDR)
39 = Gravel Lot South
43 = Gravel Pit Lot (Northwest Newbold Lot)
46 = Linaka Lot
56 = Bacchus (Backer) Lot
58 = Northeast lot back of Post Road
61 = 1926 Christmas Tree Plot
63, 64 = Jones Lot

Notes
1. Quantities are unknown where none indicated after date.
2. Plot numbers on 1934 College of Forestry plan do not correspond exactly with 1942 version by the College (Partelow), “Property of F. D. Roosevelt.”
3. Plot 1 on the Tompkins Farm was divided in 1931 with construction of NY 9G.
4. Plot 23 on the Tompkins Farm was a red pine underplanting in gray birch.
5. Plot 34, in the Swamp Pasture on the Home Farm, was presumably never planted.
6. Plot 36 is listed under the Bennett and Tompkins Farms, but was on private property south of the Tompkins Farm (Powers Lot).
7. Plot 42 included an experimental mixed plantation of Norway spruce, tulip-poplar, and red oak.
8. Plot 44 was the site of the 1938–39 USDA experimental Asiatic chestnut plot.
9. Plots 51 and 53 on the Hughson Farm were presumably never planted.
10. The location of Plot 59, presumably never planted, is not known.

Sources
2. “Property Map Showing Portion of Estate of Franklin D. Roosevelt” (Lester Partelow, March 1942, ROVA).
3. New York State College of Forestry, “Forest Plantations on the Estate of Franklin D. Roosevelt” map and key, 1933 (SUNY ESF). (continued)
Notes (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLOT</th>
<th>Norway Spruce</th>
<th>White Spruce</th>
<th>Sitka Spruce</th>
<th>Red Pine</th>
<th>Scotch Pine</th>
<th>White Pine</th>
<th>European Larch</th>
<th>Dahurian Larch</th>
<th>Balsam Fir</th>
<th>Douglas Fir</th>
<th>Northern White-Cedar</th>
<th>Tulip-poplar</th>
<th>Red Oak</th>
<th>Black Walnut</th>
<th>Other (see key)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHEELER PLACE AND ROGERS LAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1912: 1,000</td>
<td>1912: 1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1912, 1914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (part)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G (part)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ca.1912-16</td>
<td>ca.1912-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c.1916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME FARM (Boreel and Bracken Places)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1912, 1913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ca.1916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ca.1924-26</td>
<td>ca.1924-26</td>
<td>ca.1924-26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ca.1927</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ca. 1924-1928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1930: 1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ca.1930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1931: 6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1930: 500 d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1930: 500 d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1932 e</td>
<td>1932 e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1931: 300 e</td>
<td>1932 e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLOT</td>
<td>Norway Spruce</td>
<td>White Spruce</td>
<td>Sitka Spruce</td>
<td>Red Pine</td>
<td>Scotch Pine</td>
<td>White Pine</td>
<td>European Larch</td>
<td>Dahurian Larch</td>
<td>Balsam Fir</td>
<td>Douglas Fir</td>
<td>Northern White-Cedar</td>
<td>Tulip-poplar</td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>Black Walnut</td>
<td>Other (see key)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1942: 6,000 c</td>
<td>1943: 300 c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1944: 319</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**JAMES R. ROOSEVELT PLACE (Boreel and Kirchner Places)**

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E (part)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G (part)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Red gate (?) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1938: 250 (1) 1939: 203 r |
| V | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1938: 250 (1) 1939: 297 r |
| ? | 1939 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**BENNETT AND TOMPKINS FARMS (Val-Kill)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1914</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M (see 61)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1930: 2,000 d 1931: 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1930: 2,000 d 1931: 100 r 1930: 700 d 1931: 300 r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1930: 2,000 d 1931: 1,000 r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1930: 2,000 (6) d 1931: 500 (6) R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLOT</td>
<td>Norway Spruce</td>
<td>White Spruce</td>
<td>Sitka Spruce</td>
<td>Red Pine</td>
<td>Scotch Pine</td>
<td>White Pine</td>
<td>European Larch</td>
<td>Dahurian Larch</td>
<td>Balsam Fir</td>
<td>Douglas Fir</td>
<td>Northern White Cedar</td>
<td>Tulip-poplar</td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>Black Walnut</td>
<td>Other (see key)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1930: 1,000 d</td>
<td>1931: 300 r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1930 d</td>
<td>1931 r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1930: 100 r</td>
<td>1931: 200 d</td>
<td>1931: 100 r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1930 d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1931: 100 (6) d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1930 d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1931 d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1930 d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1931 d</td>
<td>1931 d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1930 d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1931: 1,000 (4) d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1930 d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1931: 500 (7) d</td>
<td>1933: 400 (7) d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1930 d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1933: 400 (4) d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1930 d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1933: 400 (5) d</td>
<td>1934: 400 (5) r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1930 d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1931 d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1932: 2,000 e</td>
<td>1933: 100 r</td>
<td>1932: 2,000 e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1932 e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1932: 4,000 e</td>
<td>1932: 2,000 e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1932 e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLOT</td>
<td>Norway Spruce</td>
<td>White Spruce</td>
<td>Sitka Spruce</td>
<td>Red Pine</td>
<td>Scotch Pine</td>
<td>White Pine</td>
<td>European Larch</td>
<td>Dahurian Larch</td>
<td>Balsam Fir</td>
<td>Douglas Fir</td>
<td>Northern White-Cedar</td>
<td>Tulip-poplar</td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>Black Walnut</td>
<td>Other (see key)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1933: 1,500 e</td>
<td>1933: 1,500 r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1932 e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1933: 4,600 e</td>
<td>1934: 3,000 r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1933: 4,600 e</td>
<td>1934: 4,600 r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1933: 600 e</td>
<td>1934: 600 e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1933 e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1932: 2,800 e</td>
<td>1932: 2,800</td>
<td>1932: 2,800 e</td>
<td>1932: 2,800</td>
<td>1932: 2,800</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1933: 3,900 e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1933: 800 e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1933: 800 e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1933 e, s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1933: 1,500</td>
<td>1934: 1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1933: 1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1933: 3,800 e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1933: 5,500 e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1935: 11,000</td>
<td>1935: 6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1935: 6,000</td>
<td>1935: 11,000</td>
<td>1933: 2,000</td>
<td>1933:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ca.1937 r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1931 e 1930</td>
<td>1931: 1,000 e, s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1931: 500 e</td>
<td>1931: 1,000 r</td>
<td>1931:</td>
<td>1931: 4,000 e, s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLOT</td>
<td>Norway Spruce</td>
<td>White Spruce</td>
<td>Sitka Spruce</td>
<td>Red Pine</td>
<td>Scotch Pine</td>
<td>White Pine</td>
<td>European Larch</td>
<td>Dahurian Larch</td>
<td>Balsam Fir</td>
<td>Douglas Fir</td>
<td>Northern White-Cedar</td>
<td>Tulip-poplar</td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
<td>Black Walnut</td>
<td>Other (see key)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1934: 10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1934: 1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1934: 3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1934: 5,000 c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1934: 5,000 c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1934: 4,000 c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 (M)</td>
<td>1926 c 1944: 1,407 c</td>
<td>1944: 1,407 c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1944: 1,311 c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DUMPHY AND HUGHSON FARMS, JONES LAND**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hughson NE Lot</th>
<th>ca.1927</th>
<th>ca.1927</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1936: 10,500 c 1938: 3,600 c 1940 r</td>
<td>1938: 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1936: 10,500 c 1937: 1,700 c 1940 r</td>
<td>1937: 2,000 c 1937: 1,000 c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1937: 21,300 c 1938: 7,800 c 1940 r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1938: 5,600 c</td>
<td>1938: 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1938: 11,000 c 1940 r</td>
<td>1938: 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1939: 12,480 c 1940: 10,450 r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLOT</td>
<td>Norway Spruce</td>
<td>White Spruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1939 c</td>
<td>1940 r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1939 c</td>
<td>1941:18,000 c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1942:14,000 c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>ca.1948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1939 c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1940:23,330 c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1943:10,000 c</td>
<td>1943:10,000 c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1944:5,663 c</td>
<td>1944:4,888 c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1946:5,000 c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ROHAN FARM, LENT AND BRIGGS WOOD LOTS (Top Cottage)**

| 57   | 1940 r        | 1939:2,000   | 1939:2,000  | 1939:2,000 |          |           |           |               | 1946:500 |             |                     |              |         |              |                 |
| 58   | ca.1948       |             |             |            |          |           |           |               |          |             |                     |              |         |              |                 |
## APPENDIX C

### PLANTING KEY TO

**NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF FORESTRY PLANTATION MAP, 1933**

*(See Figure 2.126 for map)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plot No.</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Date of Planting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Red pine</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>European larch</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scotch pine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dahurian larch</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Western yellow pine</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Norway spruce</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>White spruce</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sitka spruce</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Western yellow pine</td>
<td>1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Northern white cedar</td>
<td>1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Douglas fir with northern white cedar and white spruce in the wet spots</td>
<td>1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Japanese red pine</td>
<td>1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Jack pine</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Red pine</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Corsican pine</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Scotch pine</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Tulip poplar</td>
<td>1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern white cedar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European larch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dahurian larch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tulip poplar</td>
<td>1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern white cedar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European larch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dahurian larch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>White pine</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese larch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot No.</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Date of Planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Norway spruce&lt;br&gt;Japanese larch</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Sitka spruce&lt;br&gt;Tulip poplar</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Tulip poplar&lt;br&gt;Northern white cedar&lt;br&gt;European larch&lt;br&gt;Dahurian larch</td>
<td>1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Red pine</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Red pine underplanting&lt;br&gt;under grey [gray] birch</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Stratified red oak acorns</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Red pine&lt;br&gt;Norway spruce</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Red pine&lt;br&gt;European larch</td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Meadow [unplanted as of 1933]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Swamp [unplanted as of 1933]&lt;br&gt;(clearing and draining unfinished)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Plots 17, 18, 19, 20 and 28 comprise the Tamarack Swamp.

Transcribed from original document using original tree names; reformatted and annotated.
APPENDIX D
SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR LETTER, 1947

Secretary of the Interior Krug to Estate Trustee Basil O’Connor, April 11, 1947, regarding development of the land surrounding the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site. The partly illegible annotation by Mr. O’Connor apparently asks Eleanor or Elliott Roosevelt whether the beneficiaries and guardians could give the lands to the government. (Source: O’Connor and Farber Papers, Franklin D. Roosevelt Library.)
(a) That buildings, pole lines and structures may be erected on such lands only for farm or residential purposes. New buildings or major alterations to existing buildings shall be subject to the prior approval of the National Park Service. No commercial buildings, power lines or other industrial or commercial structures shall be erected on such lands, except that existing commercial buildings may be altered or the property may be otherwise improved for the purpose of continuing established use after plans have been approved by the National Park Service.

(b) That no mature or stable trees or shrubs shall be removed or destroyed on such land without the consent of the grantee or its assigns, except such seedling shrubbery or seedling trees as may be grubbed or cut down in accordance with good farm practice and residential maintenance, and except that cultivated crops, including orchard fruits, may be pruned, sprayed, harvested, and otherwise maintained in accordance with good farm practice.

(c) That no dump of ashes, trash, sawdust, or any unsightly or offensive material shall be placed upon such land.

(d) That no sign, billboard, or advertisement shall be displayed or placed upon such land, except one sign not greater than 18 inches by 24 inches advertising the sale of the property or products raised upon it.

Such restrictions, I agree, would seriously affect the sale value of the property. I believe it is understood, however, that the potentialities for commercial development, brought about by the establishment of the Historic Site and its great attraction to the public since the late President's death, have increased the value of the lands and created the situation which it is sought to avoid.

I hope that these suggestions may be helpful in finding a solution satisfactory to the Roosevelt heirs and the Surrogate Court that will afford the desired protection to the Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Basil O'Connor, Executor,
Estate of Franklin D. Roosevelt,
120 Broadway,
New York 6, New York.
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    Second Empire, 86
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Arnold, Fred H., 298
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Barber, Nancy Crooke, 65
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road to (Bracken Lane, Newbold Road), 148, 149
See also Bracken Place
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formal flower garden, 115
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McKim, Mead & White renovation (1911), 115, 143
Bennett Farm, 5, 6, 9
acquired and managed by FDR (1900–1928), 8, 20, 113, 136, 137, 155–60, 162
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barn complex, 72, 306, 347, 348
disposition and development (1945–1970), 11, 277, 293, 302, 306–10, 313
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farmhouse (Woodlawns), 20, 36, 72, 156, 223, 306, 308, 309–10, 348
farming and forestry on (1945–1970), 11, 293, 306–7
farm road, 158, 159, 160
FDR’s improvements, farming, and forestry on (1900–1928), 113, 140, 157, 193
FDR’s improvements, farming, and forestry on (1928–1945), 203–4, 206, 207, 223–24, 296
fields/pastures and woodlots, 72, 157, 158, 223–24, 340, 348
suburban development and preservation (post-1970), 343, 346–52
tenant farmhouse (Curnan house), 156–57, 160, 223, 310, 347
Val-Kill lease agreement, 160, 225, 306, 309
See also Val-Kill property
Bennett farmhouse. See Woodlawns
Bennett, Willet E., 155, 156
Berge, Arnold, 238
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Big Cove, 70, 90, 91, 94, 139, 146, 345, 346
Big Lot (Home Farm), 97, 150, 152, 343
Billings Estate, Woodstock, Vermont, 121, 137
Billings, Frederick, 121, 138
Biltmore Estate (George W. Vanderbilt Estate), Biltmore, North Carolina, 119, 122, 125
Biltmore School of Forestry, 125
Black Forest, Germany, 26, 137–38
boat landing (Springwood)
removal of, 146
rock-spill, 146, 147
boathouse (Springwood), 90, 93, 99, 100, 146, 153, 154, 215, 221
Boorman, James, 7, 68, 87
Boorman-Johnston-Wheeler Place (Bellefield, Springwood), 66, 67, 85
eyearly habitation and settlement (pre-1867), 67–71, 87
farmstead, 69
fields/pastures and woodlots, 69
See also Bellefield farm; Bellefield house; Springwood house; Wheeler Place
Boreel, Robert, 7, 70, 89, 98
Boreel, Sarah Astor Langdon, 70, 98
Boreel Place (Home Farm, J. R. Roosevelt Place), 5, 64, 66, 283
acquired and managed by James Roosevelt (1867–1900), 7–8, 81, 89, 96, 99, 100, 101
disposition and development of (1945–1970), 289–91
Index

drainage lot, 100, 288, 289, 290
early habitation and settlement (pre-1867), 70–71
farmstead (Home Farm farmhouse and barn), 64, 70, 89, 96
fields/pastures and woodlots, 70–71, 152, 210, 211, 212, 213–15
owned and managed by FDR, 10, 139
See also J. R. Roosevelt Place; Red House

Bower, Ray F., 202, 213, 230, 231–32, 233
Boy Scouts of America
forestry programs, 27–28, 31, 129, 190
Bracken, Timothy, 89, 97
Bracken Lane, 96, 148, 149
Bracken Place (former Wheeler-Bellefield farm)
acquired and managed by James Roosevelt (1867–1900), 5, 89
acquired and managed by FDR (1900–1928), 148, 149
early habitation and settlement (pre-1867), 68
farmhouse and barn complex, 89, 96–97, 101
fields/pastures and woodlots, 89
Bracken Pond, 151, 219
Brierstone, 68, 81, 87, 88
See also Springwood house
Briggs Wood Lot, 5, 6
acquired by FDR, 9, 10, 196, 244, 245
acreage acquired by NPS, 340, 350–51
disposition (1945–1970), 315, 316
subdivided from Rohan Farm (1816), 74
See also Top Cottage
Briggs, Margaret, 244
Broom, William, 65
Brown, Nelson (New York State College of Forestry professor)
as adviser on national forest policy, 33
on FDR's forestry operations at Roosevelt Estate, 40–42, 201, 204, 242, 250, 291
on FDR's navigation of woods roads, 197
as link between Hyde Park forestry and New Deal conservation programs, 33
on scientific forestry, 118
Butler Estate (Crumwold), 85
Buttermilk Drive, 316
Carr, James K., 290
Central Hudson Gas & Electric Company
power lines, 141, 157, 308, 309
power poles for, 20
chestnut blight, 131, 141, 152, 192, 208, 241, 243
Chesnut Woods, 243
Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), 23, 27, 31, 32, 41, 46, 189
Clara Barton Memorial Forest, 134, 135
Clark Estate, Cooperstown, 127
Clinton, Town of, 58
“Kansas,” 36, 37
Commerce Grant, 154
Congress
  joint resolution of 1939 (enabling legislation), 10, 12, 198, 282, 339, 340
  Roosevelt Family Lands Act (1998), 339
conservation movement, American, 18
  natural resource planning, national, 33–35, 44
  sustainability/wise-use, 23, 44, 118–19, 282
  wilderness (wild nature) preservation, 23, 118–19, 280, 281–82, 298–99
Conservation Department, New York State. See New York State Conservation Commission
Cook, Nancy, 9, 31, 113, 155, 158–60, 223–25, 227
Cornell University Department of Forestry, 128, 190
  County Farm Bureau System cooperative extension programs, 128, 130, 190, 191, 192, 346
Cottage Committee, 346
Country Place Era, 84–87, 186
country places, Hudson River. See Hudson River estates
County Farm Bureau System (cooperative extension program of Cornell University)
  cooperative extension program in farm forestry, 128, 130, 190, 191, 192
Cream Street, 63, 71, 75, 245, 315, 316
Creek Road, 55, 63, 71, 75, 317
  plantations along, 227, 228–29, 232, 233
  See also Violet Avenue
Cronk Place, 312
Crooke, Charles I and II, 64–65
Crooke, John, 65, 67
Crooke estate, 7, 64–66, 197
  farmstead, 64, 70
  mansion house (Red House precursor), 64, 65, 67, 70
  old house lot, 64, 66, 67
  See also Boreel Place, J. R. Roosevelt Place, Home Farm
Cross Road, 224, 234–35, 344
Crum (Krum) Elbow, 42, 58, 65, 146, 197, 204
  FDR's preferred name for Springwood estate, 143, 197–98, 249
Crum Elbow Creek, 58
Crum Elbow Point, 146, 197, 215, 341
Crumwold Acres Development Corporation, 279, 299
Crumwold Farms (Rogers Estate), 81, 83–84, 86, 87, 88, 115, 186
  farm/barn complex, 84, 115
  forestry on, 115, 127–28, 132, 135, 137, 138, 204
  subdivision and development of, 215, 279–80, 299
  trail to “Cliff Walk,” 93
Crumwold Hall (Crumwold mansion), 93, 198
Culinary Institute of America, 341, 345–46
Curnan, Charles, 310, 347
cuttings, selective, 131–32, 141, 147–48
  clearings, 131, 132, 141, 147, 152, 208, 213
  damage cuttings, 131, 132, 141
  liberation cuttings, 131, 132
  thinnings, 131, 132, 147–48, 152, 195, 203, 213, 292
dairy farming
  rise and decline of in Dutchess County, 71, 95, 82–83, 115, 116, 185, 244
  on Roosevelt Estate, 95, 113, 148, 150, 151, 196, 218, 220, 223, 238, 244, 245, 293, 299
  See also Dutchess County farms and farming: farming, on Roosevelt Estate
Dallarme, T. See T. Dallarme Farm
Day, Joseph P., Inc., 279, 286–88, 300
Dead Man’s Curve, 201–2
   bypass around, 226–27, 229
   plantations along, 226–29
Delavan, C. C., 228, 229
depression, agricultural, 116, 119
Depression, Great
   environmental problems and remediation, 29, 31, 32, 36–38, 39–40
   public works programs, 31, 32–33
   reforestation initiative in response to, 31, 32–33, 37–38, 39–40
Dickerman, Marion, 9, 31, 113, 155, 158–60, 223–25, 227
Dietrich, Charles F., Estate, Millbrook, New York
   forest plantations on, 29, 124, 125
Diller, J. D., 241
Dill Lane, 315
Dinsmore Estate (The Locusts), 83, 86
Dolce, Rosario G., 310, 346, 347
Downing, Andrew Jackson, 62, 69, 86
Draiss, Frank, 216, 311
drive-in theater, 10, 68, 300, 343
Dumphy, James, 73
Dumphy Farm, 5, 6, 199
   acquired and managed by FDR, 9, 10, 196, 206, 223–24, 234, 244
   acquired and managed by Thomas Newbold, 115–16, 148, 155, 243
   acreage acquired by NPS, 340, 349–50
   barn complex, 74, 235, 236
   early habitation and settlement (pre-1867), 71, 73
   Fall Kill tract, 349
   farmhouse, 73–74, 235, 236, 238, 312, 348
   farm road, 235
   fields/pastures and woodlots, 74, 235, 349
   forestry on, 196, 239–40, 241, 243, 296, 349
   Gravel Lot East, 240
   Gravel Lot South, 240
   Gravel Pit Lot, 240
   housing project (G. Hall Roosevelt), 236, 239, 249, 311, 312, 348
   suburban development and preservation (post-1970), 11, 339–40, 343, 348–49
See also Top Cottage
Duplex (Wheeler Place), 11, 92, 144
Dutch Colonial–style stone buildings, 58–59
   planned by FDR, 17, 196, 216, 246
Dutch elm disease, 192, 212
Dutchess County, New York
   early land grants, 57–58
   European settlement, 57–59
   Native American habitation, 57
   suburban development, 184–85, 250, 316, 339
See also upland farms, in and around Roosevelt Estate
Dutchess County farms and farming, 37, 55–56, 59–60
   apple orchards, 116
   dairy farming, 71, 82–83, 95, 115, 116, 185, 244
   decline of, 60, 71, 75, 82–83, 116–17, 119, 185
   grain and fodder crops, 60, 71, 82, 96, 97, 116
   heyday of, 59–60
   livestock production, 60, 71, 82
   transportation networks and, 60, 82, 116
See also farming, on Roosevelt Estate; gentlemen farmers; model farming
Dutchess Country reforestation, 130, 188, 189, 191–92
Dutchess Hill, 2, 224, 234, 236–37, 243
fields/pastures on, 71, 73
views from summit/Top Cottage, 10, 54, 243, 244, 246–47
woods on, 73, 243
Dutchess Hill Road, 245

East Farm Lot (Home Farm), 96, 150, 152, 221
East Tract (Roosevelt Estate subdivision), 285, 286–87, 288
Edgar, James, 96
Eleanor Roosevelt Center, 341
Eleanor Roosevelt National Historic Site, 341
establishment of, 2–3, 11, 340, 346–47
historic setting of, 352
Eleanor Roosevelt's Val-Kill (ERVK), 346–47
electricity, introduction of, 141
English building traditions
barns, 59, 73, 74, 236
houses, 59
Enlarged Reforestation Program, New York State, 188–89, 190, 280
Erie Canal, 60
erosion control, role of forestry in, 29, 31, 37–38, 39–40
Estates Road, 68, 142–43
European settlement, early, in Hudson River Valley
contact with Native Americans, 56–57
forestry practices, 23, 26
patterns of settlement, 53, 58–59, 75
Everson, John, 65–66
Everson, Widow, 7, 65–66, 73
Everson estate, 64–66
See also Springwood estate

Factory, the (Mrs. Roosevelt’s Cottage at Val-Kill), 159–60, 223–25
rehabilitation of (post-1970), 341, 347
Fall Kill, 9, 56, 72, 73, 74, 155, 158–59, 349
bridge, 157, 158, 225, 235, 347
ponds, 158, 225, 236, 308, 347
farming, in Dutchess County. See Dutchess County farms and farming
farming, on Roosevelt Estate (Home Farm, upland farms, Val-Kill Farms)
apples/orchards, 142, 144, 212, 218, 294, 299, 307
dairy, 95, 113, 148, 150, 151, 196, 218, 220, 223, 238, 244, 245, 293, 299
grain and fodder crops, 96–97, 148, 150, 218, 293–94, 299
livestock, 293, 299, 314
poultry, 148, 150, 196, 218, 220, 293, 299
farming, traditional, 37, 55–56
decline of, 18
farmland
abandonment to natural succession (marginal soils), problem of, 1, 18, 59, 60, 71, 75, 82, 94, 97, 101, 113–14, 116–17, 119, 138, 281, 340
soil conservation/crop rotation, 83
soil depletion, 60, 75, 82, 113, 116
suburban development, 184–85, 186
Farm Road (Farm Lane), 95, 96–97, 149, 158, 301, 302
farms, model. See model farming on country estates
farms, upland (eastern), in and around Hyde Park
  decline of (1867–1900), 82–83, 113, 116
  patterns of settlement (pre-1867), 58–59, 60–61, 62, 75
  relocation away from river, 61, 66
  soils, 55–56, 59
See also Dutchess County farms and farming
farms, upland (eastern), in and around Roosevelt Estate, 5, 6
  acquired and managed by FDR (1900–1945), 6, 18, 113, 136, 155–61, 183, 196, 201–3, 211, 223–49
  converted/absorbed into country estates (1867–1900), 85
  FDR’s improvements and forestry on (1900–1928), 155–62
  FDR’s improvements and forestry on (1928–1945), 223–49
  fields/pastures regenerated to native forest, 71–75, 97–98, 157, 158
  leased to tenant farmers, 155–57, 183, 196, 206, 223, 227, 232, 238, 249, 293, 306, 310, 314, 315
  owned and operated by Elliott Roosevelt (1945–1970), 277, 282, 283, 284, 288, 293–95, 302
  owned and operated by yeoman farmers (subdivided from water lots, pre-1867), 61, 66, 71–75
  owned and operated by yeoman farmers (1867–1900), 81, 85, 101
  soils, 55–56, 59, 71–75, 96
  suburban development and preservation (post-1970), 339–40, 346–52
See Bennett Farm; Dumphy Farm; Dutchess County farms and farming;
  Home Farm; Hughson Farm; Jones Farm; Rohan Farm; Tompkins Farm;
  Wright Farm

Farm Wood Lot (Home Farm), 392

Farrand, Beatrix
  Bellefield formal garden design, 115

Faxon, Charles H., Estate
  forestry on, 124, 125

Fenway Drive, 316

Fernow, Bernhard E., 118, 119, 123, 125
  fire protection, 123, 139, 147, 193
  Fireside Chats, 21, 31
  firewood, 141, 203, 208
  Flood Control Act (1936), 33
  flower and domestic gardens, 87
    Victorian style, 87

Ford, FDR’s hand-controlled, 19, 20–21, 197

Forest, Fish and Game Commission, 8, 24–25, 31, 125–26, 127, 128, 137
See also New York State Conservation Commission

forest, native and second-growth, 56
  ash, 221
  beech–maple, 56
  black locust, 97
  chestnut, American, 131, 157, 192, 241, 242
  chestnut oak, 93, 97, 127, 157, 209, 223
  clearing of, 59
  elm, 97, 192, 212, 218
  gray birch, 157, 158, 228, 231, 247, 316
  hemlock, 70, 93, 97, 98, 141, 153, 209, 210, 214, 215, 221, 346
  hickory, 73, 97, 141, 157, 225
  as managed woodlots, 117, 127, 130–32, 141, 146, 147–48, 155, 203–4, 208–9, 280
  maple, 97, 209
  natural succession/regeneration, 69, 71, 72, 73, 75, 82, 93, 94, 97, 117, 151, 157, 158, 281, 299, 340, 343, 353
oak, 16, 63, 72, 73, 120, 141, 155, 208–10, 215, 221, 233, 243, 245, 343
oak-chestnut, 56, 71, 75, 82, 131, 138, 141
old-growth/virgin stands, 23, 45, 210, 214, 215, 221
red cedar, 56, 157, 158
red maple, 97, 98, 127, 220, 229
red oak, 94, 97, 98, 209, 221, 223
red pine, 56
tamarack (larch), 73
white oak, 97, 98, 127, 157, 209, 223
wolf trees, 132, 232
See also woodlot management; woodlot management at Roosevelt Estate forest, native and second-growth, at Roosevelt Estate, by compartment, 204, 214

forestation program, New York State. See New York State reforestation program

forest management

classifications, 130
See also forest plantations (artificial regeneration); Management Plan for
Kromelbooge Woods; woodlot management

forest plantations (artificial regeneration), 120, 133
German precedent, 23, 26, 119, 120–21, 122, 124, 130, 137–38
harvesting, 233
maintenance, 147, 195, 280, 292–93, 296, 298–99, 311, 353
monoculture, 132, 133, 192, 193, 194
planting methods, 133–34, 194, 311
pruning, 195, 213, 221, 233
spacing, 133–34, 135, 147, 192, 230, 240, 241
thinning, 131, 132, 147–48, 152, 195, 203, 213, 221, 233

forest plantations (and tree stock) by species, 385–92, 393–94

American beech, 207, 208, 222
Asiatic chestnut, 193, 207–8, 241, 242, 250
basswood, 139, 141
black locust, 133, 151, 193
black walnut, 145, 203, 229, 230–31, 233
Carolina poplar, 133
Colorado blue spruce, 201
corel (white) fir, 207, 242, 292
Corsican pine, 133, 203, 231
Dahurian (Korean) larch, 203, 220, 228, 230, 231, 232
douglas fir, 20, 125, 203, 207, 211, 229, 232, 241, 242, 292, 294, 311
European larch, 121, 124, 125, 133, 139, 147, 193, 203, 207, 220, 229–30, 231, 232, 240, 247
flowering and gray dogwood, 193
grand fir, 207, 242
hawthorn, 193
hemlock, 193
jack pine, 203
Japanese barberry, 193
Japanese larch, 193, 203, 207, 228, 232, 233, 240
Japanese red pine, 203, 229
lodgepole pine, 208
maple, hard/sugar, 124, 153, 221
Nikko fir, 292, 311
noble fir, 242
northern white-cedar (arborvitae), 133, 193, 203, 207, 229, 230, 232, 233
ponderosa pine, 208
red oak, 43, 45, 46, 139, 141, 201, 203, 231, 241, 243
Scotch (Scots) pine, 122, 124, 125, 133, 139, 140, 145, 147, 151, 203, 212, 230, 231, 233, 281
sequoia, 208
shortleaf pine, 229, 230–31
Sitka spruce, 203, 228, 230
sugar maple, 153
western yellow pine, 203, 228
white ash, 193
white oak, 43, 45, 46, 145, 201, 203
white spruce, Canadian, 133, 140, 203, 207, 211, 226, 228, 232, 241, 242, 281, 292, 294, 311
forest plantations at Roosevelt Estate
character of landscape, 130
FDR’s conservation legacy (post-1970), 12, 352–53
FDR’s professionally managed (1928–1945), 9–10, 18, 30, 31, 40–43, 183, 200–211, 232–42
forest management plan, 12, 18, 162, 204, 213–14, 219, 233
forest products and timber harvests, 19–20, 27, 34, 43, 45, 205, 208–10, 223, 248, 296, 313, 314
maintenance, 147, 195, 280, 292–93, 296, 298–99, 311, 343, 353
specimen trees, 145, 208, 297, 348
swamp plantations, 42–43, 73, 220, 229–30, 231–32
tree stock/seedlings for, 129, 132–33, 139, 140, 145, 203, 280, 293–95
See also woodlot management at Roosevelt Estate
forest plantations at Roosevelt Estate, by plot, 385–92, 393–94
Plot A, 13, 147, 212–13, 298
Plot B, 147, 151, 205, 212–13, 298
Plot C, 149, 151, 157, 201, 221
Plot D, 45, 46, 157, 158, 204, 225
Plot E (Post Road white pine screen), 145, 212, 221, 304, 305
Plot F, 147, 212–13, 216
Plot G, 145, 205, 212
Plot H, 151
Plot I, 145, 212
Plot J, 145, 205
Plot K, 145, 205, 212–13
Plot L, 151–52, 298
Plot M, 157, 204, 207, 225
Plot N, 151
Plot O, 152, 221
Plot P, 145, 205
Plot Q, 152
Plot S, 219
Plot T, 219
Plot U, 216, 299
Plot V, 222
Plot W, 314, 316
Plot 1, 228, 229, 232, 233
Plots 1–8, 228
Plot 3, 233
Plot 14, 230–231
Plot 15, 230–231
Plots 16–20, 230, 233
Plots 18–20, 232
Plot 21, 230
Plot 22, 231
Plot 23, 231
Plot 24, 231
Plot 25, 231
Plot 26, 231
Plot 27, 230
Plot 28, 230, 232
Plot 29, 220
Plot 30, 220
Plot 31, 220, 225, 228, 229, 232, 233
Plot 32, 220, 229, 232, 233
Plot 33, 220
Plot 35, 232, 235
Plot 36, 233
Plot 37, 232, 233
Plot 38, 232, 233
Plot 39, 240
Plot 40, 240
Plot 41, 240
Plot 42, 241
Plot 43, 240
Plot 44, 240, 241
Plot 45, 240
Plot 46, 241, 311
Plot 48, 241
Plot 49, 241
Plot 50, 241, 311
Plot 52, 311
Plot 54, 311
Plot 55, 240
Plot 56, 241
Plot 57, 247, 316
Plot 58, 220
Plot 60, 241
Plot 61, 226, 241
Plot 62, 241, 242
Plot 63, 241, 242, 248, 314
Plot 64, 311
See also Appendix B (plantation tally by plot)

Forest Preserve, Adirondack
establishment of, 123, 139
reforestation areas, 123, 125–26, 139, 187
tree nursery, 125

Forest Preserve, Catskill
   establishment of, 123
   reforestation areas, 187

forest products and timber harvests, 19–20, 27, 34, 43, 45, 46, 141, 151, 193, 194–95, 203, 208–10

forestry
   landscape of (1900–1928), 130–36
   landscape of (1928–1945), 192–45
   as remedy for environmental devastation (flood, erosion, dust storms), 24–25, 29, 31, 32, 36, 37–38, 39–40, 44–45, 125, 353
   for watershed protection, 127, 129, 189, 190
   as worthwhile and profitable investment, 26–27, 28–29, 34, 43, 45, 138, 206, 250
   See also forest management; reforestation movement

forestry, early practice in United States, 18, 132, 137
   cooperative projects, 26–27, 30
   demonstration and experimental, 136, 190–91
   European precedent, German model (plantation or artificial forest), 23, 26, 119, 120–21, 122, 124, 130, 133, 137–38
   European precedent, French model (selective management of natural stands), 23, 119, 120, 130, 141, 192
   federal efforts/programs, 33–35, 122–23, 280–81
   state efforts/programs, 123–24, 125–30, 135–36, 139, 186–91, 250, 280–81, 317
   See also forest plantations; reforestation movement; woodlot management

forestry, scientific (sustainable)
   definition of, 117–18, 120
   FDR's vision and practice of, 118

Forest Service. See U.S. Forest Service

4-H clubs
   forestry programs, 129, 190

Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Institute, 289, 345, 351

Franklin D. Roosevelt Conservation Camps, 28

Franklin D. Roosevelt Foundation, 10, 289
   See also Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Institute

Franklin D. Roosevelt Library and Museum, 2, 184, 216–18, 346
   administration of, 296, 341
   construction of (1939–40), 15, 16, 216–17
   dedication and purpose, 16–17
   design of, 216–17, 246
   Eleanor Roosevelt wings (1972), 341, 346
   entrance/exit drives, 217, 296, 297, 342
   establishment of, 198, 216, 282, 317
   landscape design, 217–18
   See also Library parcel

Franklin Road, 312

Fulton Trust Company, 284, 293

gardener's cottage (Springwood)
   Gothic Revival–style, 69, 92

gas stations
   Mobilgas, at Val-Kill Tea Room, 227
   Cities Services Oil Company, 300 (Home Farm), 312 (Dumphy Farm)
gentlemen farmers, tradition of, 18, 61, 81, 83–84, 116, 121, 218
  See also model farming, in Northeast and around Hyde Park
geologic history and landforms of Hudson Valley
  bedrock, 54–55, 59
  glaciation, 55, 59
  shale, 54, 59
  soils, 55–56, 59, 71–75, 96
  terraces (plateaus), 55–56, 59, 72, 96
Gettysburg Tours (contractor), 347
Gilded Age, 84
Girard, Stephen, 121–22, 125, 138
Giraud, Joseph, 70
Goddard. See J. M. Goddard Company
Golden Manor Motel, 301, 302, 343
grant of land under water, 146, 154, 215
Gravel Lot (Wheeler Place), 92–93, 139, 140, 145–46, 151, 212–14
Gravel Lot East (Dumphy Farm), 240
Gravel Lot South (Dumphy Farm), 240
Gravel Pit Lot (Dumphy Farm), 240
Great Bear Spring Water Company, 127
Great Nine Partners Patent, 7, 57–58, 63, 75
Great Plains
  Depression-era environmental disasters and remediation, 37–38, 39–40
Great Smoky Mountains National Park dedication, 38–40, 45
Green Pastures Rally (1936), 37, 45
Greene, Fred, 307–8
Greene-Jones subdivision (Tompkins Farm), 307–8
Greenfields subdivision (Rohan Farm), 316, 317, 340, 350
Gregg Farm, 244
  See also Rohan Farm
Hackett, Henry T., 146, 206, 238, 246, 283, 289
Hanley Drive, 308
Harbourd Hills subdivision (upland farms), 310, 313–14, 315, 339–40, 348–49
  Lot No. 1 (owned by John Roosevelt), 310, 314, 347
Haviland Park (East Park), 306, 313
Haviland Road, 313
Hayden Michael, 351
hedgerows, 59
Heiberg, Svend, 194, 204, 220–21, 227–28, 232, 247
Heiberg Reforestation Plow, 194
Henry A. Wallace Visitor and Education Center, 3, 342
Hertlein, Fred and Elsie, 304, 305
Hewitt, Charles A., 30, 188–89, 190
Hewitt Amendment (reforestation amendment), 30–31
Hilltop Cottage. See Top Cottage
historic resource study
  research sources, 6
  scope of purpose, 3–4
Historic Sites Act (1935), 186, 198
Holbrook, Ephraim, 68
Home, The. See Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site; Springwood house
Home Farm (Springwood farm, formerly Boreel Place farm), 5, 89
  acquired and enlarged by James Roosevelt, 89
  acreage acquired by NPS, 340, 344
  apple orchards, 218
  Big Lot, 97, 150, 152, 343
  dairy operation/milkhouse, 148, 150, 151, 196, 218, 220, 299
### Index

- East Farm Lot, 96, 150, 152, 221
- Farmed and managed by James Roosevelt (1867–1900), 95–98, 101
- Farmed and managed by FDR (with Sara Delano Roosevelt) (1900–1928), 100, 139, 141, 148–52
- Farmed and managed by FDR (with Sara Delano Roosevelt) (1928–1945), 218–21, 248, 250
- Farmhouse and barn complex, 64, 70, 89, 96, 149–50, 151, 218, 301
- Farm Wood Lot, 392
- Fields/pastures and woodlots, 150–52, 302
- Forestry on, 139, 140, 151–52, 202, 209, 218–21, 296, 343
- Grain and fodder crops, 96–97, 148, 150, 218, 299
- Locust Pasture, 97, 149, 151, 199, 219
- Middle Pasture, 97, 150–51, 220
- Night Pasture, 96, 97, 150, 152, 343
- Northeast Wood Lot, 98
- North Farm Lot, 96, 150, 301, 302
- North Parker Lot, 97, 150, 300–301
- Proposed hotel and motel, 301–2
- Poultry farming, 148, 150, 196, 218, 220, 299
- Soils, 150
- South Farm Lot, 96, 149–50, 218, 301, 302
- South Parker Lot, 97, 150, 300–301
- Suburban development and preservation (post-1970), 342–44
- Swamp Pasture, 97, 151, 220
- Triangle Wood Lot, 98, 152
- Woodlot management, 97–98, 150–52, 220–21

*See also* Boreel Place; Bracken Place; forest plantations on Roosevelt Estate; woodlot management on Roosevelt Estate

**Home Garden (Springwood)**, 142–43, 145, 212, 216, 217, 219, 297

**Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site**, 278, 283, 347
- Enabling legislation for, 10, 12, 198, 282, 339, 340
- Expansion of (post-1945), 12, 290–91
- General management plan, 4, 12, 353
- Master plan, 342
- National Register documentation, 4
- Opened to the public, 277, 282
- Planning and establishment of, 2–3, 10, 184, 198, 211, 216, 317, 352
- Visitor center and services, 3, 11, 340, 342
- Visitor parking lots (Home Garden), 296, 342

*See also* Roosevelt Estate; Springwood estate; Springwood house; Top Cottage

**Hoppin & Koen (Springwood architects)**, 143

**Horticultural Company**, 145

**Hosmer, Ralph S.**, 190–91

**Hotel and motel, proposed by Elliott Roosevelt on the Home Farm**, 301–2

**Howard Johnson’s Restaurant**, 11, 300, 301

**Hudson Lowlands**, 54, 55

**Hudson River**
- Geologic history, 54–56, 59
- Transportation for market farming, 60, 82

**Hudson River Railroad**, 68, 70, 82

*See also* New York Central and Hudson River Railroad

**Hudson River estates (riverfront farms and country places)**
- Beginnings of (pre-1867), 7, 59, 60–61, 66–67
- Decline of (1900–1945), 114, 185–86
Roosevelt Estate Historic Resource Study

decline of (1945–1970), 279, 293
expansion and heyday of (1867–1900), 1, 82–88, 279
landscape design, 86–87, 92, 94
settlement patterns of (riverfront “park” pleasure grounds, upland farms), 61–62, 66, 75, 86, 88, 101, 114, 115
views from, 62, 86
See also landscape design; woodlot management

Hudson River School, 62
Hudson Valley Lumber Company, 210–11

Hudson Valley

Dutch settlement of, 7, 57–59
European settlement patterns, 53, 58–59
geologic history and landforms, 54–56, 59
Native American habitation, 7, 16, 53
suburban development, 184–85, 250, 278–80, 316, 339–52
See also Hudson River riverfront farms and country places (estates)

Hudson Valley Welcome Center, 343
Hughson Farm, 5, 6, 235–36
acquired and managed by FDR (1928–1945), 9, 196, 206, 234
acquired and managed by Thomas Newbold, 115–16, 148, 155, 234
barn, 236, 239
disposition and development (1945–70), 293, 309, 311–13, 317
ey early habitation and settlement (pre-1867), 71, 74
farmhouse (Linaka Cottage), 74, 236, 237, 239, 311, 312, 348
forest plantations on, 116, 196, 240–41, 242, 248, 296, 310–11, 313, 314
housing project (G. Hall Roosevelt), 236, 239, 249
suburban development and preservation (post-1970), 11, 339–40, 348

Hyde Park. See Springwood estate; Vanderbilt Mansion

Hyde Park, Town of, 2
early settlement, 58
FDR’s model for American democracy, 37, 45
incorporation of, 58
suburban development, 184–85, 250, 278–80, 316, 317, 339–52
See also Dutchess County; farms, upland (eastern), in and around Hyde Park

Hyde Park Drive-In, 10, 68, 300, 343
Hyde Park Estates, 302
Hyde Park Fire and Water District, 341
Hyde Park Gift Shop, 300, 343
Hyde Park Mall, 10, 344
Hyde Park Theater (Roosevelt theater), 301
Hyde Park Trail (Roosevelt Farm Lane), 46, 341, 344, 348
Management Committee, 344
Hyde Park Visual Environment Committee, 11, 346

Hy-Sid, Inc., 302

ice pond (Springwood), 56, 91, 94, 99, 100
Ickes, Harold, 291
Indians. See Wappinger Indians
Isenberg, Irving, 18, 204, 213–14, 233

J. M. Goddard Company, 301
J. R. Roosevelt Place (Red House), 1, 5, 7, 10, 91, 98, 199
acquired and managed by NPS, 298, 340, 344–46
barn, 70, 99, 100
chauffeur’s quarters, 153
farmhouse (Teamster’s House, staff residence), 100, 153, 155–55, 304, 305, 345
entrance drive (Kessler Drive), 96, 98, 99, 154–55, 222, 345
entrance gates, 99, 222
fields/pastures and woodlots, 222, 304
formal garden with hemlock hedge, 153, 346
gardener’s cottage, 154–55
greenhouse, 153, 346
improvements by James Roosevelt (1867–1900), 98–100, 101
improvements by J. R. Roosevelt (1900–1928), 8–9, 152–55
improvements and forestry by FDR (1928–1945), 221–23
landscape/grounds, 63, 70, 98–99, 153, 222
motor house, 153, 154, 221, 303, 346
riverfront/lower woods, 93–94, 99, 144–47, 153–54, 210, 211, 212–15, 221, 298, 304, 345, 346
service area/complex, 154–55, 345
stables and horse barn, 70, 99, 100, 154, 222
suburban development and preservation (post-1970), 344–46
summerhouse, 99, 100
trotting course, maple-lined, 9, 153, 221, 303, 304, 346
See also Boreel Place; Kirchner Place; Red House

Johanssen, Nellie, 227, 307
John G. Waite and Associates, 351
Johnston, John, 67–68
Joint Committee on Forestry, 35
Jones, William F., 307–8
Jones, Wyatt, 236–37
Jones Farm, 9, 196, 206, 236–37
Jones Land
  acquired and managed by FDR (1928–1945), 6, 9, 196, 206, 238
  forestry on (1928–1945), 206, 211, 241–42, 248
  disposition and development (1945–1970), 311–13, 314, 348
Kay, William, 296, 302, 308–9, 312, 313–14
Kay-Reifler, 302, 308, 313, 343
Kelsey Nursery Company, 145, 222
Kessler, Bernard and Sidney, 290–91, 302, 305, 344–45
Kirchner, Charles and Caroline, 90
Kirchner Place, 5, 67, 198, 249
  acquired and managed by James Roosevelt (1867–1900), 8, 81, 88, 90, 91, 98–99, 100, 101
  acreage acquired by NPS, 12, 345
  disposition and development (post-1945), 8, 10, 289–91, 303, 341
  fields/pastures and woodlots, 152
  improvements and changes by James R. Roosevelt (Rosy) and heirs, 9, 10, 146, 154, 221, 277, 283, 298
  Morgan-Newbold interest, 154, 221
trotting course, maple-lined, 9, 153, 221, 304
See also J. R. Roosevelt Place
Koons, Earle, 284
Krom (Krum) Elbow, 42, 65
See also Crum Elbow
Lahey, Matthew and Loretta, 351
landscape design
  flower and domestic gardens, 87, 142–43
  Natural (rural) style, 86
  neoclassical-style formal gardens, 114–15, 143
  orthogonal pattern, 61, 62, 114–15, 143
  sublime picturesque (Irregular, rustic) style, 69, 86–87, 92, 94
Langdon, Mrs. Walter, 70
Langdon, Sarah Astor. See Boreel, Sarah Astor Langdon
Lash, Joseph and Trude, 311, 313
Lent Wood Lot, 5, 6, 245–46
  acquired by FDR (majority interest), 9, 10, 196, 245–46, 247, 249
acreage acquired by NPS, 340, 350–51
disposition of (1945–1970), 315, 316
  See also Top Cottage
Library parcel, 16, 198, 283
given to federal government, 10, 198, 216, 218, 277
Library, FDR. See Franklin D. Roosevelt Library and Museum
Lila Acheson and DeWitt Wallace Fund, 350
Linaka, Russell, 205, 237, 249, 250, 291–93
Linaka Cottage (Hughson farmhouse), 239
Linaka Road, 237
Locust Pasture (Home Farm), 97, 149, 151, 199, 219
Low (Lower) Taconic foothills, 54, 56, 59, 63, 75
Lower Woods Road, 147, 211, 213–14, 215–16
Lyon, Clarence, 308
Lyons Drive, 308

Management Plan for Kromelbooge Woods (1931 forest management plan for the Roosevelt Estate), 12, 18, 162, 204, 213–14, 219, 233
Mancius, Jacob, 65, 70
Maritje Kill, 56, 65, 71, 96–97
  bridge, 149, 159
Marsh, George Perkins, 118, 120, 121
McKim, Mead & White
  Bellefield house renovation (1911), 115, 143
  Hyde Park (Vanderbilt mansion), 114
memorial forests, 134, 135
Middle Pasture (Home Farm), 97, 150–51, 220
model farming on country estates, in Northeast and around Hyde Park, 83–84,
  113, 115–16, 121–22, 123, 126–28, 137, 201, 250
  See also gentlemen farmers, tradition of
Montgomery Place, Annandale-on-Hudson, 143
Moon, Franklin, 118, 187
Morgan, Gerald, Jr., 28, 3420
  donation of Crum Elbow Point and Rogers Land tract, 341–42
  See also Water Lot 6
Morgan, Mary Newbold, 10, 154, 186, 215, 234, 249, 280, 288, 299, 303
Morgan Circle, 312
Morrill Land Grant Act (1862), 119
Mount Hope, 7, 88, 95
movie theaters, 300–301, 343
Mrs. Roosevelt’s Cottage (Val-Kill Factory). See Factory, the (Mrs. Roosevelt’s Cottage)
Muir, John, 23, 118

National Archives, 296, 341
National Forest System, 33, 35, 123
National Park Foundation, 340
National Park Service
  preservation and stewardship of Roosevelt Estate (1945–1970), 296–99
  preservation and stewardship of Roosevelt Estate (post-1970), 11–12,
  Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance Program, 344
National Park System
  CCC reforestation projects, 32, 46
National Plan for American Forestry, 34–35
Nesooka-Edwards Paper Company, 294
New Deal conservation programs, 32–33, 37, 39, 40, 42–43, 44
New York Central and Hudson River Railroad, 92, 139, 147
expansion of (1912), 146, 215
logs sold to, 20
New York State College of Environmental Science and Forestry
See New York State College of Forestry at Syracuse University
New York State College of Forestry at Cornell University, 124–25, 128, 190
See also Cornell University Department of Forestry
New York State College of Forestry at Syracuse University, 128, 190
coooperative relationship with FDR (1930–33), 201, 203–5, 225–26, 227–31, 250
demonstration and experimental forestry work at Roosevelt Estate, 9, 18, 29–30, 31, 40, 46, 183, 191, 196, 201, 203–5, 219–20, 225–34, 250, 308
See also Brown, Nelson
New York State Conservation Commission (Conservation Department after
1927), 128
forestry plan, 40
forestry program (1928–1945), 186–91
reforestation program (plantations, reforestation areas, advocacy, 1900–1928), 40, 41, 125–26, 128–30, 135–36, 160, 186–91
See also New York State Conservation Department; reforestation movement; tree nurseries, New York State
New York State Conservation Department. See New York State Conservation Commission
New York State Forestry Association, FDR’s involvement with, 28–29, 34
Christmas tree plantations, 193–94, 206, 281
post–World War II, 280–81
Reforestation Area No. 1, 188
state reforestation areas, 123, 125–26, 139, 188, 189, 280
State Reforestation Commission, 188
State Reforestation Law, 188, 189, 191
See also tree nurseries, New York State
Newbold, Thomas, 115–16, 148, 155, 234
practice of forestry, 116, 130
Newbold, Thomas, Estate, 86, 115, 186, 234–35
See also Bellefield; Morgan, Mary Newbold
Newbold Road (Newbold Drive, Reifler Road), 95, 148–49, 156, 301, 302, 312, 343, 344
See also Hyde Park Trail, Roosevelt Farm Lane
Night Pasture (Home Farm), 96, 97, 150, 152, 343
Nisonger-Boos, 285, 286
Nordstrom Nurseries, 294
Norris Doxey Farm Forestry Act (1937), 33
North Avenue Lot (Wheeler Place), 90, 95–96, 142–43, 144, 212, 216, 342
See also Library parcel
Northeast Wood Lot (Home Farm), 98
North Farm Lot (Home Farm), 96, 150, 301, 302
North Parker Lot (Home Farm), 97, 150, 300–301
Novitiate of Saint Andrew, 88, 186, 278
See also Saint Andrew-on-Hudson Seminary and Novitiate nurseries, for tree stock/seedlings. See tree nurseries
O’Connor, Basil, 283, 285, 286
O’Connor and Farber law firm, 283, 290
Olmsted, Frederick Law, 122
Open Space Institute (Beaverkill Conservancy), 340, 349–50
Outpost Nurseries, 209

Paddock Lot (Wheeler Place), 92, 93, 142, 144, 146
Palmer, George A., 285, 289, 300, 301–2
Parmentier, André, 62
Patrick, Charles, subdivision, 307–8, 312, 348–49
Pell’s Lane, 236, 313
Pennsylvania
private forestry efforts, 121–22
state forestry efforts/programs, 125
Pete Rohan’s Lane, 315, 316
Phillips Estate (Moraine Farm), Beverly, Massachusetts, 122
picnic area and tourist cabins, 304, 305
Pinchot, Gifford, 23, 24–25, 30, 35, 119, 122, 123, 125, 137, 138
Pitcher, Clifford and Cosmelia, 315, 316
Plog, William, 93, 139, 141, 183, 205, 209, 216, 219–21, 222–23, 226, 228, 249, 314
Post Road (U.S. Route 9), 2, 51
agricultural fields along, 63
development along (post-1970), 10–11, 339, 343
ey early settlement along (pre-1867), 55, 57, 58, 60, 75
widened and paved (1900–1928), 141
widened to four lanes (ca. 1960), 304
Potter, Agnes, 315, 350
Potter, Gary and Robert, 315
Potter, Phillip and Jean, 350
Potter’s Bend, 315
Poughkeepsie, growth of (1945–1970), 278
Poughkeepsie Shopping Center, 343, 348, 349
Prairie States Forestry Project, 33
Progressive movement, 23, 27

railroad, and market farming, 61
See also New York Central and Hudson Valley Railroad
Recknagel, Arthur B., 120
Red Barn Road, 302
Red Cottage (Dorothy Schiff Backer country place), 237, 246, 313
Red House (J. R. Roosevelt residence), 1, 7, 8, 89
acquired by Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Institute, 345, 346
addition of porches (ca. 1880), 99, 152
Colonial Revival–style renovation (1915–16), 152–53
family disposition of, 290–91
initial construction of, 70, 98
as Roosevelt Robinson residence, 277, 283, 289, 290, 298, 303, 304, 305
setting (landscape, grounds), 63, 70, 98–99, 346
views from, 99
viewshed preservation, 12, 90, 298
See also Boreel Place; J. R. Roosevelt Place
reforestation (artificial regeneration). See forest plantations; New York State reforestation program; reforestation movement
reforestation amendment (Hewitt Amendment), 30–31
reforestation movement
beginnings, 18, 23
ey early examples of reforestation in New York State, 117–18, 119, 123–24, 187
heyday of, 18, 23, 186–92, 280, 317
in New York State, 23–24, 28–29, 123–30, 135–36, 186–91, 317
in Northeast, 119, 120–23, 280
Reifler Road. See Newbold Road
Réthi, Lili, and Frederick L. Rath, Jr., 248
Rhinebeck, New York, Post Office, 17
eriver estates. See Hudson River estates
riverfront farms and country places. See Hudson River estates.
River Road (Springwood), 146, 147, 153, 154, 210, 212–14, 221, 297, 298
Riverview Nursery, 145
River Wood Lot (Wheeler Place), 92–93, 139, 141, 145–46, 147, 210, 212–14, 215
road network at Roosevelt Estate (handicapped-accessible forest), 19, 46, 146–47,
wartime jeep roads, 199, 308, 349
Road to Rogers, 149, 219
Road to the Jones Lot, 238
Robinson, Helen Roosevelt, 8, 10, 98, 154, 221–22, 249, 277, 283, 289, 290, 298,
303–4
Rogers Estate (Crumwold Farms), 29, 81, 83–84, 86, 87, 88, 93, 94, 135, 147, 197,
198, 342
See also Crumwold Farms
Rogers Land, 5
acquired and managed by FDR, 11, 196, 211, 215–16
acquired by NPS, 10, 11, 340, 342
disposition and development (1945–1970), 285, 287–89
fish pond and bridge, 215, 299
forestry on, 209, 287, 298–99
landscape, 299
Rogers, Anne C., 186, 215
Rogers, Archibald, 19, 84, 87, 186
forestry practice, 115, 127–30, 137, 138
Rohan, Peter (Pete), 161, 244
as tenant farmer, 227, 232, 314
Rohan Birch Lot, 247, 316
Rohan Farm (Gregg Farm), 5, 6, 244–45
acquired by FDR, 9, 196, 224, 244–45
barn complex, 245, 314, 316
disposition and development (1945–1970), 295, 315–16, 317
eyearly habitation and settlement (pre-1867), 74–75
farmhouse, 244, 245, 315, 316
farming on, 11, 244, 245, 293–94
fields/pastures and woodlots, 74–75, 244–45, 247, 315, 316
forestry on, 247, 314, 316
Rohan Birch Lot, 247, 316
suburban development and preservation (post-1970), 11, 340, 350–52
See also Val-Kill Heights subdivision
Roosevelt, Anna (1906–1975), 8, 113, 143
Roosevelt, Anna Eleanor (1884–1962)
death and burial, 277, 309, 310
development of Val-Kill retreat, 9, 31, 113, 155, 158–60, 223–25, 227
on farming, 293
life estate and residence at Val-Kill, 277, 284, 306, 309, 310
marriage to FDR, 8, 113
memorials to, 341, 346–47
partner in Val-Kill Industries, 9, 31, 113–14, 155, 158, 159–60, 223, 224, 225, 227
purchase and disposition of estate lands (post-1945), 283, 284–85, 286, 288, 293
and suburban development, 185, 279, 352
support of FDR’s forestry program, 137–38, 225, 291–92, 293
support of Val-Kill Farms, 11, 277
See also Val-Kill Industries; Val-Kill property/retreat
Roosevelt, Anne Clark, 306, 309
Roosevelt, Curtis, 346
Roosevelt, Elizabeth Riley, 152, 154, 221–22, 277, 283, 289, 303
Roosevelt, Elliott (1910–1990), 8, 113, 143, 282–83
Val-Kill Company, 10, 288, 299–302
Val-Kill Farms, 10–11, 277, 283, 284, 288, 293–95, 302, 306, 311, 348
Roosevelt, Franklin D. (1882–1945)
as perceived by Dutchess County neighbors, 42
birth, 8, 81
career for problems of farmers, 20–22
connection with the land in Hyde Park, 1, 4, 15–16, 20, 23, 37, 42, 45–46, 353
connections and communication with foresters and farmers, 19–22, 26, 31, 35
conservation advocacy and public education, 35–40, 44, 201
conservation legacy, 12, 44–46, 339, 352–53
conservation policies, 4, 23–25, 28–31, 34–35, 40
death and burial, 247–48, 282
as farmer, 17–20, 148, 197–98, 200, 248–49
farm and forestry journals, 148, 162
farm management in Georgia, 17, 20, 21–22, 26
Forest, Fish and Game Committee appointment, 8, 24–25, 31, 137
influence on Scouting movement, 27–28, 31
involvement in architectural planning, 17, 143, 159, 196, 216, 246
marriage to Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, 8, 113
mobility via hand-controlled car, 19, 20–21, 46, 146–47, 183, 196–97, 198, 211, 215, 216, 233–34
paralysis and recovery from polio, 9, 19, 25–26, 113, 136, 140, 151, 158, 215
property management partnership with Sara Delano Roosevelt, 113, 136, 146, 148, 153–54, 155, 183, 211, 216
sense of historic continuity, 15–16, 17, 136, 144, 353
on suburban development and planning, 34, 279
support of forestry as assistant secretary of the Navy, 25
support of forestry as New York State governor, 9, 19, 28–31, 34, 40, 183, 187–89
support of forestry as senator, 22, 23, 24–25, 137
support of forestry as president, 19, 2, 32–35, 44, 189, 204–5
vision of conservation and American liberty, 39, 43–44, 45, 46
vision of conservation and sustainability, 1–2, 20, 22–23, 25, 26–27, 28, 34, 37, 46, 118, 352–53
vision of rural life, 27, 353
will and intentions for disposition and stewardship of estate lands, 184, 211, 277, 283, 284–85, 289, 290, 317, 352
See also forest plantations at Roosevelt Estate
Roosevelt, Franklin Delano, Jr. (1914–1988), 8, 113
Roosevelt, G. Hall, housing project, 236, 239, 249, 311, 312, 348
Roosevelt, Helen Schermerhorn Astor, 98
Roosevelt, James (1828–1900), 5, 7, 75–78
  acquisition and improvements of Springwood estate (1867–1900), 81–101
  as gentleman farmer, 95–96
  death and will of, 8, 100, 101, 152, 212, 288
Roosevelt, James (1907–1991), 8, 143, 283, 286, 290–91
Roosevelt, James Roosevelt (Rosy, 1854–1927), 1, 5, 7, 9, 98–100, 101
  death and will of, 154
  See also J. R. Roosevelt Place
Roosevelt, James Roosevelt, Jr. (Taddy), 98, 154
Roosevelt, John Aspinwall, Estate (Rosedale), 85–86
Roosevelt, Rebecca Howland, 7, 81, 93
Roosevelt, Sara Delano (1854–1941), 81, 198, 218
  management partnership with FDR, 136, 146, 148, 153–54, 155, 211, 216, 218
  right to life estate at Springwood (1900–1941), 8, 100, 101, 113, 183, 196, 198, 211, 212, 216
Roosevelt, Theodore, 23–24, 35, 135

Roosevelt Estate
  acquisitions and improvements by James Roosevelt (1867–1900), 81–101
  deed restrictions, 285–86, 303, 395–96
  early habitation and settlement (pre-1867), 7, 16, 53–76, 214
  FDR's improvements and amateur forestry (1900–1928), 8–9, 18, 19, 22, 23–24, 25, 30, 40, 42, 46, 113–14, 136–63, 201
  geologic landforms and hydrology, 54–56, 59
  historic limits of, 2–3, 5, 8, 9, 81, 196
  identity as farm, 197–98
  Native American habitation, 7, 16, 63
  natural setting, 2, 7, 54–56
  NPS acquisition and stewardship of (post-1970), 11–12, 339–53
  Roosevelt family acquisition of (1867–1938), 5, 7–8
  subdivisions within (pre-1867), 65–70
  subdivision and development of (1945–1970), 4, 10–11, 250, 277–317
  suburban development and preservation (post-1970), 4, 11–12, 339–53
  trails, 46, 93, 147, 250, 298, 299, 341, 344, 346, 347, 348
  trustees’ disposition of (1945–1970), 277, 283–91
  trustees’ interpretation of FDR will, 277, 283, 284, 286, 290, 317
  water lots, 7, 57–58, 59, 61, 63–64, 66
  WWII security system, 9–10, 198–99, 218, 242, 282
  See also Home Farm; Springwood estate; Springwood house; Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site; upland farms, in and around Roosevelt Estate
Roosevelt Family Lands Act (1998), 339
Roosevelt Farm Lane, 68, 69, 348
  See also Hyde Park Trail, Newbold Road
Roosevelt Forest, 135
Roosevelt Home Club (ca. 1934), 36–37
Roosevelt-Jones Bill, 24–25
Roosevelt Road, 312, 313–14
Roosevelt Theater (Hyde Park Theater), 301, 343
Roosevelt-Vanderbilt National Historic Sites, 347
Rose Garden (Springwood), 92, 142–43, 212, 216, 217, 248, 282
rustic landscape features, 69, 86–87, 92, 94

Saint Andrew-on-Hudson Seminary and Novitiate, 278, 346
See also Novitiate of Saint Andrew
Saint Andrews Road, 278
Scenic Hudson, 340–41, 343, 344, 348, 350
Schaffer Farm and woodlot, 237, 238, 316
Schenck, Carl, 119, 122, 125
Scientific Farming Movement, 119
Scout camps, 27–28
See also Boy Scouts of America
Scouting movement, FDR’s influence on, 27–28, 31
Seagaves, Eleanor Roosevelt, 346
Shawangunk and Catskill Mountains, views of, 62, 86, 90, 92, 93
shelterbelt program (Prairie States Forestry Project, 1935–1942), 33, 39
silviculture, 130
Simon, Louis A., 216
644 East 14th Street Corporation (Val-Kill Tea Room), 307
Smith, Moses, 20–21, 22, 230
as tenant farmer, 156, 160, 206, 223, 227, 238–39, 293, 306
See also Bennett farm
Social Security, origins of, 21
Society of American Foresters, 40–41, 204, 213, 280
1931 tour of Roosevelt Estate, 30, 204, 205
endorsement of FDR’s forest conservation work, 29, 41
Soil Bank Program, 281
Soil Conservation Service, 33
South Avenue Lot (Wheeler Place), 90, 95–96, 144, 212
South Farm Lot (Home Farm), 96, 149–50, 218, 301, 302
South Parker Lot (Home Farm), 97, 150, 300–301
South River Road, 70, 100
Springwood Circle, 302
Springwood estate (James Roosevelt estate, original estate, Wheeler Place, Hyde Park), 5, 81, 86, 88, 99, 197, 249
acquisition and improvements by James Roosevelt (1867–1900), 5, 7, 81–101
barn, 92
changes and development (1945–1970), 296–305
cottage overlooking river, 91, 94, 146, 215
Duplex, 92, 144
FDR’s improvements and amateur forestry (1900–1928), 8–9, 113–14, 136–37, 141–55
FDR’s improvements and reforestation (1928–1945), 211–23
flower and vegetable gardens, 92
gardener’s cottage, 69, 92, 100, 142, 144
grain and fodder crops, 144, 212
Gravel Lot, 92–93, 145–46, 212–14
greenhouses, 92, 142
Home Garden, 142–43, 145, 212, 216, 217, 219, 297
ice house, 92, 215
ice pond, 56, 91, 94, 99, 100, 147
riverfront/lower woods, 144–47, 154, 210, 211, 212–15, 221
North Avenue Lot, 90, 95–96, 142–43, 144, 212, 216, 342
orchards, 142, 144, 212
Paddock Lot, 92, 93, 142, 144, 146
redesign of gardens (1912), 8, 113, 142–43, 162
River Wood Lot, 92–93, 147, 212–14
Rose Garden, 92, 142–43, 212, 216, 217, 248, 282
ru
tic riverfront of, 92–94, 146–47
service buildings and drive, 90–92, 142, 144
South Avenue Lot, 90, 95–96, 144, 212
stable (carriage house), 92, 142, 144
staff residence, 92
Swan Cottage (playhouse), 212
tennis court, 144
tree nursery, 212, 219
trotting course (horse track), 88, 90, 144
water tower, 144, 217–18
See also Crum (Krum) Elbow; Home Farm; Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site; Roosevelt Estate; Wheeler Place; Brierstone

Springwood house (The Home, FDR Home), 1, 2, 91, 198
entrance drive (Home Road), 51, 90, 296

gifted to people of United States, 211, 216, 218, 249, 250, 277, 282, 283
initial Hudson River/Federal-style construction (Wheeler-Everson house, ca. 1790), 7, 66, 68, 69, 91
improvements by James Roosevelt (1867–1900), 90
Italianate-style renovations by Wheelers (ca. 1840s), 69, 91
renovation into Colonial Revival–style mansion (1915–16), 8, 113, 143–44, 162
views from, 92, 99, 144

viewshed preservation, 8, 12, 89, 90, 100, 154, 286, 289, 291, 296–97, 298, 303–4, 341, 345, 346, 352

visitor parking lots, 296, 342
See also Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt National Historic Site; Wheeler Place

Springwood Village subdivision, 301–2, 343
Squires, William J., 310, 346, 347
Stapleton, Jean, 346
Starbar Realty Corporation, 305, 345
Stone Cottage (Val-Kill Cottage)
home of John and Anne Roosevelt, 295, 296, 309
home of Marion Dickerman and Nancy Cook, 224–25, 306
office of Eleanor Roosevelt’s Val-Kill (ERVK), 347
planning and construction, 9, 94, 113, 136, 149, 157, 158, 159

Stone Cottage Road, 67, 69, 84, 93, 147, 197, 215–16, 287, 299
Stone Ledge senior housing, 343
stone walls (fences), 59, 66, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 223, 304, 305
Stuyvesant Estate (Edgewood), 85
Sucato Drive, 308
Suckley, Daisy, 243, 246
Surico Drive, 308
Swamp Pasture (Home Farm), 97, 151, 220
Swan Cottage (playhouse, later Val-Kill doll house), 212

Tamarack Swamp, 73, 341
reforestation of, 42–43, 229–30, 231–32, 233, 296, 308
Taylor-Dietrich Estate, 85
Taylor farm, 88
T. Dallarme Farm, 123–24
Teller, John, 66–67
Teller’s Hill, 55, 63
Temporary Emergency Relief Administration (TERA), 31
Tennessee Valley Authority, 33
timber depletion, problem of, 119
Tompkins Farm, 5, 6, 198, 199
acquired and managed by FDR (1900–1945), 9, 136, 137, 155, 160–61
acreage acquired by NPS, 340
barn, 73, 161, 226, 227
Cedar Swamp, 232
early habitation and settlement (pre-1867), 72–73
farmhouse, 73, 161, 226–27, 229, 348
fields/pastures and woodlots, 73, 160, 206, 233–34
forest plantations on, 18, 42–43, 46, 160, 196, 201–2, 203, 204, 206, 225–34, 296, 307, 311
improvements (1925–28), 161
pond, 233–34
proposed inn, 307
suburban development and preservation (post-1970), 343, 346–52
Tamarack Swamp, 42–43, 73, 229–30, 231–32, 233, 296, 308, 341
Tompkins, Sarah, 161
Toombs, Henry, 159, 216, 237, 246
Top Cottage
acquired (with surrounding acreage) by NPS, 12, 340, 345, 350, 351
design and construction of (1938–39), 10, 17, 183, 196, 246, 248
designated national historic landmark, 350
disposition of (1945–1970), 295, 315–16, 350
improvements (1945–1970), 315
restoration of (ca. 2001), 341, 351–52
road and entrance drive, 224, 234–35, 236, 243–44, 246–47, 315
site and setting, 2–3, 45, 46, 54, 183, 206, 224, 234, 236–37, 243–44, 246
views from, 10, 54, 243, 244, 246–47, 351, 352
See also Briggs Wood Lot, Dutchess Hill, Dumphy Farm, Lent Wood Lot
Top Cottage Trail, 347, 350, 351
tower, Italian Villa–style, 69, 91
trails, on Roosevelt Estate, 46, 93, 147, 250, 298, 299, 341, 344, 346, 347, 348
tree nurseries, European, 122, 124, 125, 231
tree nurseries, New York State Conservation Department, 123, 124, 126, 129, 132–33, 139, 140, 189–90, 192, 203, 207–8, 211, 292, 293–94
Free Tree Bill, 129–30
at Salamanca, 140
at Saratoga, 129, 140, 192, 292
subsidized tree stock, 126–27, 129, 139
tree nurseries, New York State College of Forestry, 203, 292, 293–94
tree nurseries, private, 121, 122, 140, 145, 211, 222, 294–95
tree planting methods
mattock-slit planting, 133, 134, 194
plowing, 133, 194
shovel-digging, 133
Triangle Wood Lot (Home Farm), 98, 152
Trust for Public Land, 340, 344–45
Tugwell, Rexford, 32

U.S. Department of Agriculture
Division of Forestry, 123
U.S. Forest Service, 33, 123
unemployment, relief of. See Depression, Great; New Deal programs
United Forestry Company, 131–32, 141, 148
upland farms. See farms, upland, in and around Roosevelt Estate

Val-Kill Company (Elliott Roosevelt), 10, 288, 299–302
Val-Kill Drive, 315, 350
Val-Kill Farms, 11, 277, 283, 284, 288, 293–95, 302, 311, 348
  demise of, 277, 307, 311
Val-Kill Heights subdivision, 315–16, 317, 340, 350
Val-Kill Industries (furniture factory, workshops), 9, 31, 113–14, 155, 158, 159–60, 223, 224, 227, 238, 239
  demise of, 224, 225, 227
Val-Kill Lane and extension, 159, 160, 224, 310
Val-Kill property/retreat, 158–60
  acquired by John and Anne Roosevelt, 309–10
  designated national historic site, 2–3, 11, 340, 346–47
  farming on, 310
  flower gardens, 224–25
  forestry on, 20, 45, 46, 202, 220, 225, 296
  home of Eleanor Roosevelt, 224, 277, 306
  improvements (1928–1945), 223–25
  improvements (1945–1970), 309
  lease agreement, 160, 225, 306, 309
  planning and construction of, 9, 113, 136, 149, 155, 158, 159
  rehabilitation of (post-1970), 341, 347
  setting and landscape (family picnic ground), 113, 155, 157, 158–59
  specimen trees, 224–25
  suburban development and preservation of (post-1970), 11, 346–47
  swimming pool, 9, 158, 159, 223, 225
  tennis court, 309
See also Bennett Farm; Eleanor Roosevelt National Historic Site; Factory, the (Mrs. Roosevelt’s Cottage); Fall Kill; Stone Cottage (Val-Kill Cottage)
Val-Kill Tea Room (Weaving Cottage), 227, 295, 307, 348
Val-Kill Water Company, 302
Van Alen, Mrs. James, 186
Vanderbilt, Frederick, 113, 186
  forestry at Hyde Park, 130, 137
Vanderbilt, George W., 122, 138. See also Biltmore Estate
Vanderbilt Mansion (Bard Estate, Hyde Park), 58, 61, 62, 81, 86, 114, 186
  established as national historic site, 186, 278, 279, 280
  farm complex, 115
  formal gardens, 114–15
  specimen trees, 145
Vanderbilt Mansion National Historic Site, 58, 186, 278, 280, 347
Van Wagner (Haviland) Road, 184–85, 236
Vermont
  forestry programs/practice in, 121
Violet Avenue (NY Route 9E, 9G), 2, 55, 63, 317
  Dead Man’s Curve, 201–2, 226–27, 229
  reconstruction and bypass (1931–33), 226–27, 229
See also Creek Road
visitor parking lots (Home Garden), 296, 342
Wagonwheel Road, 316
Wappinger Indians, 7, 16, 53, 56–57
  agriculture, 57, 63
  trails, 57, 58
Warder, John A., 119
Warm Springs, Georgia, 17, 20, 21–22, 26, 136, 247
Water Lot Five, 63–64, 66, 71, 72, 74, 197
See also Boreel Place
Water Lot Four, 66, 72
water lots, 7, 57–58, 59, 61, 63–64, 66
subdivided into riverside and upland lots, 61, 66, 85
Water Lot Seven, 68, 74, 235
Water Lot Six, 63–64, 66, 67, 73, 74, 197, 235
old house lot, 64, 65, 67
See also Bellefield estate
watershed conservation
forestry and, 127, 129
Weaving Cottage, 227, 295, 307
See also Val–Kill Tea Room
Webendorfer, Henry J., Estate, 86, 88, 90, 99, 186
West Tract (Roosevelt Estate subdivision), 285, 287–89
Wheeler, Mary and Josiah, 7, 68, 87
Wheeler-Everson house. See Springwood house
Wheeler Place (Brierstone, “park” side of Roosevelt Estate), 5, 7, 64, 66, 69, 85, 87
acquired and improved by James Roosevelt (1867–1900), 81–101
barn/farm complex, removal (1915), 144, 145
forest plantations on, 8, 13, 140, 212–16, 287, 298–99
owned and managed by FDR (1900–1945), 100, 142–48, 212–18
landscape improvements by James Roosevelt (1867–1900), 90–94, 101
NPS stewardship and improvements (1945–1970), 10, 296–99, 303–4
sale of estate farm (Bellefield farm), 89
See also Roosevelt Estate; Springwood estate; Springwood house
Withers, Frederick C., 92
Wood, Simeon, 74
Woodland Management Company, 209
Woodlawns (Bennett farmhouse, Moses Smith house), 20, 36, 72, 156, 223, 306, 308, 309–10, 348
woodlot management
definition and classifications, 120, 130–31
for aesthetics, 130, 131–32, 141, 148, 152, 204, 213–15
French model of selective management, 23, 119, 120, 130, 141, 192
improvement cutting system, 131–32, 203, 204
and model farming, 121, 123, 127
in New York State, 117, 123, 127–28, 138
post–World War II, 280
See also cutting, selective; forest, native and second–growth
woodlot management on Roosevelt Estate, 117, 127, 130–32, 141, 146, 147–48, 155, 203–4, 208–9, 211, 250
in cooperation with New York State College of Forestry, 203–4
on Home Farm, 97–98, 220–21
on Springwood estate, 141, 146, 147–48
timber harvests (selective harvesting), 19–20, 27, 42–43, 45, 141, 151, 203, 205, 208–10, 214, 220–21
on upland farms, 71–75, 98, 155–63, 203–4
See also Briggs Wood Lot; forest, native and second–growth; Lent Wood Lot; River Wood Lot; upland farms
World’s Columbian Exposition (1893–94), 114
World War I, 136
World War II, 21, 189, 198
security and communication system at Roosevelt estate, 9–10, 198–99, 218, 242, 282
wartime timber harvests on Roosevelt Estate, 43, 45, 205, 208–10, 223, 248
Wright, Fred, 238
Wright Farm, 6, 9, 196, 206, 238
Wright Land
   acquired and managed by FDR (1928–1945), 6, 9, 196, 206, 238
   disposition and development (1945–1970), 311–13, 314
   forestry on (1928–1945), 206
   subdivision and development of (1928–1945), 238, 348

Yale School of Forestry, 125