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PREFACE

The history of Prince William Forest Park is a multi-layered mosaic encompassing the original residents of the area, park administrators, the U. S. military forces, and official Washington including the office of the President. A definitive history of every facet of this rich heritage would be impossible to accomplish within the limited time frame afforded this effort. An overview of Prince William Forest Park's administrative history, detailing several critical periods in the park's development, has been produced through the cooperative efforts of many talented people.

Overall supervision of all research and writing of the park's history was provided by Barry Mackintosh, Bureau Historian for the National Park Service, and Dr. Peter Henriques, Graduate Intern Coordinator of George Mason University. The invaluable experience of these two scholars guiding this research effort helped to insure both its accuracy and relevancy. Marcia Keener, Management Assistant at Prince William Forest Park, initiated this project and assisted in every phase of the effort with critical logistical and moral support.

The location of valuable records critical to this effort was facilitated by staff members of the National Capital Parks. Mrs. Jean Smith located records at the Suitland Record Center that
park staff believed to be lost. Mr. Joseph Ronsisvalle introduced this researcher to the vast stores of information to be found at the Cartographic Center of the National Archives on South Picket Street in Alexandria, Virginia.

Every member of the Prince William Park staff with whom I came in contact took an active interest in this history, often providing leads to key persons connected to the park for oral interviews. Kelvin Fields especially, extended his help on his own time to act as a bridge between this researcher and "old timers" in the black community who provided valuable eyewitness accounts of the park's early construction. Mrs. Laura Hobbs, secretary to the superintendent, patiently answered every woeful plea for help as she unraveled the mysteries of the park's CPT in the production phase of this effort. Finish typing was expertly handled by Mary E. Reed, of Triangle, Virginia.

It would be impossible to thank everyone who offered assistance on this project. However, many unknown staff persons at the Library of Congress, the National Archives, the Prince William County School Board, and the Bureau of Docks and Yards at the Washington Navy Yard, gave freely of their time to assist in locating all the source material for this history. While just doing their jobs, these individuals helped to spur me on.

Finally, Superintendent Robert L. Harney of Prince William Forest Park was always available to act as coach and friend underscoring the importance of this effort and giving me ready
admittance to a corps of unique and talented individuals on the park staff.

Susan Cary Strickland
January 1986
FOREWORD

Situated on the edge of the densely populated Washington metropolitan area, the comparatively vast woodlands of Prince William Forest Park offer an inviting retreat. Prince William Forest Park consists of approximately 13,000 acres on the watershed of the Quantico Creek. It is approximately 35 miles from Washington, D. C., in Prince William County, Virginia. About twelve percent or 1,600 acres of privately owned lands, or inholdings, lie within the boundaries of the park.

Prince William Forest Park is roughly bounded by Route 619 on the south and west, Route 234 to the north, and Interstate 95 to the east. Two provinces of the Appalachian system, the Coastal Plain and the Piedmont, fall within the park. The fall line separating the Piedmont from the Coastal Plain crosses the park near the eastern boundary of the Quantico Creek. The highest elevation is 387 feet above sea level, the lowest slightly greater than 100 feet.

The Quantico Creek watershed is a major resource of the park. The north and south branches of the creek run parallel to each other, flowing northwest to southeast through the park. The two branches of the Quantico Creek meet at the confluence near the old pyrite mine. Several impoundments and reservoirs create surface water features (six lakes). (See map on the following page.)
"Prince William Forest Park"

"Rev. Spr. 1977, New 1973"
The park was built on sub-marginal farm land. Before reclamation the land was badly eroded by poor soil management practices spanning more than two centuries. American Indians first utilized the area thousands of years ago to gather plant food and hunt. In 1756 the town of Dumfries was founded by Scottish immigrants. The newcomers rapidly cleared the land and began the intensive farming of corn, wheat, cotton, and tobacco. The resulting soil erosion led to the total siltation of the port of Dumfries by 1785. Intensive farming continued through the early 20th century leaving the area depleted of nutrients. Remaining farmers were barely able to make a living on the sub-marginal land.

Today the park is a natural oasis in rapidly urbanizing Northern Virginia, providing a variety of outdoor experiences for the visiting public. The watershed of Quantico Creek is almost entirely forested with one of the finest examples of a Piedmont deciduous forest on the eastern seaboard. Pines and mixed hardwoods and various stages of natural succession are apparent. The lush stream valleys and rolling terrain associated with the fall zone between the Piedmont and Coastal Plain physiographic provinces create diverse wildlife habitats and recreational settings. Deer, beaver, ruffed grouse, fox and wild turkey can all be observed in the park.

Preserved as a tranquil setting for the study and interpretation of its natural and cultural resources, Prince William Forest Park represents a significant asset to the entire...
Washington metropolitan area. It is administered through the National Capital Region of the National Park Service. Small by comparison to the great national parks, Prince William Forest Park serves a unique mission reflecting the idealism that created the national park system.
CHAPTER ONE

THE CONSTRUCTION OF PRINCE WILLIAM
FOREST PARK

In the fall of 1934 Miss Annie Williams, a trusted black midwife and mother of four children, harvested her apples and peaches from her small orchard on Hickory Ridge Road in Joplin, Virginia. She would sell them to passers-by following a pattern well established over the past 20 years. As she was selling her fruits to help "get by," little could she have known of the radical changes planned for her and her land by unseen benefactors in the Roosevelt Administration.¹

In his fight to end the Great Depression, President Franklin D. Roosevelt was prepared to spend federal money to directly aid the poor. Roosevelt had entered the White House in 1933 with a mandate to end the Great Depression. Self-liquidating projects employing the jobless were a major component of his recovery program.² Responsibility for distributing more than $500 million allocated to the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA) fell to Administrator Harry L. Hopkins.³ His creative programming fostered the formation of the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) and the Works Progress Administration (WPA). These and several other
federal work programs were made available for the development of national, state, and metropolitan parks.4

Prince William Forest Park, originally called the Chopawamsic Recreational Development Area at its inception in 1934, would be one of the beneficiaries of this federal relief effort.5 The Recreational Demonstration Area (RDA) program was one of the really successful New Deal programs supervised by the National Park Service.6

Unlike other park development plans, the RDA program had funds for land acquisition.7 This funding stemmed from the RDA's place in President Roosevelt's overall conservation program. While governor of New York, Roosevelt made conservation a governmental responsibility. His concern for the problem of land utilization became a national issue in 1934 when he created the Land Planning Committee consisting of Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace, WPA administrator Harry L. Hopkins, and the governor of the Farm Credit Administration W. I. Meyers. The committee worked through coordinators appointed by the cooperating agencies. Conrad L. Wirth was designated Interior Department coordinator and Matt Huppuch of the National Park Service (NPS) his alternate.

Studies of recreational needs conducted by the Land Planning Committee revealed an urgent need for natural areas relatively close to population centers and available to large
numbers of people for weekend and every day use. Useful recreational facilities consisted of group campsites, hiking trails, swimming, and picnic facilities. Studies also revealed many private groups, especially those serving the urban poor, which could not afford to build their own facilities for group camping but could provide effective operational leadership and maintenance.8

In the case of the Chopawamsic RDA, charitable organizations in nearby Washington, D. C. were desperate for adequate group camping facilities. Those in Rock Creek Park were no longer viable for "long-period camping" as it was increasingly being used for "intensified day use and recreational purposes."9 Because of the utter absence of alternate facilities groups like the Twelfth Street YMCA, the Salvation Army, and the Boys' Clubs of Washington were pressing the National Park Service for relief. As a result, the construction of group camping facilities took top priority at the Chopawamsic RDA, with other day-use facilities considered of lesser importance.

The RDA program, one of four development projects devised by the Land Planning Committee, was intended to address these needs. The inspiration for the RDA program came from Matt Huppuch of the NPS. While traveling in Switzerland, Huppuch had observed that all school children had opportunities to spend time in a nature camp. His wholehearted endorsement of
the practice was taken up by the Land Planning Committee. In response, the FERA organized the Land Program, headed by John S. Lansill. Using part of a $25 million allocation from the Board of Public Works, 46 RDAs in 24 states were planned and developed between 1933 and 1942.\(^\text{10}\)

The RDA program was a new concept in outdoor recreation which fully reflected Roosevelt's vision of a progressive government working through a federal system to enhance the public good. As it combined the goals of conservation and social welfare, the RDA concept received the unanimous approval and support of the National Park Service and the Land Planning Committee of the FERA.\(^\text{11}\)

The general objective was to provide quality outdoor recreation facilities at the lowest possible cost for the benefit of people of lower and middle incomes. On these areas major emphasis was to be placed on building campsites for group camping. Provisions for year-round camping facilities for week-end and day use were also to be constructed.\(^\text{12}\)

In hard fact the RDA program meant that the land of Miss Annie and 150 other families was to be purchased by the Federal government in order to construct a park in Prince William County. Miss Annie's home in Joplin had been targeted by the site selection team of the Land Planning Committee: Conrad Wirth and Matt Huppuch.\(^\text{13}\) Once an area had been identified the Land Program of the FERA would provide funds for land
acquisition, the NPS would plan and supervise construction of all recreational facilities, and the WPA, CCC, and PWA programs would provide the necessary labor.

Site Selection

Conrad Wirth and Matt Huppuch made the RDA program's twofold mission of conservation and social welfare the basis for site selection. Before an area could be considered, Wirth had to demonstrate that "a reasonable part of the land we purchased was submarginal from an agricultural standpoint." Consequently, the Land Program of the FERA targeted blighted rural areas located within 35 miles of major urban centers. Cooperation between federal, state, and local agencies was initiated to reclaim the submarginal lands and assist in relocating the rural poor. In a few instances, displaced residents were offered help in finding other occupations. RDAs were purposefully located where they would be accessible to large numbers of people thereby fulfilling their designation as demonstrations in the use of lands well adapted to recreation.

Other criteria in site selection considered necessary by Wirth to insure the recreational value of each RDA included an "abundance of good water, available building materials, and an interesting environment. "We felt water recreation was important and wanted to be sure to have a location where we could build small lakes if a lake was not already there."
Cost was another factor. Wirth was to "get land that could be purchased for five dollars an acre, though later that was extended to an average price of ten dollars an acre."\textsuperscript{17} Wirth was proud to have been involved in a land planning effort of such national significance. In his view the Land Program coordinated "the best knowledge and experience in agriculture, rural economics, rehabilitation and recreation to effect the orderly planning of land use in America."\textsuperscript{18}

**Administration**

The original intent of the RDA program was to turn the RDAs over to the states. Consequently, all plans for land acquisition and development carried both NPS and state or county park authority approval.\textsuperscript{19} Before this transfer occurred, the RDA program experienced several administrative changes. By executive order on May 1, 1935, the entire Land Program was transferred to the newly established Resettlement Administration under Rexford Tugwell, although by then the program was well underway. Again on November 14, 1936, Executive Order 7496 turned the entire RDA program over to the National Park Service. Only requests for funds were submitted to the Resettlement Administration.\textsuperscript{20} Finally, on August 13, 1940, Congress passed legislation granting the Secretary of the Interior authority to "either deed or lease to the states any lands purchased under the RDA program together with improvements, subject to an agreement that they would be used
for public park and recreation purposes for at least twenty-five years.\textsuperscript{21}

Part of Catoctin RDA in Maryland and the Chopawamsic RDA (Prince William Forest Park) were never placed under state control. Catoctin Mountain Park surrounds Camp David, the presidential retreat. Prince William Forest Park has remained a part of the National Park System serving residents of and visitors to the national capital area. It was retained in 1939 in recognition of its value as "an ideal recreational and camping area needed for organized camping facilities for various social service agencies and other organizations" in the Washington area.\textsuperscript{22} Indeed, early in the planning process C. Marshall Finnan, Superintendent of the National Capital Parks had warned of the possible "discontinuance of the use of existing sites" by the urban population of the District of Columbia in the absence of NPS control over the Chopawamsic RDA.\textsuperscript{23}

**Justification for the Chopawamsic Site Selection**

On February 19, 1935, John S. Lansill, director of the Land Program within the FERA, gave "Connie" Wirth, assistant director of the NPS, the go-ahead to begin accepting options to sell on the land for the Chopawamsic RDA.\textsuperscript{24} Soon thereafter Miss Williams and her neighbors were asked to set a value on their land and offer it to the government for sale.
Located close to Washington, D. C., the Chopawamsic Demonstration Area provided Wirth with an "accessible experimental station" on which to build a model RDA.25 Aware that this accessibility also meant the close scrutiny of FERA administrator Harry L. Hopkins, Chief Engineer Thomas Hibben, and Director Lansill of the Land Program, Wirth felt the success or failure of the Chopawamsic RDA could affect all Land Program projects. 26

Consequently, particular attention was paid to the site selection to insure that the Chopawamsic RDA could be fully justified under the guidelines of the Land program. Mrs. Marion Lewis, Relief Director for Prince William County, Virginia, was contacted to provide an economic profile of the initial 8,081.12-acre site under consideration in Joplin. She reported that of the 150 families living in the target area, "only 40 had a regular income. Seventy had part-time employment and 40 had irregular or no employment or cash income." Further evidence of the "essential" need for improvement lay in the fact that more than 30 farms were abandoned, 5 store keepers had gone out of business between 1925 and 1934, and tax delinquencies over 5 years had been 22 percent.27 The pyrite mine was abandoned in 1925 leaving many families "stranded on this land." Attempts to "eke out a living through hill-side agricultural pursuits" left these people very poor with "50 to 60 percent on relief."28
these statistics it could be concluded that the submarginal agricultural land was not providing a decent standard of living to its inhabitants. 29

The Chopawamsic RDA project required the relocation of at least 40 of the most desperately poor families living in the target area. Plans called for assistance to be rendered to allow those "best suited to agriculture" to continue farming while allowing training for "those best suited to other occupations." 30 Charles Gerner, Chopawamsic project manager for the Resettlement Administration, cooperated with H. H. Gordon, director of the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation, a division of the Virginia Emergency Relief Administration, to identify and assist the most needy families. Records of their transactions were sent to James M. Gray, head of the land utilization division of the FERA in Raleigh, North Carolina. S. S. Teel of the Virginia Rural Rehabilitation Corporation performed the actual on-site survey of need. Locally, a Mr. Sizer did most of the rehabilitation work for Prince William County but he was excluded from assisting with the Chopawamsic RDA project as Assistant Manager William R. Hall wished to avoid complications inherent in dealings with "the Manassas ring" controlling Prince William County government. 31 Working with the input of Gordon and Teel, the FERA project staff in Raleigh determined the type of assistance required by the poorest families on the Chopawamsic RDA site. Through the
assistance given to these poor families the Joplin site provided an opportunity for the RDA program to demonstrate its ability to serve the needs of the rural poor.

Cost was another factor which made the Joplin site attractive to FERA officials. The purpose of the Land Program as seen by Project Manager William R. Hall "was to buy a quantity of land at low prices." The Joplin Site consisted of land badly depleted by poor farming practices. Land in the vicinity of the abandoned pyrite mine was badly scarred by soil erosion. Thus, FERA officials considered the Joplin site a good candidate for a "low initial investment" in an RDA. The average price paid per option was $13.33 per acre which was considered by Land Program officials to be definitely fair and most likely one which "could not be duplicated" on the open market.

As a future recreational facility, the most compelling attraction of Joplin was its forests and streams. The area to be purchased was forested "except for relatively small clearings comprising less than a tenth of the tract." The second growth forest contained many fine old trees. Wildlife was abundant. Early preliminary plans included lakes, wildlife sanctuaries, picnic areas, horseback riding and boating facilities in addition to cabins for organized camping. All of these ideas were inspired by the natural beauty of the wilderness areas on the Joplin site.
Endorsements for the Chopawamsic RDA were easily attained. A well documented need for recreational facilities existed in the Washington area. Rock Creek Park was no longer viable for "long-period camping" as it was increasingly used for intensified day use and recreational purposes. Because of the lack of alternate facilities for group camping near Washington, D. C., all of the charitable agencies with youth programs endorsed construction of a park in the Chopawamsic RDA. (See Appendix IV for a list of endorsing agencies.) The Board of County Supervisors of Prince William County endorsed the project as it would provide "material help and benefit" to the farmers involved and to "all the people residing in Prince William and Stafford counties." In addition, public service organizations such as the Manassas Kiwanis and all area scouting programs lent their support to the project.

The Human Cost

Inevitably, however, the Land Program planners were forced to confront the need to displace those already living on the land. Here the ideals of the RDA concept came into sharp conflict with the reality of land use patterns in Joplin.

Unquestionably, much of the land had little value for commercial agriculture. But, the economy of Joplin was not based upon a cash income. Rather, the land was a tool for subsistence farming supplemented by outside pursuits. Most people had just a small home in the woods with two to five
acres cleared around it. On this land they kept the mandatory hogs, chickens, and cattle as sources of meat and milk. Vegetable gardens, small orchards, and bee keeping provided an abundant and varied diet. According to lifelong resident John Taylor, "no one really thought they were poor." As long as one was "able to set a good table" Miss Annie felt life was sweet. Most of life's material needs could be obtained through barter. Essential goods such as material for clothing, wood stoves, and furniture were acquired this way. Education was a luxury. Most considered themselves fortunate to have completed grade school.

In this rural society, cash income was regarded as "outside money." The depression simply meant that there would be less money with which to purchase luxuries. The land provided a self-sufficient, stable life. Outside money came from the sale of lumber, dairy products, fruits, and vegetables. Jobs at Fort Belvoir, Quantico Marine Corps Base, or the Washington Navy Yard provided cash for a lucky few. Others hoped to earn extra cash as day laborers on more prosperous farms. Triangle was graced by two grocery stores and a car dealership.

No one spoke of but many profited from the lucrative trade in moonshine. Members of the Mountjoy family were renowned for their good moonshine. Their prosperity made possible many
charitable donations which earned them the equally high accolade as good community people.\textsuperscript{47}

Homes were functional structures. Few had inside plumbing, telephones, or electricity.\textsuperscript{48} Rather than feel deprived, Miss Annie valued her "country house" as opposed to the "modern houses" city dwellers might enjoy.\textsuperscript{49} This ready acceptance of a simple, rudimentary lifestyle led relief officials to conclude "if these people (have) needs, they bore their wants and privations through to exhaustion" and did not make their needs public.\textsuperscript{50}

Most importantly, the majority of this land had been in the family for generations. Annie Williams' land could be traced back to her great-grandmother. Ownership of this land gave her a special dignity as few blacks in the area owned their own land.\textsuperscript{51} For her and her neighbors, the land had an almost spiritual hold over their hearts. The land, and not their cash income, was the source of their self-respect.

It would be many years before these original landowners could understand how the construction of a Recreational Demonstration Area serving the underprivileged of Washington, D. C., constituted the "best use" of their land. Nevertheless, the government represented a formidable power in their lives and the majority of those who were not relocated did not resist the sale of their land.\textsuperscript{52} Those few who fought condemnation proceedings found the court battles exhausted their life
savings, thus inspiring few imitators. Doubtless, the most desperate, "facing an empty belly and no job," regarded selling their land as the "smartest thing they could do." After selling their land most fell back on relatives living nearby or purchased small tracts just outside the boundaries of the park. Today, many of the original landowners and their descendants still live in the surrounding community.

Early Development of the Park

By November 1935, Project Manager William R. Hall was winding down the resettlement phase of his work. His efforts reflected his commitment to buying a "quantity of land at low prices." He had accepted offers on 115 tracts or a total of 12,422.31 acres of land for an appraised value of $180,723.36. He had purchased this land for a total of $138,938.88. (See Appendix V for details on individual tracts.)

Careful planning for the recreational use of the Chopawamsic RDA proceeded concurrently with land acquisition. Equally challenging, this task gave the youthful Hall a ready outlet for his enthusiasm. The U. S. Department of the Interior had already determined that "if in camps the underprivileged, even the moderately circumstanced may not eat cake, in an aesthetic sense, it remains an obligation on planners to contrive a substitute that is no less palatable." Even "the cheapest structures" were to possess "romantic appeal," be "painless to the eyes" and built of "appropriate materials."
In creating facilities for organized camping, the goal of producing a "human crop" of "sturdy citizens" from children who had been forced to live in the "artificial living conditions" imposed on them by life in "sprawling, overcrowded cities" was to dominate the creative effort.\textsuperscript{60}

The Chopawamsic RDA was to be a model of the character building benefits of group camping. To insure its success, Hall was directed to "keep in close contact with the various social agencies of D. C. who will use these areas."\textsuperscript{61} Using their design inputs, Hall had a free hand to direct the talents of "men employed under the Land Program, all reporting directly to him."\textsuperscript{62} Labor costs for the Chopawamsic RDA were covered by CCC, WPA, and PWA funds. Indeed, land purchases for the Chopawamsic RDA purposefully spanned Prince William and Stafford Counties so that WPA workers could be recruited from both areas. At the height of construction about 200-300 CCC workers lived in the park.\textsuperscript{63} (See Illustration One for details on CCC camps within the park.)

With this huge work force behind him, Hall was in a position to mastermind the creation of an entirely new type of park. Under his direction the Chopawamsic RDA grew to include five cabin camps, each accommodating 150 campers, five lakes, three CCC camps, a temporary office, and a makeshift maintenance area.
Hall's enthusiasm was matched by all of the Washington social service agencies. Miss Mary Edith Coulson, secretary of the Washington Council of Social Agencies, affectionately referred to the National Park Service as "our fairy godfather." Detailed suggestions flowed in. Most valued improvements included swimming areas, recreation halls, infirmaries, ice boxes, and telephones. As can be seen from the Master Plan of 1939 in Appendix III, all of these ideas and more were incorporated into the overall design of the Chopawamsic RDA. Camps One and Two were opened in June of 1936. Camp One was known as the boys' area and Camp Two as the girls' area. Incomplete as of opening day, the cabin camps were nevertheless welcomed. (See Illustration Two for details on these initial cabin camps.)
ILLUSTRATION 1

CCC CAMPS

SP-22
Established: May 13, 1935
Superintendent: Mr. Paul Day
Location: Near current park headquarters
Occupied: May 7, 1935
Abandoned: April 24, 1939

SP-25
Established: July 29, 1935
Superintendent: Ernest G. Baldwin
Location: Near camp 2, site of old Randal home, off Route 626
Occupied: October 10, 1935
Abandoned: May 25, 1938

SP-26
Established: August 12, 1935
Location: Near camp 3
Abandoned: September 30, 1937
Reestablished: March 25, 1938
(dated: Lykes to Gerner, October 3, 1941)
(sites: Land use map 1937)

Salaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>$30.00/month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>$45.00/month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Leader</td>
<td>$35.00/month</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(War Dept. Reg., 1934)

Demolition

Permission sought: December 16, 1953
Permission granted: January 13, 1954
Bid accepted: October 29, 1959 ($153.00 plus clean up work)

War-Time CCC Camps

NP-D-5
NP-D-16 Near camp 3
Supt. John Gun
L. L. Long, CCC District Executive Officer
Dates of operation: June 1941 to February 1943

Community Liaison

Dances, movies & dinners (Thanksgiving, etc.)
Initially, there was substantial public confusion over who built the park. The *Washington Star* reported in 1936 that the FERA constructed the park. While celebrating the new park in a speech before the Washington Rotary Club, that same year, Charles Fyfe, director of the Boys' Club of Washington, incorrectly credited the Resettlement Administration with construction of the park.\(^66\) This is not surprising when the large number of cooperating agencies is considered. Even the NPS Land Program director, Connie Wirth, had difficulty keeping track of the funding as responsibility for administration of the RDA program shifted from the FERA to the Resettlement Administration in 1935. The simultaneous use of PWA, WPA, and ECW funds further complicated the issue.\(^67\) One fact remained clear, however, a long-sought place for organized camping in the Washington, D. C. area had been found.
**ILLUSTRATION II**

**CAMP FACILITIES**

1936

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boy's Area</th>
<th>Girl's Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 camper cabins (4 ea.)</td>
<td>10 camper cabins (4 ea.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 leader cabins</td>
<td>2 leader cabins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 unit lodges</td>
<td>1 unit lodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 latrines</td>
<td>1 latrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 dining hall</td>
<td>1 dining hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 infirmary</td>
<td>1 infirmary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 wash house</td>
<td>1 wash house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 water &amp; sewage system</td>
<td>1 water &amp; sewage system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(per progress report, July 1, 1936  
Rg. 79, Box 121, #901)*

**NOTE OF CONSTRUCTION:**

All of the cabin camps were built from materials found in the park. The CCC used a portable sawmill to process the lumber used to build the cabins. Only flooring and interior woodwork was purchased locally (*February 11, 1936, Paul Day, Sp. 22*). Initial gravel roads were built with rocks processed on site with a 12-ton rock crusher with a screen and belt feeders. A five compartment bin was built to store the different sizes of stone. Stone was then gravity fed into waiting dump trucks without the need for hand labor (*Day, February 11, 1936*). When finished, the combined cost of the cabin camps was about $200,000. Today, they probably could not be duplicated for less than 2 million dollars *(Lykes)*.
In 1939, the Chopawamsic RDA received its first National Park Service manager. He succeeded Charles Gerner and William R. Hall. Upon his arrival, work on the five cabin camps was substantially complete. Ahead lay the challenge of developing a system of roads and bridges for the park, especially a main entrance. Day-use facilities yet to be constructed also remained in the plans.

The man called upon to meet these challenges, Ira B. Lykes, was destined to leave a lasting impression on the park's development. In 1939, funding for the CCC program was winding down. At the same time the pending U. S. involvement in World War II was causing massive changes in the priorities of the federal budget. As a result, principal sources of labor for park construction, the CCC, PWA, and WPA forces, were being diverted to military projects. Secretary of the Interior Ickes prided himself in foreseeing war long before others in the cabinet did. Not surprisingly, PWA funds under Ickes' jurisdiction were used to build two aircraft carriers, four cruisers, four heavy destroyers, four submarines, two gunboats,
and more than 130 aircraft.\textsuperscript{68} In this atmosphere obtaining appropriations for a small park serving primarily the underprivileged of Washington might have seemed hopeless.

However, Ira B. Lykes was a resourceful man. Former employees characterized him as a hard-headed, demanding boss possessed of great determination and creative ability.\textsuperscript{69} Local government leaders remember most his remarkable abilities in public relations.\textsuperscript{70} Area residents remember his kindness and concern for community affairs.\textsuperscript{71} Former employees and community people alike note his unquestioned commitment to the success of the park as the spark which sets him apart from other park rangers.

Lykes managed the Chopawamsic RDA from 1939 to 1951. During his tenure as manager he witnessed major social and economic changes affecting Prince William County and his park alike. The World War II military build-up brought with it a major expansion in the Quantico Marine Corps Base bordering the park. As the Washington bureaucracy grew, Prince William County was transformed from an agricultural community into a suburb of Washington causing an increase in both the number and diversity of its people. Accepted patterns of segregation in the surrounding community were in conflict with NPS standards. Facing these many challenges and changes, Lykes was poised to leave a lasting impact on the park. His tenure yielded the park its greatest boon: a network of roads at a fraction of
their real cost; and its greatest headache: an ongoing land dispute with neighboring Quantico Marine Corps Base.

From the outset, public relations became Lykes' top priority. Lykes maintained a good working relationship with the "major domos" of local politics, county officials, state politicians, officials of the National Capital Parks, Army and Marine commanders, wildlife organizations, Washington charitable organizations; in short, anyone who could further the interests of the park. His guiding principal for building good public relations was the belief in meeting people "on their level." Yet, everyone he came in contact with knew who was the boss. An administrator who set perfection as the goal, he could be most exacting with those who worked for him.

Persuasion was Lykes' principal management tool. For instance, rather than confront poachers, he preferred to "convince people they shouldn't do it." Well placed acts of kindness helped him win over a few disgruntled area residents. Mary Byrd, an elderly black woman, could count on near weekly visits from Lykes at which he would present her with a much loved can of snuff. If a new baby was born, Lykes came by with a gift. Christine Curtis, as a young clerical worker, learned to drive from Lykes. Through such carefully directed acts of kindness, the park became synonymous with Ira B. Lykes in Prince William County. This firm grounding in peoples' affection allowed Lykes to be hard-headed and demanding and
still inspire loyalty. The only group unfazed by his easy-going ways were area moonshiners. Lykes and Sheriff Lay would hide out in the woods hoping to catch them, to no avail. The elusive bootleggers would escape downstream before he had an opportunity to exercise his powers of persuasion upon them.

Shortly after arriving in the park, Lykes determined that numerous improvements were necessary to augment public access to the park. Chief among these was the need for a good system of roads within the park. Shrinking budgets and an uncertain labor supply would make this an onerous task at best. Nevertheless, Lykes believed he was "built to be bothered." Whatever the obstacles he would build roads.

Funding was the most stubborn obstacle to new construction. Lykes' first attempt at securing federal allocations for the park taught him just how contrary the process could be. The two CCC camps in the park in June of 1941 were to be used exclusively for defense-related construction projects on nearby military installations. (See Illustrations One for detail on the CCC camps.) Hoping Chopawamsic's status as an RDA would qualify the park for funds from the Federal Security Agency for a nationwide WPA defense recreation program, Lykes gamely applied for funds. The most significant improvements sought were an entrance road, dam and sanitary facilities. Alas, his gamble failed. "Certified defense projects" already in operation at Fort Belvoir and
other military federal agencies called for more workers than were available.\textsuperscript{82} Chopawamsic's roads were simply not a wartime priority. (For details see the 1939 Master Plan in Appendix III.)

**Military Occupation of the Park**

After 1942 the defense needs of the nation totally superseded the recreational needs of the underprivileged. In this atmosphere, Lykes placed his future plans for the park on hold as he feverishly safeguarded the park's very existence. As early as 1938, military maneuvers had been conducted in the park by forces from Quantico and Fort Belvoir.\textsuperscript{83} By 1942, the practice had become so commonplace that Lykes complained the Marine Corps "have assumed the right to enter upon the area without advising or consulting this office."\textsuperscript{84} Finally, in May of 1942, the War department was granted a special use permit allowing it exclusive use of all five cabin camps.\textsuperscript{85} From 1942 to 1945, the park was occupied by the Office of Strategic Services (OSS).

During this time, it became Lykes' special duty to preserve the original concept of the park in the minds of the community, the military, and the federal budget planners. Lykes tackled this chore with his most valued administrative tool: persuasion. Throughout this period Lykes gave lectures to area community groups on forestry, land reclamation, and recreation. He used his knowledge to train Marines from
Quantico in the latest fire-fighting techniques. Area civil defense groups were reminded of the value of the park as "hospital space. . . [in case of] an air attack on Washington, D. C." Lest the Marines over-value the park for maneuvers, Lykes continually cited the park's willingness to "give special precedence to requests for fish to be used in stocking recreation areas" to enhance the park's recreational value to nearby military personnel. However good the cause, Lykes was determined to get his park back at the end of the war.

It was inevitable that Lykes would be called to the military. As a first lieutenant in the USMC stationed at Quantico, however, Lykes could "serve two masters." At Quantico Lykes directed the forestry program on base. Years later, Lykes remained grateful to Maj. Gen. Philip H. Torrey, commanding officer at Quantico, for his appointment as his service as a Marine got him "away from the stomach-turning roughhouse of OSS!"

On weekends, Lykes caught up with his duties as park superintendent. During the week, the park's sole wartime employee, Miss Thelma Williams, served as "acting park superintendent." From the one-room temporary office headquarters off Joplin Road, Miss Williams managed all of the park business, holding unfamiliar matters or matters requiring Lykes' direction for his weekly visits. The building's amenities included a wood stove and an outdoor toilet. These
she shared with the OSS' single clerical employee, a secretive man given to drink.\textsuperscript{92} From his home in the park Lykes could keep an eye on changes being made by the OSS in route to work at Quantico. Their combined presence served to remind the military personnel that they were guests in a national park.

Cooperation with the OSS

The OSS occupation was a critical period in the park's history. During this time the potential existed for the park's land and facilities to become a permanent military installation. Lykes thwarted this eventuality through close cooperation with the military and a firm control over alterations made to the park. This was no simple task.

The "greatest secrecy" covered everything the OSS did. Even Lykes had to pass a military checkpoint to enter and leave his home.\textsuperscript{93} Rumors were rampant. The community watched as barbed wire fences were erected and armed men patrolled with guard dogs. The old haunt of bootleggers and poachers was completely shut off. The secrecy led area residents to conclude "they were up to no good. Must be housing German prisoners of war there."\textsuperscript{94}

In actuality, they were training spies there.\textsuperscript{95} The cabin camps housed officers being trained to penetrate enemy lines and gather intelligence. Old buildings were booby-trapped and destroyed. A "little Tokyo" was built in the woods and regularly assaulted in training practice. A new plane, the
C-24, flew over the park night and day as men learned to parachute jump. Despite the adventurous nature of this training, it was carried out with deadly seriousness. Students were not permitted to gather in groups larger than four. An unexplained absence could result in imprisonment for the remainder of the war. A Colonel Hickson once called upon Lykes to serve as a guide during a manhunt for a misplaced student. Given a 45-caliber pistol and told to "shoot first and ask questions later," Lykes was relieved that the student was not found while he was an aide to the group.

Promoted by the Marine Corps to captain by the end of the war, Lykes related well to his military tenants and, not surprisingly, persuaded them to help him over his major obstacle: funding.

By November 1, 1941, the park had acquired 14,446 acres of land. The five cabin camps were not connected by a system of internal roads, requiring a nine-mile trek over state roads to get from camps one and four to camp three. Lykes hoped the "army occupation" would be a "splendid opportunity" to build "at least temporary connecting roads between the organized camps, particularly camps one and four and the central road." However, Lykes abandoned his scheme in light of past difficulties in getting "the army to stop unnecessary auto traffic," at odds with sound conservation practices. Nevertheless, by 1945, the Army did maintain "certain roads in
good condition," built barrier gates on the roads into the park, winterized the cabin camps, and leveled the houses on lands bought by the Army during the war.\textsuperscript{102} (See map NCP 6.5-122, 1950 for details on Army purchases.) Despite the displacement of the organized campers and the obvious reconditioning of the park facilities necessitated by the OSS occupation, the park reaped a substantial benefit from its wartime experience. Lykes had located a new source of funds: the Defense Department. (See Illustration Three for details on OSS changes to the park. See Illustration Four for details on the status of roads in the park.)

\textbf{Importance of Post-War Community Relations}

In 1946, Capt. Ira B. Lykes was once again able to direct his full energy into camp management as he prepared for the summer camping season. He had the assurance of 1st Lt. Charles L. Spear, CE, commanding the Bomb and Shell Disposal team of Fort Belvoir, that the area was "long since cleared" of unexploded mortar shells, booby-traps, and other explosive devices.\textsuperscript{103} (See map NCP 6.5-64, 1946 for the exact location of weapons areas.) Thus assured that his was not the "forbidden forest" of literature but once again a natural preserve for man and beast, Lykes renewed his community liaison efforts. Given the proximity of the park to the Quantico Marine Corps base and its recent wartime usage, without
ILLUSTRATION III
OSS CHANGES TO THE PARK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Constructed</th>
<th>Danger Areas Created</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pistol house (40' x 80')</td>
<td>10 target ranges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boat house (16' x 30')</td>
<td>3 demolition areas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 latrines (2.5 man)</td>
<td>4 acres on old 643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 acre on 620 north of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>626 intersection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 acres on 626 and 619</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (6.5-58 source)  * (6.5-56, 56A, 1946, source)

**Types of Weapons Used**

rifle ranges
mortar gun, mortar and rocket range
demolition range firing live chargers - timber
demolition ranges firing live charges (2) - steel cratering
  fragmentation grenade range
pistol, carbine and sub-machine gun night-firing course
demolition range firing live charges - general
mortar range (abandoned)

* (6.5-64, 1946 source)

** dead launching grenade found in the roof of one of the
cabins in Camp 3, summer of 1985 by Jim Fugate, Chief of
Maintenance.
ILLUSTRATION IV

ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM IN 1939

Roads and Facilities to be Obliterated

Buildings:
- temporary headquarters off Rt. 626
- remaining structures on Old Joplin Road on 626
- remaining structures on 623 and Dumfries and Batestown

Roads:
- all county roads
- state roads: 620, 646, 628, 643 (where it joins Rt. 620)

Roads Extant in the Park

North end of park: 623, 629, 643, 644, 619
South & central section of park: 626, 619, 620, 628, 648

Roads to be Retained

619 and 623 up to the camping area in the Negro section

* All roads not otherwise identified are state routes
** Source: NCP 6.5-107, Base Map of 1937
community support the park could easily have been swallowed up by the Korean Conflict military build-up. Speeches to groups like the Prince William Chamber of Commerce gave Lykes a forum to outline the benefits of having a national park in the county, announce plans for the Chopawamsic Recreation Area, and appeal for allies in the upcoming budget wars. Lykes gained some powerful community backers.

Prince William County was firmly controlled by the Byrd organization. Requests for funds went through its long-term congressman, Judge Howard W. Smith. Smith relied on the local arm of the Byrd organization for advice on specific projects. Locally, the few men of power and influence were the businessmen, doctors, large landowners, and lawyers. Lykes made it his duty to befriend them all. A key friend was Dudley Martin who owned a Chevy dealership in Triangle. A leading citizen, Martin was very active in the politically influential Chamber of Commerce. Another intimate, Dr. Ben Philips, served with Lykes on the Civilian Defense Board. Philips was also a member of the Prince William County Board of Supervisors for many years. Another associate, Charlton Gnadt, was Commissioner of Revenue for the county and a proud member of the Byrd organization. Gnadt personally interceded with Judge Smith on behalf of the park on numerous occasions. Charlie Cloe, a "major domo" of Dumfries politics, was charmed by Lykes and could also be counted on to "see Judge Smith about doing
Lykes eschewed any closer involvement in politics. He always worked through others to avoid embarrassing compromises. Indeed, it proved to be very useful for Lykes to be considered a "great man" by Prince William County's leading citizens. With such a powerful "home team" behind him, Lykes could move freely through the bureaucratic jungle to get approval for his plans, easily thwarting all usurpers to his park.

**Unique Funding of Park Roads**

Lykes' acumen in public relations aside, a deft hand at procuring funds remains the acid test of any manager's performance. It is in this area that Lykes masterminded an innovative scheme which netted the park its most enduring legacy of his stewardship.

It all began quite innocently. While strolling through a field in the park one day in 1946 Lykes noticed a sign which read "caution land mines." This discovery prompted a trip to Fort Belvoir to "get the colonel to take a look." On their way back to the park the colonel and Lykes observed soldiers at Fort A. P. Hill building roads and bridges as part of a training exercise for the Army Corps of Engineers. Once constructed, the roads and bridges were torn down so that a new team could complete the exercise. This practice seemed pure folly to a man with no roads in his park. So, Lykes said to
the colonel, "Hey, come on down. I've got plenty of roads for you to build." 111

The thorn in the rose was the fact that while Army men and equipment could be used to build the roads, the NPS would have to provide the necessary cement, gas and fuel oil. 112 Not to be stymied by details, Lykes appealed to National Capital Parks Superintendent Frank T. Gartside for funds. 113 He was able to "talk him into" a $25,000 appropriation to cover the NPS side of the deal. 114

The colonel proved to be a man of his word. At 5:00 a.m. the day after his visit Lykes was awakened by an army commander. Outside he found a company of men and their equipment. After getting the men settled into Camp Two, the commanding officer asked Lykes, "Where would you like your road?" Following a route previously surveyed, Lykes got some sticks and preceded the troops, staking out the road. Similar Army assistance continued until 1950. 115

NPS supervisor for the road building projects was Robert C. Horne, chief of the Engineering Division. On-site supervision was provided by the Army CEs and Lykes. 116 Overall supervision of Army engineers was provided by Lt. Col. Willard McCrone. Most of the work was provided by the 62nd and 94th Battalion, Army Corps of Engineers. The bridges were designed by the 112th Battalion, Corps of Engineers. By February 1, 1949, Maj. Gen. Wirth, commanding Fort Belvoir, made an
inspection tour of the park to witness the extensive improvements accomplished by his men.\textsuperscript{117} (See Illustration Five for details on Army construction projects.) Lykes estimated the value of the Army Corps of Engineers' contribution to be well over $2 million.\textsuperscript{118} Not a bad return on the NPS investment of $25,000 for supplies. Lykes' wartime lessons on the depth of the Defense Department's purse had paid off.

News of Lykes' road building coup spread far beyond the Interior Department. On February 10, 1951, the Saturday Evening Post wrote of Lykes' accomplishments in an article entitled, "Do You Have A Million Dollar Idea?" He was rewarded for saving the Park Service millions of dollars with a cash award of $1,000, a princely sum at the time.\textsuperscript{119}

Given their close working relationship, Lykes' involvement with the Army Corps of Engineers was not without amusing incidents. One such incident involved the dam at Camp Four. As Lykes and an Army engineer were inspecting the site, the Army engineer asserted that his men could build the dam in one week. A bet was made and the race against the clock began. Using powerful arc lights, the men worked night and day. At the end of the week Lykes had to supply twelve cases of beer for the troops before he could take possession of his new dam.\textsuperscript{120}
ILLUSTRATION V

CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS COMPLETED BY THE ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Bridges:

1 pile bridge on South Branch of Quantico Creek above Camp 2
1 Armco arch bridge above Camp 1
Design work: Bailey, Johnson, Hitchcock, and Hamilton

Roads:

entrance road off Route 1 (built 1951)
entrance and central road 13.1 miles
camp roads 7.5 miles
service roads 12.8 miles
truck access roads 12.2 miles

Total 46.6 miles

Building:

administration building and traffic circle
central service area (5 buildings and barn)
2 ranger stations (built 1947)

Other Facilities:

earth filled dam at Camp 4
cleared and graded lake bottom at Camp 4
day use and road intersection
stockpiles: lumber (from lake bottom and road right-of-way), crushed rock (from quarry with army equipment)
demolition: all portable and temporary buildings left by OSS near Camp 4, relocated boathouse from Camp 5 to Camp 2

(Lykes to Rot, February 20, 1948, 1460 #6)
The Park Receives a New Name

In addition to road improvements, Lykes included changing the name of the park among his top priorities upon his return in 1946. Lykes believed the name "Chopawamsic" was inappropriate for the park for which he had such grand designs as it was "inclined to provoke laughter when pronounced before the uninitiated." Hence, Lykes recommended to his superiors that the name Chopawamsic, devoid of "aesthetic, historic or commercial value," be dropped. Further, he suggested, "let us have done with the words 'Recreational Demonstration Area.' Let us call it a Park, which it is or will be one day soon, I sincerely hope." For his park he preferred the name "Old Dominion," a name "rich in early American history, strong in meaning and character."

Lykes was generally regarded as a very capable man. Consequently, his superiors were inclined to humor him with respect to the park's name. Besides, Wirth and other officials in Washington considered Chopawamsic hard to spell and cumbersome. Nevertheless, the park had been given the name Chopawamsic Recreational Demonstration Area by the act of Congress which transferred the area to the NPS on August 13, 1940 (See Appendix II). No action was taken on the matter until another act of Congress was pending. In 1948 the long contemplated transfer of lands from the Chopawamsic RDA to the Quantico Marine Corps Base was the subject of congressional
action. (See Chapter Four for details.) As the legislation finalizing the land transfer was being hammered out in committee, consensus existed on a name change as "the name Chopawamsic would no longer have any particular significance after [the land transfer] as the Chopawamsic River would be outside of the park area."125

The name "Prince William Forest Park" was favored by Arthur Demaray, associate director of the NPS, and his assistant Conrad Wirth. Perhaps they foresaw that the Prince William County Board of Supervisors would be flattered by the change.126 In any case, on August 20, 1948, Lykes received an official memo from national Capital Parks Superintendent Irving Root advising him that the area's new name was Prince William Forest Park.127 Although he did not get his favored "Old Dominion," Lykes was rid of the detested "Chopawamsic" and the "certain stigma" he felt went with it.128
CHAPTER THREE

THE EFFECTS OF SEGREGATION ON PARK MANAGEMENT

No account of Prince William Forest Park's early growth and development would be complete without giving recognition to the effects of segregation on the planning process. Prince William Forest Park was substantially developed between 1936 and 1950 in rural Virginia. Although the official policy of the NPS was one of non-discrimination, deference was paid to "local custom" when developing parks in southern states.129

To understand the role segregation played in the development of the park it is necessary to identify the key decision makers. Critical input was provided by the NPS staff, camp users and, to a lesser extent, area residents.

The NPS was divided into regions. Prince William Forest Park fell into Region One headquartered in Richmond, Virginia. Early in the planning process a tug-of-war developed between the Richmond office, headed by M. R. Tillotson, and the Land Planning Division of the NPS in Washington, headed by Conrad Wirth, assisted by Matt Huppuch.
Mr. Tillotson felt very strongly that the planners of Prince William Forest Park recognize the long-standing attitudes and customs of the people, which require, as a fundamental, that recreational areas and facilities for the two races be kept entirely separated. Such a policy should not be considered discriminatory, since it represents the general desire of both races.130

In contrast to Mr. Tillotson's views, Mr. Wirth was obliged to uphold the beliefs of his bosses, Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, and Harry Hopkins, administrator of the FERA. Progressives formed in the same mold as President Roosevelt, Ickes and Hopkins fought for equal rights for blacks.131 Within the Interior Department, Ickes insisted that no race, or creed or color should be denied that equal opportunity under the law. . . . Times have changed for all of us . . . . If we are to enjoy the rights and privileges of citizenship in the different world that lies ahead of us, we must share in its obligations as well as its responsibilities. This principle applies to all of us, Caucasian, and Asiatic and Negro.132

At issue were these two points: a) would the area be divided into separate camps for white and black and b) how would roads and entrances reflect the separation of the races. Caught between the Washington and Richmond offices were the two early managers of the area, William R. Hall and Ira B. Lykes. Hall and Lykes also came into contact with groups sponsoring organized camping in the park which constituted a third and equally forceful body of opinion.
An incident occurring in July 1941 illustrates the attitudes of many park patrons. Contrary to policy, someone in the office of the superintendent of the National Capital Parks issued a permit for the Girl Scouts of Washington, D. C., to use an unused portion of Cabin Camp Two housing the Girl Scouts of Arlington, Virginia. Wisely, Miss Eleanor Durrett, director of the Girl Scouts of Washington, D. C., wrote a letter to Miss Ida Fleckinger, camp director for the Arlington Girl Scouts, requesting her permission to use the vacant cabins in Unit C. Miss Fleckinger promptly reminded Ira Lykes that

...the facilities and program have been planned for white campers only. A mixed group of colored and white campers living simultaneously in the same camping units will not bring the desired results in the state of Virginia. 133

Clearly, the "customs of the people" were incongruous with the principles of equal opportunity upheld by Secretary Ickes, to the vexation of Hall and Lykes.

The issue of racial segregation was most hotly debated between 1935 and 1939 when the cabin camps were being constructed. No one wished to be drawn into a controversy over segregation, aiding the search for a workable compromise.134 What developed was an interesting divergence between policy and practice about which little was said.135

As can be seen on the 1939 Master Plan in Appendix III, the area was divided into separate sections for white and black campers. The cabin camps were numbered in the order in which
they were built. Camp One was built in the section set aside for Negroes and the facilities were designed to meet the needs of underprivileged blacks in Washington, D.C.\textsuperscript{136} Official recognition could not be given to this arrangement, therefore responsibility for the racial composition of the camp was assigned to the "maintaining agency" as follows:

Our policy is not to construct camps for any particular organization but to provide sufficient facilities to meet community needs, those facilities include provision for both white and colored wherever such arrangement is satisfactory to the maintaining agency.\textsuperscript{137}

Thus, by placing access to the cabin camps under the control of the organizations using the facility Wirth was able to bow to prevailing racial attitudes without officially endorsing racial separation. By 1942 Camps One and Four had become known as Negro camps and Camps Two, Three and Five as white camps. (See Illustration Six for details on maintaining agencies.)

As plans were drawn for the park's entrance and interior roads the issue of racial separation again arose as a major concern of the Richmond office. Mr. Tillotson recommended "separate entrances to each the White and Negro areas be established" to "prevent public access to" organized camping areas thereby making it impossible for "patrons destined to the Negro day use area" from having access to "White camping areas."\textsuperscript{138} (See Appendix VII for copies of Tillotson and Wirth's letters.)
ILLUSTRATION VI
SEGREGATED USAGE OF CABIN CAMPS

Camp 1 - Negro YMCA

Camp 2 - Social Welfare Group
         Arlington Girl Scouts

Camp 3 - Family Service Association for White Children. It was built primarily for expectant mothers, mothers with new-born babies and mothers with children up to 3 years of age. It was only used for 1 year for its original purpose. Its flexibility allows other uses.

Camp 4 - Designed for Negro mothers and children, same as Camp 3.

Camp 5 - Washington Salvation Army

CCC Camp - Can be used for group purposes, not designed for organized camping.

** Based on minutes of the meeting of the NCP officers and the Social Service Agencies of Washington, D. C. area, December 11, 1942.
In response, Wirth stopped short of making a counter-proposal to the Richmond plan but noted the increase in cost of two entrances and the fact that the necessary signs "informing the public of the segregation of the races" was "objectionable.\textsuperscript{139} The Washington office favored one entrance over the Quantico Reservation. Circumstances prevented the issue from coming to a head. Lack of funds for road construction allowed time for representatives of the Richmond and Washington offices to meet and work toward a compromise. Their deliberations produced no less than three separate road plans. (See Appendix VIII for a description of each plan.)

The most elaborate day use and entrance plan provided for two separate entrance roads converging on a double-looped control circle which would divide white and black patrons to routes connecting to separate day use areas bordering a lake. Amenities included athletic fields, a boat house and pavilion, and large parking lots in each day use area. Revised in 1942, this plan retained the concept of a traffic control circle and separate roads leading to white and black day-use areas. (See map in Illustration Seven.) Today, all that remains of this plan is a vastly scaled down circle in front of park headquarters.
Debate over the placement of the entrance road delayed the construction of other key buildings in the park. The superintendent's residence, park headquarters, and a permanent utility area could not be located until the location of the entrance road was finalized.

A decisive meeting was held on October 4, 1939. It was determined that one entrance from Dumfries, Virginia, would be built at the intersection of Route 1 and Route 629. The entrance road would follow Route 629 for a short distance to a one-point control circle at the intersection of the main entrance road and the roads to the day use and organized camps. Actual construction was delayed until the right of way could be purchased and the necessary funds appropriated. (See Chapter Four for acquisition details.) Elated by the breakthrough Inspector Ray M. Scheneck, who had worked on the park steadily since its inception, suggested "October 4 should be declared as a day of annual celebration for the Chopawamsic Area" and an open house "should be held on that day." 

An apparent victory for the Washington office, this decision was actually a well disguised compromise. Pending completion of the entrance road there would be two effective entrances: one off Route 234 into the black camping and day use area and one off Route 626 and Joplin Road into the white camping and day use areas. The lack of funds for land acquisition and road construction brought on by the pending
involvement of the U. S. in World War II meant the single entrance road so detested by the Richmond office was far from becoming a reality. Regardless, Wirth could point to the absence of discrimination in the official design of the park. The road was built in 1951.

The battles waged between the Washington and Richmond offices of the NPS over camp facilities and access roads had little bearing on the day usage of the park. This is not to suggest that racial prejudice did not exist in Prince William County. Simply stated, from 1935 to 1950 there were no day use facilities to speak of in the park. The Pine Grove Picnic Area was not constructed until 1951. The few roads in the park were made of rough gravel, uninviting to motorists. Casual sightseeing was further discouraged by signs which read "Federal Reservation. Closed except to persons holding camping permits." Were that not sufficient to deter the curious, recent memory of the OSS occupation was enough to convince the local population that the park was off limits.

Race relations in Prince William County during this period are described as a time of peaceful coexistence by white residents. Area blacks remember rigid codes of discrimination which bound one from entering white churches, stores, restaurants, or theaters where an uninvited entrance left one open to "getting your feelings hurt." Even the county courthouse provided separate bathrooms for white and black
citizens. With few exceptions the dependence of the small black population in the county on the white majority for jobs discouraged flagrant, mass violations of the accepted code. When it occurred, defiance was on the interpersonal level. For example, Miss Annie, a highly respected black midwife, recalls refusing food or drink if acceptance meant consuming it in a segregated section of a home or restaurant.\(^{145}\) Adherence to the code was the norm, however, leaving area whites to believe they were blessed with a "good bunch of Negroes here."\(^{146}\)

Only after 1950 did the park experience substantial day use. Whites and blacks used the Pine Grove Picnic Area without incident. Area residents assumed the park was integrated from the beginning.\(^{147}\) Only one violent incident has ever been linked to racial tension. On June 23, 1960, a group of white postal employees, having consumed two kegs of beer, decided to oust a group of blacks using an adjacent softball field. Words were exchanged "whereupon a postal employee threw a bottle at a Negro and another shoved a small boy." The conflict escalated. A "Negro inflicted minor knife wounds on a postal employee," a "white threw a baseball bat and hit a Negro." In all about 350 people were around. Ten to twelve state troopers responded to the call that a "riot" was in progress. The violence ended in about 15 minutes. Two blacks and one white man were arrested and turned over to the state police. The park ranger on duty believed the two kegs of beer were the principal antagonist and
subsequently alcohol usage was banned from the park. Preferring to call the incident a "disturbance" and not a "riot," the ranger noted it was the "only incident of this kind in the park... involving White and colored boys."148 [sic]

Prevailing racial separation among organized campers became a concern of park management. In 1956 a program was instituted by the park naturalist to encourage interaction between the organized camps. A "Friendly Forest Fair" was initiated to unite the camps in an "annual festive holiday."149 Exhibits were planned to provide an "exchange of ideas for nature recreation" and encourage "good quality nature and wood crafts."150 Optimistic in concept, the Friendly Forest Fair met with only marginal success. Only Camp Lichtman and Camp Pleasant, black camps, took an interest in the project and put forth the greatest effort, producing some fine displays. The white camps, which had not placed a high value on the event, were overshadowed and immediately objected the "competition [had] no place in camp life." A discouraged park naturalist concluded that they had "missed the spirit of the event" and recommended that it be discontinued.151 Today, attempts at upgrading the awareness of nature among patrons of the organized camps is conducted on a camp-by-camp basis.
An ongoing administrative problem for Prince William Forest Park has been the issue of the 4,862 acres of land on loan to the Quantico Marine Corps Base. Known as the permit land, the 4,862 acres south of Route 619 were first utilized by the Quantico Marine Corps Base in 1943. This land was obtained under permit by the Marine Corps during World War II as it adjoined a larger tract of about 50,420 acres south of Route 619 acquired in a major expansion of the base facilities. (See Illustration Eight for a map of the area.) The park land was utilized for training purposes and never returned. Both the Marine Corps and the NPS believe they have a valid claim to the 4,862 acres which has so far thwarted efforts to make a final disposition of the property.

The disagreement between the Marine Corps Base and NPS officials over the utilization of title to the permit land stems from the administration of Ira B. Lykes. During his administration the decision was made to allow the Marines permanent access to the permit land. The root of this decision
may extend as far back as 1941. The only official source on the early negotiations concerning the permit land is the memos of Lykes documenting conversations he had with Marine Corps generals and NPS officials. Nevertheless, the Marines were granted a renewable permit to the 4,862-acre tract of land in 1948. The conversion of this permit to actual legal title to the land has been at the core of the ongoing dispute.

Close cooperation with the Marine Corps Base did not evolve haphazardly. From the inception of Prince William Forest Park in 1935 park planners have consulted with Marine Corps officials at Quantico on development plans for the park. As the park land and the Marine Corps Base share a common border, Marine Corps officials hoped to find "mutually advantageous" ways to utilize their "contiguous areas under Federal control." As can be seen from the map in Illustration Eight, original land purchases for Prince William Forest Park were made on both sides of Route 619. Initial plans contemplated the purchase of all the land "included in the drainage areas of the Quantico and Chopawamsic Creeks, west of U. S. 1 and not already a part of the Marine Reservation." This would accomplish two goals. First, the park would control the watershed of both creeks, considered essential for sound conservation of the park's resources, and second, the park would own land in two counties, Prince William
and Stafford, doubling the job benefits of the WPA program in the park.

However, the area on the Chopawamsic Creek watershed was never utilized for recreational development. It was preserved as a wilderness area, containing only a one-room temporary office and a makeshift maintenance area. By 1939 all five cabin camps were constructed north of Route 619 on the north and south branches of the Quantico Creek. The land south of Route 619 on the Chopawamsic Creek became subject to a number of agreements between the Marine Corps Base and the park deemed "mutually advantageous." Specifically, on August 12, 1938, Acting Secretary of the Interior Elbert K. Burlew gave permission for the Department of the Navy to build a dam on the Chopawamsic Creek to store water for the Marine Corps Reservation. Throughout 1938-1940, Arthur E. Demaray, associate director of the NPS, gave permits to individual field commanders to conduct training exercises on park land. Because of a curtailment of funds the complete acquisition of the watershed of the Quantico Creek had not been possible and remained a top priority of NPS officials in Washington.

Arriving in 1939, Lykes observed the dam on the Chopawamsic Creek being built. On more than one occasion he complained of presumptuous colonels arriving for maneuvers without a permit. The message to him was clear. Successful management of the park included accommodating Marine Corps
demands wherever possible. Through his road-building program Lykes had established himself as a resourceful man adept at squeezing the maximum out of every federal dollar. Hence, he began to look for ways to meet the Marine Corps needs while obtaining the maximum benefit for the park.

Acquisition of the land on the Quantico watershed remained a management objective. After 1942 Lykes wore two hats as a Marine Corps lieutenant and superintendent of the Chopawamsic RDA. Not surprisingly, he looked for a way to serve both masters and net the necessary 1900 acres to secure the Quantico watershed, rounding out the borders of the park. Inspiration struck. In a conversation with Maj. Gen. J. McCarthy Little in 1941, it was suggested to Lykes that the Navy Department might be able to use funds then available to purchase "land needed for recreational development on the Quantico watershed for transfer to the NPS, provided an equivalent amount of land on the Chopawamsic watershed could be exchanged and added to the Marine Corps reservation." Lykes was not inclined to pass up the opportunity to use military funds to accomplish a major management objective of the Park Service. He relayed the content of his conversation with General Little to his superiors in the Park Service. Repeating Lykes' account of the conversation in a letter to the Secretary of the Navy, Acting Secretary of the Interior Burlew endorsed the proposal as mutually beneficial and suggested that representatives from
both departments be designated "to work up a more detailed proposal."\(^{157}\)

Again, in 1942, Lykes was approached by Brigadier General Harrington, U. S. Marine Corps Schools, about the pending expansion of the Quantico Base and the possibility of incorporating slightly less than 5,000 acres of park land into planned training facilities.\(^{158}\) Given the history of close cooperation between the Marine Corps Base and the park, the proposition of a land exchange was enticing.

Lykes responded quickly. In a memo to Superintendent Irving C. Root of the National Capital Parks on March 8, 1943, Lykes enclosed a list of all the property holders, acres, and cost of land needed to round out the park's boundary and secure the Quantico watershed. Lykes estimated the cost of the land to be acquired at $84,494.\(^{159}\) Lykes' memo received the immediate consideration of Superintendent Root, Associate Director Arthur E. Demaray, and Acting Secretary of the Interior Abe Fortas. Lykes' recommendations for the terms of a land exchange were given unanimous approval. Demaray added only one additional suggestion. He considered it important that the "Navy guarantee to maintain their portion as a wildlife refuge. . .no hunting allowed."\(^{160}\)

Using Lykes' memo as the basis for a transfer agreement, a letter was drafted for Acting Secretary Fortas' signature. Upon the termination of the war it was proposed that the
necessary legislation for a land transfer be drafted to "serve the objectives of both departments." 161

In anticipation of a permanent agreement the Park Service cooperated with the Marine Corps' wartime requirement for immediate access to the 4,862 acres on the Chopawamsic Creek. In 1943 the Quantico Marine Corps Base was issued a temporary permit for the land for the duration of the war and six months thereafter. 162 Recall that in 1942 the OSS had occupied the entire park north of Route 619 on the Quantico watershed. Clearly, NPS officials placed top priority on cooperation with the military forces in the short term to bring about a successful conclusion to the "national emergency," World War II. 163

Somewhere between 1943 and 1946, when committees were formed to draft transfer legislation, a breakdown in communication occurred. At the park level it was clear that Lykes felt he had a verbal commitment from base personnel to buy the 1900 acres required by the park on the Quantico watershed in exchange for the 4,862 acres on loan to the Marine Corps Base. On the basis of this understanding the Marines used the land for lumbering, troop training, and other operations during the war which left the land, in Lykes' opinion, "no longer. . .in any way suitable for recreational development." 164
Given the status of the land, NPS officials did not want available funds to dwindle away before a "sudden termination of the war" might "complicate the situation."\textsuperscript{165} NPS attempts to enact a transfer prior to 1948 were stone-walled by the Navy Department, anxious to keep its options open pending an investigation into the "post-war needs and requirements of the Quantico Marine Corps Base."\textsuperscript{166}

Frequent changes in command at the Marine Corps Base during the war led to a shift in attitudes toward the park lands. As the end of the war neared some on base felt the most desirable solution to the transfer question was to "take over, in toto, after the war the entire interests of the Department of Interior in the Quantico-Independent Hill Area."\textsuperscript{167}

By 1946 the original 1943 agreement was technically terminated yet the 4,862 acres appeared to be a permanent fixture of the Marine Corps Schools. Negotiations were now conducted at the secretarial level by the real estate and legal divisions of the NPS and the Department of the Navy. The balance of the equation was further complicated by the new lands acquired by the Army during the war. Approximately 1,138.62 acres of land wholly within the boundaries of the park were added when declared surplus by the Army after the war.\textsuperscript{168} This new acreage was added to the negotiations for the transfer legislation. Where it might appear to Navy officials that the surplus land was nearly equal in acreage to the land the park
was asking the Navy to purchase, this land actually added to the ongoing problem of administration and control of the Quantico watershed, making the acquisition of the 1900 acres of private land along the boundary of the park that much more imperative. Nevertheless, all record of any verbal agreements with the Navy to purchase the 1900 acres appeared lost. Navy negotiators advised NPS representatives that "no useful purpose would be served by proposing legislation authorizing the Navy Department to acquire these privately owned lands for transfer to the Department of Interior."

Negotiations bogged down. Despite the Secretary of the Navy's objections, the only change made in the drafted legislation was in the amount designated to purchase the 1900 acres bordering the park on the Quantico watershed. In a letter to Rep. Richard J. Welch, chairman of the House Committee on Public Lands, the Secretary of the Interior struck out the words "sums as may be necessary" on page 3 line 12 to read "not to exceed the sum of $10,000." This is difficult to explain as Secretary Oscar L. Chapman had previously estimated the present value of the land at $35,000 in his recommendation to James E. Webb, director of the Bureau of the Budget. Apparently, the NPS representatives placed a premium on establishing a legal requirement for the Navy to purchase the 1900 acres for the park and were willing to leave the funding question open to future resolution.
Once drafted the legislation required a sponsor in the House. Judge Smith could be counted on to back the legislation as long as none of his constituents were adversely affected. Thus, upon Wirth's request, Lykes secured a letter from C. A. Sinclair, county treasurer, asserting that most of the 1900 acres to be acquired was "owned by Negroes" and of "particularly no agriculture value" with much of the land delinquent in taxes. All political considerations thus laid to rest, HR 6246 became Public Law 736, 80th Congress, on June 22, 1948. Far from the final word, Public Law 736 has become the basis of an ongoing dispute between the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Interior. The transfer of lands provided for by the law has yet to take place.

Subsequently, the positions of both departments have hardened around the questions of money and jurisdiction. The $10,000 authorized by Public Law 736 was never appropriated. In the interim land values have appreciated far beyond that amount. Also, Public Law 910, passed one year after Public Law 736, prohibited the transfer of land to non-military agencies. Although Senate bill 1038, passed in 1951, effectively repealed Public Law 910, the non-military purpose for which the land is intended remains the Navy's principal objection to purchasing the land.

Lykes left the park in 1951 still believing that the Navy had "elected to ignore their obligations" to the park as Public
Law 736 was "all the Federal authority required to straighten out this matter." Despite the existence of Public Law 736, to date all attempts to give the Marine Corps permanent legal title to the 4,862 acres, hereinafter referred to as the permit land, have been fruitless. The Park Service still insists that the Navy acquire the 1900 acres of privately owned land adjoining the park's boundary on the Quantico watershed, hereinafter referred to as the acquisition, before a transfer of title can take place.

Over the past 36 years negotiations between the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Navy have gone through distinct phases. In the period 1948-1958, the Navy continued to take a stand on the question of jurisdiction. The Navy insisted that it would be inappropriate for them to request funding for park land while "vital Navy projects were deferred for lack of funds." Further complicating the situation was the obvious fact that the $10,000 authorized by Public Law 736 was woefully inadequate to purchase the acquisition desired by the NPS. By 1956, land values were estimated to be around $150,000. Also, the permit land had come to be regarded as a "permanent part of the Marine Corps Schools" by the Navy.

The impasse was broken in August of 1956 when National Capital Parks Superintendent Edward J. Kelly made a recommendation to the director of the National Park Service
that a conference with Navy representatives be held to determine if it were necessary to amend Public Law 736 to "relieve the Navy of any obligation as a condition precedent to the transfer. . . ." Subsequent negotiations resulted in a Navy Department request for a permit "pending completion of the action required to consummate the transfer to this Department." The action contemplated was the repeal of Public Law 736 should it be determined that the Park Service no longer needed the acquisition stipulated in the Act. The negotiations concluded with the Department of the Interior issuing the Navy a revokable permit for the 4,862 acres of permit land and launching a study into the land requirements of Prince William Forest Park.

From 1958-1959 the subject of negotiations between the Park Service and the Navy centered around the content of new legislation intended to replace Public Law 736. The Navy continued to assert that they had no funds available to purchase the acquisition required by Prince William Forest Park. It was the Navy's position that the new legislation should require the Bureau of the Budget to allocate funds to the Interior Department for this purpose.

Interior Department officials, however, continued to receive urgent requests from Prince William Forest Park Superintendent Ted Davenport to exert pressure on the Navy to comply with the terms of the original legislation, Public Law
Davenport was convinced that "a defense agency could secure funds for a purchase of lands much easier than a civilian agency." His concern was made more acute by the realization that "the longer purchases are delayed, the harder and more expensive" the acquisition would become. The fact that several tracts within the acquisition were "being subdivided and sold for residential purposes" provoked still more concern for future "erosion and pollution problems."

Frustrated by foot dragging at the secretarial level, Davenport took actions designed "to get their attention." On September 27, 1962, he sent the commander of the Marine Corps Schools a terse letter proposing "to terminate your lease and offer the 4,862 acres for exchange with those owners of private land in the park," if action were not taken by the Navy to purchase the acquisition land urgently required by the park. This letter set off a flurry of letters up and down the chain of command within the departments of the Interior and the Navy.

Inter-departmental negotiations took place between 1967 and 1969. No reason for the delay between 1962 and 1967 could be offered by the commander of the Marine Corps Schools who found the situation "inexplicable." All the same, representatives of both the Navy and the Interior Department came to the negotiating table armed with facts to support their positions.
Navy representatives pointed to the extensive improvements made by the Marine Corps on the permit land (see Appendix IX) and the integral role these lands played in future plans for the base as justification for their immediate transfer. The Navy representatives proposed that the acquisition sought by Prince William Forest Park become a separate issue to be resolved by new legislation designed to relieve the Navy of any funding obligation.\textsuperscript{187} New legislation was deemed necessary by the Navy Department because of the financial demands of the Vietnam War as compared to the now "utterly unrealistic" cost of the acquisition land.\textsuperscript{188} The 1969 value of the acquisition land was estimated to be $1,400,000.\textsuperscript{189}

The work of Interior Department negotiators was complicated by their dependence upon the Navy Department for assistance in several key areas. Navy assistance was considered vital in the preparation of accurate maps of the acquisition land, necessary before a firm land appraisal could be established.\textsuperscript{190} Navy backing on any legislation presented to the Bureau of the Budget was also deemed necessary to secure approval before such legislation could be submitted to Congress. Further, \textit{de facto} control of the permit land by the Marine Corps rendered any threat to revoke the 1948 permit meaningless.\textsuperscript{191} However, the Interior Department could document the vastly increased need for public recreational land and facilities in the Washington metropolitan area. Purchase
of the acquisition land was imperative to prevent development and secure these lands for suitable facilities and services to area residents.192

Given the logistics of the situation, Interior Department negotiators chose the pragmatic over the ideal solution to the permit land controversy. Prince William Forest Park Superintendent Floyd B. Taylor laid the idea of joint use of the permit land on the negotiating table to preserve a "healthy relationship with the Marine Corps."193

Once again, the impasse in negotiations was broken. A formal agreement between the Interior Department and the Navy Department over the use of the permit land took the place of any legislative changes. In May of 1969, a memo of agreement was signed by George B. Hartzog, Jr., director of the National Park Service and Frank Sanders, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Installations and Logistics. (See Appendix X for a copy of the agreement.)

Under this agreement the Interior Department received some major concessions:

- the exclusive use of the land area adjacent to the Breckenridge Reservoir, per Drawing No. 858-41002-B,
- help with a survey of the acquisition lands and a land appraisal, and
- the transfer of Navy land encompassed by areas retained by the Interior Department to the Interior Department.
The Navy Department netted their principal objective in this agreement:

- use of the remaining permit land until no longer required by the Defense Department, and
- an agreement by the Interior Department to draft legislation to amend Public Law 736 to permit transfer of the permit lands to the Navy.

Although the 1969 agreement did not result in the purchase of the much needed acquisition lands, the Interior Department did make significant advances in that direction. Navy assistance with land appraisals set forth in the agreement was a major step forward. For this assistance the Interior Department paid the rather steep price of granting the Marine Corps ownership of the permit land in all but name only.

The draft legislation created as a result of the 1969 agreement never came before Congress. It was rejected by OMB pending completion of a federal land inventory ordered by President Richard M. Nixon. The idea of an amendment to Public Law 736 was also rejected by the Property Review Board designated by President Nixon to conduct the federal land survey. Rather, the Board recommended:

Take no action now to amend the 1948 Act. Continue the special use permit to the Marine Corps subject to (a) return of 348 acres to the Interior and (b) issuance of a permit for 54 acres now under Navy jurisdiction as parkland. Department of the Interior and the Department of the Navy would agree to defer implementing the agreement of May 27, 1969, until some future date.
The recommendations of the property Review Board were incorporated into a renewed permit granted March 20, 1972, which would expire in 1982. (See Appendix XI for a copy of the permit.)

The issuance of new permits was delayed because of many discrepancies found between Interior and Navy Department maps.\textsuperscript{196} Alarm Marine Corps management of the permit land aroused in area conservation groups further complicated the issuance of new permits. As predicted by NPS planners, Prince William Forest Park's location within 35 miles of Washington, D. C., allowed a curious public to discover its wild, unspoiled beauty. Thomas W. Richards, president of the Nature Conservancy, and Mrs. Jean Packard of the Northern Virginia Conservation Council demanded the repeal of Public Law 736 and the cancelling of the Marine Corps permit to the land.\textsuperscript{197} These conservationists were upset that the Marine Corps had the right "at any time...to shut the public out" and that hunting was permitted on the permit land.\textsuperscript{198}

Neither the Marine Corps Base nor the conservationists relented and the battle dragged into 1979 as Prince William Forest park began work on a general management plan. Conservationists vowed to push for the return of the permit land to the Park Service.\textsuperscript{199} George Berklacy, Associate
Regional Director, Public Affairs, of the NPS National Capital Region, conceded that

perhaps the conservationists are right that the land should be administered by the Park Service but we've had a very amicable and mutually beneficial relationship with the Marines. They have, in effect, taken care of the land for us.200

Berklacy, together with Prince William Forest Park Superintendent Robert L. Harney, was determined not to allow the land transfer to become a political issue.201 Negotiations were opened between Gen. Robert H. Barrow, Marine Corps Commandant, and William J. Whalen, Director of the National Park Service, over the return of the land and the means of protecting the south branch of the Quantico Creek from erosion.202 Simultaneous night meetings were held at the park headquarters with representatives of conservation groups to address their concerns.203

As in the past, the logistical obstacle to implementing Public Law 736 was recognized and deferred to the secretarial level. Indeed, Superintendent Harney believed the purchase of the acquisition lands was a "dead issue" because of the dramatic escalation in cost.204 The central issues involving Prince William Forest Park and Quantico Marine Corps Base officials concerned the conservation of the Quantico Creek watershed and the wildlife management practices of the Marine Corps on the permit land. On December 12, 1979, Col. W. M. Winoski, Assistant Chief of Staff, Naval Facilities, advised
Superintendent Harney by letter that Lt. Gen. John H. Miller, Commanding General of the Marine Corps, had designated him as chief negotiator for the Navy to meet with Prince William Forest Park staff to resolve outstanding policy questions. A divergence of standards in wildlife management was at the root of the problem between the base and the park. Col. Winoski proudly pointed to the fact that the Virginia Fish and Game Commission had described the Quantico Marine Corps Base wildlife management plan as a model program. In response, Jim Fugate, chief of maintenance for Prince William Forest park, characterized the difference between the Virginia Fish and Game Commission and the National Park Service approach to wildlife management as "the difference between a Ford and a Cadillac." There is a direct link between the missions of the Marine Corps and the National Park Service which accounts for the gap in their respective quality standards for resource management. Whereas the Park Service is charged to protect and preserve the natural resources under its care, the Marine Corps must take a multiple use approach to the management of their wilderness areas. Superintendent Harney conceded that the Marine Corps managed the permit land very well with the only controversial point being the persistence of hunting on the permit land. Marine Corps personnel insisted that hunting was necessary to control game populations in areas used for training missions.
The latest round of negotiations ended with two significant agreements. The Marine Corps was issued a new permit to the permit land in 1984. The new permit deviated from the old 1972 permit in one key area: the terms of termination. Under the 1984 permit, the signatures of both the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Interior are required to terminate the permit. The acquisition land question remained a dead issue as Superintendent Harney estimated the total cost today might exceed $26 million. To satisfy the concerns of conservationists and park officials a joint resource management agreement was signed in 1984. (See Appendix XII for copies of both the 1984 permit and the 1984 resource management agreement.) Should Prince William Forest Park officials have reason to question the advisability of Marine Corps practices upon the permit land, a channel of communication now exists to resolve the issue. For example, the use of tanks in training maneuvers on Marine Corps land above park land on the Quantico Creek recently caused a siltation problem for the park. An exchange of phone calls to the appropriate Marine Corps personnel made with reference to the 1984 agreement was all that was necessary to end the practice and eliminate one source of siltation into the park's watershed.210

The ultimate disposition of the permit land title is in the hands of the Secretaries of the Navy and the Interior.
Cost considerations have made the terms of the original legislation, Public Law 736, unenforceable. A suitable exchange of land involving the permit land and the Marine Corps land along the watershed of the Quantico Creek could be arranged. Control of the Quantico Creek watershed has been deemed far more vital to the park's ultimate mission of preservation than title to the permit land. As such an exchange involves the loss of turf by the Marine Corps in exchange for land they already have de facto control over, the probability of such an exchange is impossible to gauge. At the park level it remains clear that the title issue is considered resolved and receives attention only when amicable relations with the Marine Corps Base appear threatened, thereby jeopardizing preservation concerns.
The present size and shape of Prince William Forest Park is the result of an ongoing program of acquisition and improvement. Initial purchases were later supplemented to increase the size of the park, secure the watershed of the Quantico Creek, and meet the road needs of the park.

Until the transfer of the Land Program to the Resettlement Administration in 1935, the FERA directed all land acquisition for the RDA program. A substantial portion of the core of Prince William Forest Park was purchased with FERA funds between 1934 and 1936. Hence, transactions were handled by both the FERA and the Resettlement Administration depending upon the date of purchase.

First, the land was "optioned for sale." This meant the federal government told the property owners they were interested in purchasing their land and were requesting them to make the government an offer. Most options were held for six months. Project staff members Charles Gerner and William R. Hall met with prospective sellers. They were bound by Land Program policy to accept offers of no more than ten dollars per
If option prices were higher, they negotiated with the seller, hoping to arrive at an acceptable price. If at the end of six months a price could not be agreed upon, there were two courses of action left open: drop the option or condemn the property and purchase it at a price set by the government. Surpluses in the Land Program budget did permit prices higher than ten dollars per acre for a few particularly valuable tracts. By January 1935 Charles Gerner, project manager of the Chopawamsic RDA, reported that he had acquired 7,520 acres in 87 generally contiguous tracts optioned from $12.00 to $30.79 per acre with a "remarkable cover of trees." The average cost per acre was $13.33. Total acreage contemplated for purchase was 15,000 acres. The land appraised at $200,000 after consideration was given to the value of improvements and timber. The 8,081.12 acres recommended for immediate purchase were appraised at $92,542.26. Land Program officials hoped to buy the land for $66,481.42 with an average option price of $8.23. Discrepancies between Gerner's cost figures and those of the Land Program office are accounted for by the location of tracts within the park. Small interior tracts were valued much less than tracts bordering Routes 619, 626, 234 and 643. The later purchase of these less valuable tracts lowered the overall average cost per acre.

Payment did not follow immediately upon concluding the sale in most purchases. Records of land transactions went
first to the U. S. attorney's office for the Eastern District in Norfolk, Virginia, for processing before payment could be made. Land titles were sent to the Richmond office of the NPS. Delays in the paperwork were not uncommon and some property owners waited more than a year to receive payment for their land.

From 1936-1939 project manager William R. Hall continued land purchases on both the Chopawamsic and Quantico Creeks. The first NPS manager, Ira B. Lykes, purchased land also. The goal of these initial land purchases was to acquire the watershed of both creeks and eliminate all inholdings or privately owned land encompassed by park land. The process was not always a simple one, requiring extraordinary effort at times. For instance, Mr. Clarence Williams died before the deed to his land was obtained. As a result, Ira Lykes found himself in the uncomfortable position of attending his funeral in order to "get the signatures of most of his heirs while they were assembled." By 1941 Lykes estimated the total acreage of the park to be 14,446 acres owned by simple fee. However, "many 100's of acres of privately owned lands within the outer bounds of the area" eluded federal purchase.

Obtaining these inholdings, mostly along the park's boundary, has been a management objective of each succeeding NPS superintendent. Priority has been given to tracts infringing upon the Quantico watershed or necessary for road
construction. Land acquisition has been complicated by the unclear boundary markers designated in the original deeds. This has led to some emergency acquisitions. For instance, when building the new entrance road in 1958 a short section of the park road was "accidentally built across the corner of two parcels of private property," that of Paul Johnson, et al., heirs of Peter Johnson, and Kyle Williams. Unlike the Johnsons, the granddaughter of Kyle Williams, Mrs. Ruby Williams Humphries, did not settle the account quietly. She was paid $500 for a parcel of land valued at no more than $200 to "prevent action against us for trespass."

With the passage of Public Law 144, 83rd Congress (67 Stat. '84, July 23, 1953) the park was in a better position to acquire inholdings. The law authorized the exchange of park land for the purpose of consolidating Federal holdings. (See Appendix XIII, 1962 Report of Non-Federal Land in the Park, for details on individual tracts.) Two major exchanges took place as a result of this enabling legislation.

Of primary importance was an exchange benefiting the Telegraph Road Picnic Ground. Two acres of land infringing on the Telegraph Road Picnic Ground was purchased by condemnation from Mr. Dudley J. Martin and Mr. Leonard J. Lonas, Jr., and given to the park in exchange for land destined to be severed from the park by Interstate 95.
The other major exchange involved the Prince William County School Board. In 1951 the Washington Reed Consolidated School for Negroes opened on Route 234. The former black school, the one-room Cabin Branch Elementary School, was then abandoned. County school officials were interested in exchanging five acres desired as a buffer strip adjoining the new consolidated school on Route 234 for one-half to one acre of land containing the old Cabin Branch School. The land in the desired buffer strip was wooded, contained no park structures, and was not considered essential to future park development. By contrast, the old school, valued at $8,000, was located within the park watershed in an area of future development. Records on this transaction are scant; however, school board minutes indicate that negotiations on the land exchange were concluded in December of 1951. No actual deed for this property has been located in either the school board archives or the park records. As the school is no longer in evidence on the tract identified on park maps, it is fairly safe to conclude that the demolition of the structure took place as outlined in the agreement with the park discussed in the school board minutes.

Other major acquisitions served the needs of road construction. Again, Mr. Dudley J. Martin played a pivotal role. In 1941 Mr. Martin assisted in the acquisition of 20 acres of land belonging to the heirs of Joseph F. Wheat
required to build the original park entrance road off of Route 1. The land was obtained by a "declaration of taking" as the heirs of Mr. Wheat were unwilling to sell. Unlike a condemnation proceeding, a declaration of taking allows the Park Service immediate access to a disputed property. Owners are compensated later after completion of all legal transactions with monies held in escrow for that purpose. In the case of the Wheat estate money placed in an escrow account by Mr. Martin was used to compensate the truculent heirs based on the appraisal of a disinterested third party. Unfortunately, work on the new road was delayed as a complication involving title to the Wheat property held up the appropriation of construction funds. Taxes had not been paid on the land between 1941 and 1943, the time elapsed between when the title was granted and when it was recorded. A clear title is required by federal law before any federal money can be allocated for improvements. Legal wrangles over who was responsible for payment were not cleared up until 1944. Road construction began in 1950.

Later in 1958 a new entrance road was made necessary by the construction of Interstate 95, the path of which bisected the park's original entrance road off of Route 1. (See map in Illustration Nine.) As Route 95 was destined to become a major access road for North-South travelers through Prince William County, NPS officials sought to procure a new entrance with
access to Route 95 as compensation for the loss of the original entrance to the park. Hence, NPS negotiators requested that the Virginia Department of Highways buy land between the existing boundary and Route 619 and construct a new entrance road to include a circle in front of the headquarters building with connecting roads to the main park road.\textsuperscript{229} Virginia highway officials agreed to this plan as it was less expensive than building an overpass over the original entrance off Route 1.\textsuperscript{230} However, park officials were disappointed that plans for the new entrance did not include "additional right-of-way at the connection with Route 619" believed necessary to "protect the principal park entrance from these adverse developments."\textsuperscript{231} The adverse developments consisted of private homes adjacent to the entrance. Despite Park Service objections, the road was built in 1960 on the right-of-way established by the Virginia Highway Department.\textsuperscript{232}

Somewhat later, the park received an additional 8.6 acres of land between Route 95 and Forestburg Lane. Considered an additional buffer between the park and Route 95, this acreage almost eluded the park. According to Joseph Hebda, a former maintenance foreman in the park, around 1968 the 8.6 acres were slated to become a sand and gravel depot for the Virginia Department of Highways. Alarmed, he alerted the park superintendent. Fortuitously, the superintendent tracked down the responsible officials in the Virginia Highway Department.
and the NPS the very day the land was to be signed over to the Highway Department. A quick trip to Washington, D. C. brought the superintendent face to face with the Virginia Highway Department and NPS officials before the crucial signatures were in place. Abruptly, it was decided that Prince William Forest park had a more pressing claim upon the land and it was deeded to the park.233

Subsequently, ownership of the 8.6 acres bordering Route 95 has protected the park from adverse commercial development. However, current park administrators believe the land is no longer essential to park development plans. Rather, it is hoped the 8.6 acres can be disposed of profitably, allowing the park control over development, thereby safeguarding the park's resources.234

The high cost of land in Prince William County today makes future land acquisitions exceedingly difficult. As has been shown, those acquisitions purchased after 1940 meet specific project needs and were the result of outside financial assistance or exchange in all but one case, that of Mrs. Ruby Humphries. Consequently, the ongoing management objective of obtaining inholdings infringing on the park's boundary will elude acquisition unless a) Congress suddenly appropriates vast sums of money for this purpose, or b) current park administrators are able to negotiate suitable land exchanges or endowments to the park. Until Prince William Forest Park is
able to acquire lands necessary to round out its borders to include all the land between Route 619 and 234 and Interstate 95, preservation of current holdings will continue to present a challenge to park administration.
CHAPTER SIX

GROWTH OF PRINCE WILLIAM FOREST PARK
SINCE 1951 AND CURRENT GOALS

From 1951 to the present Prince William Forest Park has grown in response to the changing recreational needs of the greater Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. Its primary mission of providing group camping facilities to character building organizations has broadened to include an equal emphasis on the provision of day-use facilities.

Efforts to draw visitors into the park began with the Mission 66 program. Mission 66 was a ten-year development plan ending in 1966 designed to provide "urgently needed facilities to meet the needs of ever-increasing numbers of visitors to all the national parks."235 Prior to the onset of the Mission 66 development program the only picnic ground in the park was the Pine Grove Picnic Ground built by Ira Lykes in 1951. However, up until 1959 casual use of the park was discouraged by signs which read "Federal Reservation. Closed except to persons holding camping permits."236 Recent memory of the closure of the park by the OSS from 1942 to 1945 led many area residents to disregard the picnic ground in Prince William Forest Park believing "it must be reserved for federal workers."237
The mastermind of Prince William Forest Park's Mission 66 program, Superintendent Davenport, was determined to dispel the forbidding image of the park and open doors to increased visitation. He hoped to capitalize on Prince William Forest Park's value as the only important natural wilderness area in the densely populated Washington metropolitan area. Under his stewardship emphasis was shifted away from organized camping for "character building organizations" toward the construction of facilities for tent camping, hiking, motoring, picnicking, fishing, canoeing, swimming, and horseback riding.238

Davenport's plans brought virtually all of the current day-use and weekend facilities extant today into existence. (See Appendix Fourteen for details.) He supervised construction of the Telegraph Road Picnic Ground, the Turkey Run and Oak Ridge campgrounds, the Nature Center, and a scenic drive looping through the park.

Each superintendent has his own special interest and horseback riding was Davenport's. He believed horseback riding would "prove to be the most popular activity to be promoted in the park."239 However, a horseback riding concession was never approved. The risk of erosion on trails utilized by horses was deemed too great to allow this activity in the park.240

Of all his accomplishments, Davenport believed the scenic drive was the major attraction in the park as it allowed visitors to "penetrate far back into beautiful wilderness
surroundings." More recent visitors have likened it to a miniature Skyline Drive. Connected to the new entrance road off Route 619, the eleven miles of scenic drive loop through the park providing access to the Nature Center, administrative headquarters, picnic grounds, the Oak Ridge and Turkey Run camp grounds, and many of the trails into the back country.

Subsequent park superintendents have not always valued the circuitous scenic drive. A 1971 plan, favored by NPS director Hartzog, allowed one lane to be utilized by bicycle traffic while the other was utilized by one-way motor traffic. Current administrators do not feel driving constitutes an appropriate recreational use of the park. Indeed, there is renewed interest in the 1971 plan promoting cycling in the park.

All of the new facilities constructed by Davenport did not come about without some struggle. A clash occurred between Superintendent Davenport and the NPS planning staff over the site selection for the Oak Ridge campground. The NPS planning staff did not concur with Davenport’s site recommendation. Like Lykes, Davenport identified himself closely with the park and did not take kindly to interference with his creative efforts. Although Davenport acquiesced to higher authorities
he continued to insist the Oak Ridge site chosen by the NPS staff was

- too close to Cabin Camps 2 and 5 thereby luring campers onto the eleven-acre lake reserved for organized summer camps,
- inadequately covered by forest,
- the hottest place in the park during the camping season,
- impaired by the cemetery along side the entrance road, which was "very objectionable" even if screened off, and
- impaired by the noise from the Marine Corps firing range west of Route 619 and adjacent to the site, which could be heard "at all hours day and night."

After retirement Davenport played down these differences though the matter was never forgotten.

Concurrent with the growth of the day-use of Prince William Forest Park has been an increase in the demands placed on the organized camping facilities. The Salvation Army and Family and Child Services of Washington, D. C. are two organizations which have made extensive use of the cabin camps since their construction. As their needs grew, these organizations pressured the park to expand the cabin camps. The result was two major additions to the cabin camps
constructed through a combination of NPS funds and private resources.

The Salvation Army utilized Cabin Camp 5 continually from its construction in 1939 until 1968. As their program needs grew, H. Holmes Vogel, chairman of the board of directors of the Salvation Army, sought to expand the capacity of Cabin Camp 5.²⁴⁷ To further the cause the Salvation Army was willing to donate up to $23,000 of the $63,000 required. Five cabins, each holding four campers, were to be enlarged along with the mess hall.²⁴⁸ Government funds were appropriated for the remaining costs and work proceeded from January 1956 through January 1958. Old CCC buildings were used for some of the overhead framing and exterior walls to help match the architectural style.²⁴⁹

From the outset National Capital Parks Superintendent Kelly advised Mr. Vogel that the sizable donation of the Salvation Army "must be made with the understanding that the improvements are for the general benefit of the government and the public and do not entitle the donors to priority treatment."²⁵⁰ Mindful of this stipulation, Salvation Army officials still considered their investment in Camp 5 a worthy one when compared to the vast benefits they had received through the maintenance-free use of Camp 5 for the past 21 years.²⁵¹
Over time, however, scheduling conflicts did arise. The improvements made by the Salvation Army to Camp 5 increased its value to other groups competing with the Salvation Army for its use. Short-term programs were most dramatically affected. On more than one occasion the Salvation Army staff were forced to completely assemble and dismantle their camp over one weekend in order to accommodate another group wishing to use Cabin Camp 5 the following week.

As their program needs continued to grow, the Salvation Army officials decided to construct their own camping facility in Richardsville, Virginia. The Salvation Army utilized Cabin Camp 5 for the last time in the summer of 1968. Though 17 years have elapsed since the Salvation Army worked with the staff at Prince William Forest Park, Major Joseph Bennett, then Captain Bennett, still recalls his "tremendous relationship" with Prince William Forest Park staff.

Like the Salvation Army, the Summer Outing Committee of Family and Child Services of Washington, D. C., has been the principal user of Camps 1 and 4. The Bowman pool serving Camps 1 and 4 was built to insure their young campers access to water recreation. The lake serving Camps 1 and 4 had been experiencing troublesome siltation problems limiting its use for swimming. Utilizing an open area once used by CCC Camp SP-26, Family and Child Services obtained a donation from Ms. Lilli J. Bowman of Washington, D. C., to build an in-ground
pool. Dedicated on June 24, 1956, the Bowman pool continues to serve campers today.254

Current Goals

Stewardship of the varied visitor facilities at Prince William Forest Park and planning new programs for the future constitute a major challenge for the current park administration.

Of primary importance in the planning process are the five cabin camps. The annual budget for the maintenance and preservation of the cabin camps is currently $11 million. Of that amount approximately $890,000 is spent on preventive maintenance and an additional $200,000 on cyclic maintenance such as major repairs and rehabilitation. High costs are associated with maintaining the cabin camps given their historic base as a CCC-built facility, requiring replacement in kind as the buildings age. These costs are not being offset by visitor use of the camps. Jim Fugate, facilities manager of Prince William Forest Park, guessed the cabin camps were in use at best 60 days out of the year.

The full utilization of these expensive and historic buildings has been the focus of an ongoing review by park staff. Several suggestions have emerged of note:

• Set aside one cabin camp for use by the general public for short-term camping,
• Allow a "ma and pa type operation" to manage and maintain the remaining cabin camps on a concession basis for nine months of the year,

• Construct improved shower facilities in the cabin camp areas to provide pay-showers for the visiting public,

• Set aside only one cabin camp to be maintained as an historic site, and allow the other cabin camps to be modernized and remodeled to meet current public health standards,

• Improve the education program for the cabin camps to improve awareness of the natural environment while at the same time ending the cabin camps' exclusive access to waterfront areas in the park.

Any implementation of these suggestions awaits the budgetary process and increased public awareness of the potential uses of the cabin camps. Many officials on the park staff feel the park has been undersold to the public. Community involvement and support of park activities can go far to make needed funds available.

The funding issue is directly related to the park's second major goal: upgrading visitor services. All too often, it is feared, visitors enter and leave the park without ever seeing a park ranger. Access to the cabin camps is restricted to organized camping groups. The nature center is only open to
the general public on weekends. Without a visitor center, park patrons must seek information about the park at either the park headquarters or the nature center, neither of which is located along the main entrance to the park. Hence, the average visitor leaves the park unaware of its six lakes, five cabin camps, and extensive trail system and possibly unenlightened about its unique natural environment.

Solutions to the park's public relations shortfall vary. In 1969 the park was briefly shifted out of the National Capital Parks system into the Southeast Region of the National Park Service, headquartered in Richmond. This move was intended to give the park a national image. However, the park staff does not feel this goal has been fully realized. The name of the park is viewed as a major impediment. Prince William Forest Park took its name from Prince William County leading the general public to believe it is a county park and not a national park. Current park administrators would welcome a return to the area's original name, Chopawamsic, to eliminate this confusion. Concomitant with a name change the park staff would welcome more exposure in national brochures emphasizing the park's unique natural resources. Given its proximity to Washington, D. C., the park is well positioned to serve as both host to visitors to the nation's capital and guide to the goals and objectives of the National Park Service placing special emphasis on its mission of preservation and protection. As a
natural area built on reclaimed land and now bordering a densely populated urban area, it is uniquely situated to serve this function.

The framework upon which all desired changes must be built is the park's staff. Morale, though generally good, could be enhanced by reemphasizing the park's mission. All too frequently staff members in contact with the visiting public lose their focus and begin to perceive themselves as managing a regional park. A sense of mission needs to be rekindled in which all see their role as emissaries of the National Park Service providing vital environmental education and preservation functions.

Conclusions

Prince William Forest Park was first built by an idealistic administration hoping, in part, to take scarred rural land and beleaguered urban children and reclaim them both. In an age of toxic waste, nuclear proliferation, dying inner cities, and bedroom communities its original mission is still viable, perhaps indispensible.
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APPENDIX ONE

RECREATIONAL DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

EXECUTIVE ORDER
(No. 7496 - Nov. 14, 1936 - 1 F.R. 1946)

TRANSFER OF PROPERTY, FUNCTIONS, FUNDS, ETC., PERTAINING TO
RECREATIONAL DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS FROM THE RESETTLEMENT
ADMINISTRATION TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

By virtue of and pursuant to the authority vested in me by
Title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act (48 Stat.
200), the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 (49 Stat.
115), and the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1936
(Public No. 739, 74th Congress), I hereby order as follows:

1. There is transferred from the Resettlement
Administration to the Secretary of the Interior (a) all the
real and personal property or any interest therein, together
with all contracts, options, rights and interests, books,
papers, memoranda, records, etc., acquired by the Resettlement
Administration in connection with the recreational
demonstration projects set forth in the attached schedule with
funds appropriated or made available to carry out the
provisions of the National Industrial Recovery Act by the
Fourth Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1933 (48 Stat. 274, 275),
and by the Emergency Appropriation Act fiscal year 1935 (48
Stat. 1055), and with funds appropriated by the Emergency
Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 (49 Stat. 115), and by the
Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1936 (Public No. 739,
74th Congress), and (b) all personnel, whether in the District
of Columbia or elsewhere, now employed in connection with the
acquisition of land for those recreational demonstration
projects, together with all administration personnel records
pertaining to the employees transferred, and to those employees
engaged in development activities as of July 31, 1936, who were
released by the Resettlement Administration on that date to
permit the Department of the Interior to enter them on its
rolls as of August 1.

2. There is transferred and allocated to the Secretary
of the Interior all balances of appropriations heretofore made
available to or allotted for expenditure by the Resettlement
Administration both for acquiring land for the recreational
projects set forth in the attached schedule and for developing
those projects, under the said National Industrial Recovery
Act, Fourth Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1933, Emergency
Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, Emergency Relief
Appropriation Act of 1935, and by the Emergency Relief
Appropriation Act of 1936, to be used for the purposes for
which such funds were made available or allotted to the
Resettlement Administration. The Secretary of the Interior
shall assume all outstanding obligations, commitments, and encumbrances heretofore incurred by the Resettlement Administration in connection with the said projects.

3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, through the National Park Service, to complete and administer the projects transferred to him by this Executive Order and to exercise with respect to any real or personal property or any interest therein, contracts, options, rights and interests, books, papers, memoranda, and records acquired in connection with such projects, all the powers and functions given to the Resettlement Administration in connection therewith by Executive Orders Nos. 7027 and 7028 of April 30, 1935, and April 30, 1935, respectively.

4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the administrative functions transferred and delegated to him by this Executive Order.

Franklin D. Roosevelt

THE WHITE HOUSE

November 14, 1936

[Reprint from Original]
AN ACT

To provide for the operation of the recreational facilities within the Chopawamsic recreational demonstration project, near Dumfries, Virginia, by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That hereafter the lands comprising the Chopawamsic recreational demonstration project transferred to the Secretary of the Interior by Executive Order Numbered 7496, dated November 14, 1936, shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service as part of the park system of the National Capital and its environs.

Sec. 2. The Director of the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized:

(a) To prescribe and collect fees and charges for such recreational and other facilities, conveniences, and services as may be furnished by the National Park Service for the accommodation of the public within the said area.

(b) To enter into a contract or contracts with any reliable person, organization, or corporation, without advertising and without securing competitive bids for the operation or performance of any such recreational or other facilities, conveniences, and services within the said area.

All revenues collected by the National Park Service, pursuant to the authority of this section, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

Sec. 3. The director of the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized to exercise and perform with respect to the said area all the powers and duties that are conferred and imposed upon him by law in relation to the construction, maintenance, care, custody, policing, upkeep, and repair of the public buildings and parks in the District of Columbia.

Approved, August 13, 1940.
SEGREGATION PLAN FOR THE CHOPAWAMSIC RDA

PER NCP 6.5-38A ATTACHED
APPENDIX FOUR

AGENCIES ENDORSING THE CHOPAWAMSIC PROJECT

Charity Camps Operated by
District of Columbia Organizations 1935

Happy Land: West River near Annapolis, Maryland. For families; poorly equipped; small; facilities inadequate; capacity 30.

Camp Good Will: Rock Creek Park. For families. Has outgrown location; facilities inadequate; play space too small; capacity 200.

Fort Foote: Day camp for families

Christ Child Convalescent Home: Near Rockville, Maryland. For convalescent children. Inadequate; capacity 60.


Camp Pleasant: Blue Plains, D. C. For colored families. Camping facilities inadequate. Play space limited.


* Copied from Proposal R-3, Chopawamsic Project
APPENDIX FIVE

INFORMATION FOR CUMULATIVE CHART

Chopawamsic Recreation Area
Virginia R-3
LP-VA 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSIONS:</th>
<th>Offers</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Appraised Value</th>
<th>Purchase Price</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Purchase Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>12,394.31</td>
<td>$180,140.36</td>
<td>$138,438.88</td>
<td>$14.53</td>
<td>$11.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/17/36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>583.00</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>20.82</td>
<td>17.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS:</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>12,422.31</td>
<td>$180,723.36</td>
<td>$138,938.88</td>
<td>$11.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum acreage - 15,000 *
Maximum purchase price - $206,675 *
Maximum average purchase price -

* Report - 3/15/36

Received March 25, 1936 by,
Homer B. Mask, Regional Director
Resettlement Administration
Raleigh, North Carolina
from
L. C. Gray, Assistant Administrator
Resettlement Administration

Received March 5, 1937 by,
Howard W. Siegil, Area Attorney
Land Acquisitions, RDA
from
William R. Hall, Project Manager
Chopawamsic Recreational
Demonstration Project
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tract No.</th>
<th>Legal File No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Date Paid For</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>G. B. Wallace</td>
<td>306.61</td>
<td>2/11/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>W. W. Liming</td>
<td>156.35</td>
<td>11/22/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>W. W. Liming</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3/7/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>G. F. Weir</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>7/2/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>B. F. Liming Estate</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>2/11/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>R. E. Lunsford</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11/22/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>A. W. Embrey Estate</td>
<td>734.38</td>
<td>6/11/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>J. E. Clark</td>
<td>536.25</td>
<td>6/11/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>E. M. Young</td>
<td>107.7</td>
<td>6/11/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>M. H. Didlake</td>
<td>45.88</td>
<td>6/11/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>J. B. Florence</td>
<td>320.70</td>
<td>2/19/37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>H. H. Howard</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>6/18/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>J. Amidon</td>
<td>80.55</td>
<td>9/18/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>R. Waite</td>
<td>51.21</td>
<td>9/18/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Speake, Waters, Ratcliffe</td>
<td>123.69</td>
<td>2/19/37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>G. R. Ratcliffe</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10/25/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Brown &amp; Hooff</td>
<td>322.55</td>
<td>8/28/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>E. N. McInteer</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3/4/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>G. B. Wallace</td>
<td>312.59</td>
<td>2/11/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>A. Miller</td>
<td>24.96</td>
<td>10/19/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Q. &amp; B. Carney</td>
<td>121.2</td>
<td>7/2/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>C. H. Walker</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>6/11/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>W. T. Abel</td>
<td>28.75</td>
<td>2/11/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Williams, Carter &amp; Antel</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>7/2/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>E. Davis</td>
<td>22.25</td>
<td>6/11/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>E. Bates</td>
<td>59.49</td>
<td>2/19/37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>E. P. Cato</td>
<td>111.48</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>E. P. Cato</td>
<td>96.03</td>
<td>7/2/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>L. C. Brawner</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8/22/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>J. W. Liming</td>
<td>34.25</td>
<td>9/10/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>C. D. Binns</td>
<td>77.70</td>
<td>10/21/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>J. Watson</td>
<td>149.95</td>
<td>2/11/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>L. Johnson</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>4/4/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>B. Tubbs</td>
<td>110.6</td>
<td>11/22/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>D. Reid</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>9/11/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>J. Burke</td>
<td>83.14</td>
<td>11/27/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>W. W. Payne</td>
<td>280.48</td>
<td>11/22/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>J. J. Tolson</td>
<td>196.16</td>
<td>8/7/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>M. M. Murray</td>
<td>107.39</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>D. Riley</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>6/18/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>N. Ginn</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1/6/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>E. E. Easterbrook</td>
<td>379.90</td>
<td>2/19/37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>J. Miklas</td>
<td>159.56</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>G. R. Ratcliffe</td>
<td>250.8</td>
<td>6/11/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>F. Tuell</td>
<td>32.72</td>
<td>6/18/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>L. Williams</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>6/11/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>H. Uram</td>
<td>64.34</td>
<td>10/19/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>H. Davis</td>
<td>148.4</td>
<td>11/26/35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>H. Early</td>
<td>99.67</td>
<td>11/6/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Account Balance</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Watson</td>
<td>44.98</td>
<td>1/15/37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. M. Taliaferro</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>6/18/36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Carter</td>
<td>410.77</td>
<td>8/28/36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. W. Liming</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6/11/36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Jones</td>
<td>53.57</td>
<td>6/11/36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Lucy A. Carter</td>
<td>156.54</td>
<td>9/18/36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Howard</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>11/6/36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. S. Embrey</td>
<td>148.56</td>
<td>1/15/37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Jones</td>
<td>28.06</td>
<td>8/28/36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Wedding</td>
<td>43.27</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z. L. Ferguson</td>
<td>73.16</td>
<td>9/26/35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. L. Clark</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>7/2/36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Tuell</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>7/2/36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. A. Davis</td>
<td>29.56</td>
<td>2/19/37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. T. Davies, Tr.</td>
<td>577.28</td>
<td>11/27/36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Tapscott</td>
<td>58.85</td>
<td>8/28/36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. J. Murphy</td>
<td>59.15</td>
<td>8/28/36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. A. Poland</td>
<td>154.98</td>
<td>6/4/36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. V. Merrill</td>
<td>64.91</td>
<td>8/28/36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. C. Brawner</td>
<td>83.77</td>
<td>11/27/36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issie Simms</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>8/28/36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. A. Sinclair</td>
<td>114.94</td>
<td>10/19/36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rozier Woodyard</td>
<td>89.56</td>
<td>10/19/36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Griffin</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>2/19/37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. F. Merrill</td>
<td>148.30</td>
<td>10/19/36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerena Miller</td>
<td>184.8</td>
<td>2/19/37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. F. Liming</td>
<td>21.57</td>
<td>1/15/37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. E. Briggs</td>
<td>167.33</td>
<td>1/15/37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Miller</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>2/19/37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeal Williams</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>1/15/37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuben Robinson</td>
<td>40.21</td>
<td>2/19/37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Options Purchased Under the
National Industrial Recovery Act of
June 16, 1933
(48 Stat. 1936)

LP-VA-6-160 Cooper, Fred and Annie
LP-VA-6-163 Easterbrook, E. E. and Mrs. and William
LP-VA-6-168 Carney, Joseph
LP-VA-6-169 Uram, Harry and Marie
LP-VA-6-170 Barnes, Bernard, Adm. Barnes, Eppa Est.
LP-VA-6-171 Barnes, Bernard, Adm. Barnes, Eppa Est.
LP-VA-6-178 Watson, Richard and Flossie
Watson, Napoleon, Sr.
LP-VA-6-182 Abel, Richard - Wedding, Mrs. L.
LP-VA-6-183 Luckett, Mildred and Wallace
LP-VA-6-185 Carter, Mrs. Lucy A.
LP-VA-6-186 Nash, Herbert and Martha
LP-VA-6-187 Embrey, W. S., Inc., A. T. Embrey, President
LP-VA-6-188 Jones, Mrs. Laura
LP-VA-6-189 Wedding, Lena and Lou
LP-VA-6-191 Davis, Albert, Annie and Aada
LP-VA-6-192 Hook, J. W. Est. - Davies, H. Thornton
LP-VA-6-194 Carter, Mrs. Viola and James D.
LP-VA-6-198 Klatt, Walter H.
LP-VA-6-199 Briggs, E. W. and Sarah V.
LP-VA-6-101A Thomas, Nannie
LP-VA-6-102A Murphy, J. J. and Martha A.
LP-VA-6-103A Smith, General
LP-VA-6-105A Florence, John L.
LP-VA-6-108A King, Mrs. Elizabeth
LP-VA-6-110A The Plainfield Trust Company
LP-VA-6-101 Davis, T. Powell and Lena A.
LP-VA-6-105 Didlake, T. E. and Lion, Thomas H.
LP-VA-6-108 Florence, J. B. and May C.
LP-VA-6-110 Lipscomb, Ernest and P. D. - Lion, T. H.
LP-VA-6-115 Waite, Robert and Elizabeth
LP-VA-6-120 Ratcliffe, G. Raymond and Lillians S.
Waters, Ella C.
LP-VA-6-121 Brown & Hooff - Hooff, Brum and L. A. & AA
LP-VA-6-123 Leachman, William A.
LP-VA-6-125 Nelson, James E.
LP-VA-6-126 Scott, Elizabeth and John
LP-VA-6-127 Williams, R. A.
LP-VA-6-129 Miller, Andrew and Isaac L.
LP-VA-6-131 Grayson, Samuel and Olive
LP-VA-6-132 Liming, John W. and Ella R.
LP-VA-6-137 Gasdek, Pete and Anna
LP-VA-6-139 Bates, Elizabeth and Iron
LP-VA-6-140 Bacca, John
LP-VA-6-141 Wiscera, August and Josephine
Note on Resettlement Office Files

Each land document referenced with:

- File Number (Resettlement Office)
- Option Number
- Tract Number
- Name of Owner
- Number of Acres
- Legal File Number, same as at county court house

Resettlement Office File Numbers run from 1 to 197

Records processed by:

Phillip Dimon and
C. F. Clayton, Chief
Project Planning Section
Land Utilization Division
sent to
S. P. Meyers, Chief
Land Title Section
General Counsel's Office

[Reprint from Original]
APPENDIX SIX
PARK USAGE 1935-1940

Boy's Club of Washington, D. C.
Jewish Community Center of Washington, D. C.
Washington Council of Social Agencies (girl's camp)
Twelfth Street YMCA
Family Service Association
   Camp Goodwill (W)
   Camp Pleasant (B)
Salvation Army (D. C. and Alexandria)
Young Men's Christian Association of the City of Washington
D. C. Cooperative League
Camp Fire Girls
Boy Scouts (Arlington, Alexandria, Washington D. C., & Prince
   William County)
Girl Scouts (Arlington, Alexandria, Washington D. C., & Prince
   William County)
4-H of Prince William County
Hopkins's House
Metro Police Boy's Club
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APPENDIX SEVEN

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
National Park Service
Region One
Richmond, Virginia

January 21, 1939

Memorandum for the Director:

Attention: Supervisor of Recreation and Land Planning.

Reference is made to the memorandum for the Regional Director of January 3, signed by Mr. Wirth, recommending a single entrance road to the white and Negro day use areas at the Chopawamsic Recreational Area, Virginia. Exception is taken to this recommendation for the reasons noted below:

1. If we are to be realistic in our approach to recreation planning in southern states, we must recognize and observe the long-standing attitudes and customs of the people, which require, as a fundamental, that recreational areas and facilities for the two races be kept entirely separated. Such a policy should not be considered discriminatory, since it represents the general desire of both races.

2. A study of the Washington proposal reveals that, in order to reach the Negro day use area by the proposed new entrance, it would be necessary to pass within a thousand feet of Organized Camp 3F, which, ignoring racial considerations, presents an objectionable feature of planning from a functional viewpoint.

3. The proposed entrance will require Negro visitors from Washington, D. C., and that vicinity to travel approximately six miles farther to reach the day use area and entail the provision and maintenance of several miles of additional park road.

In addition, the present land status and topographical conditions are such as to render it extremely difficult, if not actually impossible, to so design the interior road system on the developed section of the area to provide the control which is deemed desirable.
We consider it desirable to so design the road system on Recreational Demonstration Areas to economically prevent public access to the section of the park reserved for organized camp use. It appears that the suggestions offered in the Washington Office letter make it virtually impossible to prevent patrons destined to the Negro day use area from having access to all camps unless three control stations are established.

Non-federally owned interior tracts of land are so situated that an unnecessarily long and circuitous route would have to be designed if control of access to the developed areas is to be obtained.

It is, therefore, recommended that separate entrances to each the white and Negro areas be established.

The suggested revisions in the proposed road alignment south of the Joplin Road are considered sound and will be adopted.

M.R. Tillotson
Regional Director

cc: Inspector Schenck
March 8, 1939

Memorandum for Regional Director, Region I

This is a very late reply to your memorandum of January 21, with reference to the entrance road at Chopawamsic Recreational Area, Virginia. The late reply has not been due to neglect, but to a considerable amount of review and careful thought on our part.

There are some in the Washington Office who feel that the single entrance over the Quantico Reservation is the best solution and they do not consider the fact that visitors going to the Negro area would pass within 1000 feet of the white camp would be a serious handicap. They also feel that two entrances would not only be more costly, but signs would have to be erected informing the public of the segregation of races and this might be objectionable. However, we are not in a position to make a definite recommendation at this time.

We are returning to you the map on which is shown the possibility of a road coming in through Quantico Creek. It is realized that this is not a very attractive entrance, however, it has certain merits. It allows a good approach to what has always been considered the day-use area and permits the segregation of the traffic within the park -- one line into the white day-use area, one to the Negro day-use area, and lines to the white and Negro organized camps. Of course, it is hard to tell whether contours would permit such a layout. At any rate, we believe it well to give some thought to this rough suggestion for the location of an entrance road. It may be that with the new change of the highway near Dumfries the approach suggested might eventually be better controlled and improved. Even if the road is narrow and not too attractive between U. S. Highway No. 1 and our property, it may be
a better ultimate solution, provided we can eventually gain a little wider right-of-way. We do not feel that the problem should rest on our present studies, but that further consideration should be given the matter.

Supervisor of Recreation and Land Planning

Enclosure 1903740

cc: Huppuch
    Frost
    Gerner
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TECHNICAL REVIEW

Branch of Plans and Design

SUBJECT: ERA - Virginia LD-6, Chopawamsic Recreational Demonstration Area - Interior Road System.

Following is an analysis of what seems to be the two most logical solutions to the problems involving the construction of an Interior Road System at the Chopawamsic Recreational Area, Virginia. After four years of construction this important problem is still unsolved and as a consequence the park is without residences to house the operating staff. Also a permanent service group cannot be constructed until the road system is fixed. The development program has reached the point where it is necessary that this interior vehicular circulation and control system be determined.

The attached prints of Drawing No. 9182A have been marked in colored crayon to graphically show the two seemingly most logical solutions.

Blue Line: Interior road system suggested by the Washington Office under date of March 8, 1939, and further described by Project Manager Hall in his report of June 2, 1939.

This system is predicated on the ultimate acquisition of the present privately owned interior tracts of land and the desired protective property along the entrance road from Dumfries.

When the private interior holdings are obtained, desired one point control to the entire park, including both the White and Negro developments, will be possible.
For purposes of control it will be desirable to continue to use the Dumfries-Manassas entrance (yellow line) to the Negro Organized Camps until the Federal Government has obtained the privately owned properties within the park.

Should the Negro Public Use Area be developed before the interior properties have been secured, separate control will have to be maintained to that development.

It appears that the zoning of uses in the White Public Use Area will be adversely affected, it being possible that developments will have to be installed on both sides of the road to the organized camps. This cannot be definitely determined until a detailed study or layout plan is made.

A gated interior protection and maintenance truck trail (orange line) is desirable to facilitate communication between the two sections of the park pending the time when all properties required to allow proper function of the entire road system, outlined in blue, have been purchased.

**Green Line:** Independent systems for White and Negro developments with widely separated points of entrance and two points of control with an interior protection and maintenance truck trail (orange) providing vehicular connection between the two areas.

The advantage of this system is that it will permit the building of all the roads immediately which in turn will allow construction of the utility or service groups, custodian's and caretaker's residences, and contact stations. This system is now in use.

Since there seems to be no immediate prospects of the Federal Government acquiring either the privately owned interior tracts or the rather expensive property at the Dumfries entrance, this road system possesses points of merit that should not be passed without due consideration. (See Project Manager Hall's report on June 2, 1939.)

The developments along both roads from U. S. Highway No. 1 to these two entrances are at present and probably will always continue to be unpark like in character. It is logical to assume that eventually the Triangle-Joplin Road will be improved in alignment, etc.
Brown Line: Scenic drive over the U. S. Marine Corps Reservation which is desirable if separate entrances to the White and Negro developments are established. (Road system outlined in green.)

In granting permission to construct this road over the Marine Corps' property the Navy Department has stipulated that it be used by park traffic only. To prevent its use by the public generally will require the services of two additional attendants, the expense of which is hardly justifiable.

V. R. Ludgate,  
Regional Landscape Architect

By

W. T. Ammerman,  
Associate Landscape Architect

WTA:KS
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APPENDIX NINE

MARINE CORPS JUSTIFICATION FOR KEEPING
THE PERMIT LANDS

8 December 1967

From: Commandant, Marine Corps Schools
To: Commandant of the Marine Corps (Code COC)

Subj: Special Use Permit from Department of the Interior, NOy(R)-65477 for use of Interior Department Lands

Ref: (a) Meeting held at NAVFAC on 2 Nov 1967 concerning subject Interior Lands
(b) CMC ltr COH-2/jau of 25 Mar 1957

Encl: (1) Y&D Drawing No. 963997, showing MCS and subject Interior Lands (5 copies)

1. Reference (a) was held to discuss action required to acquire certain Interior Department lands which are currently under permit to Marine Corps Schools (MCS), Quantico, Virginia. It was determined that the need for these lands should be redefined in the format of reference (b).

2. In accordance with reference (a), the following data is furnished as a basis for justification of the need of MCS for the subject Interior lands:

   a. Enclosure (1) is a copy of a map of MCS delineating the 4,862.36 acres presently used by MCS under the subject permit.

   b. The major temporary improvements on this land are recreational facilities for Breckinridge Reservoir and a mess area for field troops near the intersection of MCS No. 1 and State Route No. 619. Permanent improvements include the Breckinridge Dam and Reservoir, which is the primary source of water for MCS, and a holding reservoir for the water prior to treatment for domestic use; a short section of Russell Road, which is the principal access route between mainside MCS and the Guadacanal Area (MCS combat firing and maneuver area); and approximately five miles of new bituminous paved road designated as MCS No. 1. Total cost of these permanent and temporary improvements within this area is estimated to be $590,000.
c. The Breckinridge Dam and Reservoir mentioned previously was built in order to insure that sufficient quantities of water would be available to the MCS complex. All expansion plans for MCS, Marine Corps Air Station, and U.S. Naval Hospital have been made on the premise that this water would continue to be available. The present investment value of these facilities is $98 million.

d. The watershed for Breckinridge Reservoir consists of 18 square miles. Approximately 40 percent of this area is located on the subject Interior lands. The importance of this area to the MCS water supply is obvious.

e. The subject Interior lands are used for supplying and storing water intended for domestic use and as a training area for live firing of weapons and nonfiring training maneuvers.

f. Presently there are no plans for future construction within the subject Interior lands.

g. Future facilities planned for the MCS complex through Fiscal Year 1974 have a total dollar value of $36 million. These facilities will be dependent upon water that is obtained partially and stored completely within the subject Interior lands.

3. As evidenced by the above, the requirements of the subject Interior lands for training purposes and water supply and storage renders these lands essential to MCS in performing its mission.

J. M. MASTERS, SR.
APPENDIX TEN

1969 MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT REGARDING FUTURE USE OF 4862 ACRES OF NATIONAL PARK SERVICE LAND PRESENTLY USED BY THE MARINE CORPS DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION COMMAND, QUANTICO, VIRGINIA

Principal Interested Parties:

Department of the Navy - U. S. Marine Corps (Navy)
Department of the Interior - National Park Service (Interior)

FACTS: In general, the basis for the need for this Memorandum of Agreement is based on the following facts:

Since 1943, Navy has occupied and used 4862 acres of Interior land at Quantico, Virginia. Public Law 736, 80th Congress (22 June 1948), authorized transfer of this land from Interior to Navy contingent upon acquisition of approximately 1500 acres of land to round out the boundaries of Prince William Park at a cost not to exceed $10,000. Since this authorization, a dilemma has existed concerning the inadequate funding to acquire the land for park purposes. As a result, transfer of the 4862 acres to Navy has never taken place. Since 1958, the Marine Corps Development and Education Command has occupied this land under letter permit which is terminable at the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior. Over the years, there have been sporadic attempts by Navy and Interior to resolve the dilemma caused by Public Law 736, 80th Congress.

The Marine Corps has a strong requirement for continued usage of the 4862 acres to train Marine Corps personnel. The National Park Service has a recognized need to expand their recreation capabilities. This land adjacent to the Prince William Forest area appears to be ideal for such purposes.

In an effort to develop a compatible solution to the Navy - Interior requirements in the Prince William Forest - Quantico area, a Memorandum of Understanding was signed by Mr. George B. Hartzog, Jr. (Director, National Park Service) and Mr. Barry J. Shillito (Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics)), on 12 and 13 December 1963. The Memorandum of Understanding
designated Mr. Nash Castro, Department of Interior and Captain Alan C. Gault, CEC, USN, to pursue this problem until both the immediate solution and long-range solution have been realized.

PROBLEM: To formalize agreements reached by principal interested parties subsequent to the signing of the above mentioned Memorandum of Understanding.

PROPOSED COURSE OF ACTION: Navy and Interior, in full appreciation of the mutual interests in the area and after full discussion and negotiation, agree to the following:

a. Department of Interior:

   (1) Retain, for exclusive use, that land area adjacent to Breckenridge Reservoir as outlined in general on National Park Service Drawing No. 858-41002-B and signed by the Director, National Park Service and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics).

   (2) Transfer all remaining portions of the 4862 acres to the Department of the Navy subject to reversion to the Department of Interior when no longer needed by the Department of Defense.

   (3) Interior will draft proposed legislation seeking amendment to Public Law 736 to permit transfer of the lands.

   (4) Use Breckenridge Dam Waters on a joint usage basis subject to the following:

       (a) Water-based recreation will be in accordance with applicable Federal, State, and Marine Corps Base regulations.

       (b) Swimming, to include that incident to survivor training, will not be permitted in waters of the reservoir.

       (c) Depth of water impounded by Breckenridge Dam will be under the cognizance and control of the Marine Corps Base, Quantico.
(d) Water impounded by Breckenridge Dam will not be used to support facilities of the National Park Service.

(e) Civilian personnel visiting National Park Service facilities, when boating on the reservoir, will not be permitted to land on property under the cognizance of the Marine Corps.

(f) The Marine Corps will assume no responsibility for the safety of civilians visiting National Park Service facilities while boating on waters of the reservoir.

(g) Boating will not be permitted during hours of darkness or during inclement weather.

(5) Use of the road leading from Route 619 will be on a joint usage basis subject to the following:

(a) Road will not be fenced.

(b) Improvements to or extension of the road to be at the expense of the National Park Service.

(c) Expense of maintenance of the road within the joint use area to be the responsibility of the Marine Corps.

(d) No permanent facilities will be built within the access corridor.

(6) The area to be retained for exclusive use will be subject to the following:

(a) Fencing will be constructed at National Park Service expense along the boundaries of the area except those boundaries fronting Breckenridge Reservoir.

(b) Facilities of the National Park Service will be designed and constructed in such a manner as to prevent pollution of the Watershed of Breckenridge Reservoir.

(c) National Park Service facilities constructed in the area shall not exceed tree-top level.
b. Department of the Navy:

(1) Navy-owned areas encompassed by the area to be retained by Interior will be transferred to Interior.

(2) Assist Interior in detailed land surveys and staff appraisals of the Prince William Forest - Quantico area to determine those lands that may be acquired to round out Prince William Forest. Navy further agrees to actively support Interior before the Bureau of the Budget and the appropriate committees of the Congress in obtaining adequate appropriations to obtain the land in question.

Mr. Nash Castro will continue to be responsible for developing necessary data for the Department of Interior. Captain Alan C. Gault, CEC, USN, will continue to be responsible for such development by the Navy. These representatives will pursue this problem until both the immediate and long-range solutions have been realized.

(Date)

George B. Hartzog, Jr.
Director, National Park Service

(Date)

Frank Sanders
Assistant Secretary of the Navy
(Installations and Logistics)
APPENDIX ELEVEN

1972 SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR THE QUANTICO PERMIT LANDS AND NAVY LICENSE FOR 54 ACRES OF PARKLAND
* It is agreed by the signatories hereto that there will be an access corridor and appropriate development site for water-based recreation by Interior within the 4862 acres of land. The location and size of such corridor and development site shall be subject to further agreements following the studies mentioned above.

SPECIAL USE PERMIT AUTHORIZING THE DEPARTMENT OF NAVY TO OCCUPY AND USE A PORTION OF PRINCE WILLIAM FOREST PARK

The Department of the Navy is hereby granted permission to continue to occupy and use 4,514 acres of land at Prince William Forest Park, Virginia, lying south and west of Joplin Road (State Route 6) and contiguous to the Marine Corps Development and Education Command at Quantico, Virginia, as shown thus on the attached map, drawing number NCP 6.5-219A. Approximately 3,481 acres lying north of Lake Breckenridge Reservoir, previously under permit, is being retained by the Department of the Interior as a part of Prince William Forest Park and is shown thus on the attached map:

This permit is granted subject to the following conditions and provisions:

1. The land described above shall be used only for the training of Marine Corps troops and for the purpose of the Marine Corps Development and Education Command.

2. Every precaution shall be taken to protect and preserve the natural, geological and historical features and objects present in the tract.

3. Logging operations will not be carried on and only clearing of the wooded area necessary for the development of structures and roads will be permitted without the written consent of the Secretary of the Interior.

4. The permittee shall be responsible for all maintenance and costs of maintenance of all existing structures, roads, and facilities and those constructed in the future without cost to the Department of the Interior.

5. Every precaution shall be taken to protect the area from fire, vandalism, and unauthorized use by persons other than members of the Marine Corps Development and Education Command and adequate equipment and personnel must be made available by the permittee for fire suppression in the area.

6. The Department of the Navy and the Marine Corps Development and Education Command shall be responsible for administration of any and all tort claims or legal suits that may arise from the use of this land by both military and civilian personnel as covered under the Federal Tort Claims Act.
7. This permit shall not be sublet, reassigned, nor will the permittee part with the possession of the whole or any part of said premises without the written consent of the Secretary of the Interior.

8. Should the premises covered by this permit be abandoned or not used for a continuous period of 6 months or longer, the Secretary of the Interior or his duly authorized representative may take possession of said premises and at his option terminate this agreement.

9. Upon termination of the use of the area by the permittee all structures and facilities shall be removed and the area restored to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior.

10. The Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative must be provided access to the area under permit for the purposes of routine inspections and the policing of the conditions and provisions of this permit.

11. This permit is revokable at the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior.

Issued this 16 day of March, 1972

Director, National Capitol Parks

ACCEPTED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

This 16 day of March, 1972

By

WILLIAM W. SHAFFER

Title: Director, Real Estate Division

By direction of the Commanding Officer

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
CHESAPEAKE DIVISION
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
Building 57, Washington Navy Yard
Washington, D. C. 20390
REFER TO INSERT

i. The boundaries of the licensed area will be described by markers to be placed by the licensee.

j. Facilities of the National Park Service will be designed and constructed in such a manner as to prevent pollution of the watershed of Breckenridge Reservoir.

k. National Park Service facilities constructed in the area shall not exceed tree-top level.

l. The National Park Service may use the road leading from Route 619 jointly with the Marine Corps Base, Quantico, with the following stipulations:
   (1) Road will not be fenced.
   (2) Improvements to or extension of the road to be at the expense of the National Park Service, and will be coordinated with and concurred in by Marine Corps Development and Education Command.
   (3) Expense of maintenance of the road within the joint use area to be the responsibility of the Marine Corps.
   (4) No permanent facilities will be built within the access corridor.

m. The National Park Service may use the Breckenridge Dam waters jointly with the following stipulations:
   (1) Water-based recreation will be in accordance with applicable Federal, State, and Marine Corps Base regulations.
   (2) Swimming, to include that incident to survivor training, will not be permitted in waters of the reservoir.
   (3) Depth of water impounded by Breckenridge Dam will be under the cognizance and control of the Marine Corps Base, Quantico.
   (4) Water impounded by Breckenridge Dam will not be used to support facilities of the National Park Service.
   (5) Civilian personnel visiting National Park Service facilities, when boating on the reservoir, will not be permitted to land on property under the cognizance of the Marine Corps.
   (6) The Marine Corps will assume no responsibility for the safety of civilians visiting National Park Service facilities while boating on waters of the reservoir.
   (7) Boating will not be permitted during hours of darkness or during inclement weather.

n. The Marine Corps Development and Education Command will retain fly-over rights to the licensed area.
Approximately 54 acres of wooded lands within the Marine Corps Base, Quantico, located west of Route 620, south of Route 619, and north of the Breckenridge Dam waters as indicated on Marine Corps Base, Quantico, Virginia, Public Works Division Map PW-SK 2904-C, attached herein as "Exhibit A".

The above described area shall be used by the National Park Service only for the purpose of activities connected with group camping facilities for training and educational purposes. In addition, the use of the Breckenridge Dam waters is granted according to Provision 7m, stated below.

5. DIRECT

Department of the Navy

Commanding General, Marine Corps Development and Education Command

Quantico, Virginia 22134

6. LEASE

Department of the Interior

Superintendent, Prince William Forest Park

Washington, D.C. 20240

7. SPECIAL PROVISIONS

Commanding General, Marine Corps Development and Education Command

Quantico, Virginia 22134

Superintendent, Prince William Forest Park

Washington, D.C. 20240
7. GENERAL PROVISIONS

a. The Licensor hereby grants to the Licensee the non-exclusive permission to use the premises or facilities specified in item 3 together with the necessary rights of ingress and egress.
b. This License shall be effective during the period stated in item 2 and is revocable at any time without notice at the option and direction of the Licensor or its duly authorized representative.
c. The use to be made of the subject premises shall be limited to that specified in item 4.
d. This License shall not be assignable or transferable by the Licensee.

e. If utilities and services are furnished the Licensee for its use of the premises, the cost thereof will be reimbursed to the Licensor pursuant to applicable statutes and regulations governing such reimbursement.
f. The Licensee shall protect, maintain and keep in good order the premises or facilities licensed hereby. This obligation includes responsibility for all costs incurred for any maintenance and repair (including long-term maintenance) which the Licensee shall consider necessary or desirable in connection with its occupancy hereunder.
g. Any item of long-term maintenance, or any additions to, or alterations of, the premises or facilities which the Licensee shall consider necessary or desirable in connection with its use and occupancy shall be made only with the prior approval and consent of the Licensor and at the sole cost and expense of the Licensee. Upon revocation, expiration or surrender of this License, and to the extent directed by the Licensor, the Licensee shall remove all alterations, additions, betterments and improvements made, or installed, and restore the premises or facilities to the same or at least condition as existed on the date of entry under this License, reasonable wear and tear excepted.
h. All activities authorized hereunder shall be subject to such rules and regulations as regards supervision or otherwise, as may, from time to time, be prescribed by the local representative of the Licensee designated in item 5a.

i. The boundaries of the licensed area will be described by markers to be placed by the licensor.

j. Facilities of the National Park Service will be designed and constructed in such a manner as to prevent pollution of the watershed of Breckenridge Reservoir.

k. National Park Service facilities constructed in the area shall not exceed tree-top level.

l. The National Park Service may use the road leading from Route 619 jointly with the Marine Corps Base, Quantico, with the following stipulations:
   (1) Road will not be fenced.
   (2) Improvements or extension of the road to be at the expense of the National Park Service, and will be coordinated with and concurred in by Marine Corps Development and Education Command.
   (3) Expense of maintenance of the road within the joint use area to be the responsibility of the Marine Corps.
   (4) No permanent facilities will be built within the access corridor.

m. The National Park Service may use the Breckenridge Dam waters jointly with the following stipulations:
   (1) Water-based recreation will be in accordance with applicable Federal, State, and Marine Corps Base regulations.
   (2) Swimming, to include that incident to survivor training, will not be permitted in waters of the reservoir.
   (3) Depth of water impounded by Breckenridge Dam will be under the cognizance and control of the Marine Corps Base, Quantico.
   (4) Water impounded by Breckenridge Dam will not be used to support facilities of the National Park Service.
   (5) Civilian personnel visiting National Park Service facilities, when boating on the reservoir, will not be permitted to land on property under the cognizance of the Marine Corps.
   (6) The Marine Corps will assume no responsibility for the safety of civilians visiting National Park Service facilities while boating on waters of the reservoir.
   (7) Boating will not be permitted during hours of darkness or during inclement weather.

n. The Marine Corps Development and Education Command will retain fly-over rights to the licensed area.
SPECIAL USE PERMIT AUTHORIZING THE DEPARTMENT
OF NAVY TO OCCUPY AND USE A PORTION OF PRINCE
WILLIAM FOREST PARK

The Department of the Navy is hereby granted permission to continue to
occupy and use 4,514.0 acres of land at Prince William Forest Park,
Virginia, lying south and west of Joplin Road (State Route 619) and
contiguous to the Marine Corps Development and Education Command at
Quantico, Virginia, as shown thus [ ] on the attached map,
drawing number NCP 6.5-219A. Approximately 348.0 acres lying north
of Lake Breckenridge Reservoir, previously under permit, is being
retained by the Department of the Interior as a part of Prince William
Forest Park and is shown thus [ ] on the attached map.

This permit is granted subject to the following conditions and provisions:

1. The land described above shall be used only for the training of
Marine Corps troops and for the purpose of the Marine Corps Development
and Education Command.

2. Every precaution shall be taken to protect and preserve the natural,
geological and historical features and objects present in the tract.

3. Logging operations will not be carried on and only clearing of the
wooded area necessary for the development of structures and roads will
be permitted without the written consent of the Secretary of the
Interior.

4. The permittee shall be responsible for all maintenance and costs of
maintenance of all existing structures, roads, and facilities and those
constructed in the future without cost to the Department of the Interior.

5. Every precaution shall be taken to protect the area from fire,
vandalism, and unauthorized use by persons other than members of the
Marine Corps Development and Education Command and adequate equipment
and personnel must be made available by the permittee for fire suppression
in the area.

6. The Department of the Navy and the Marine Corps Development and
Education Command shall be responsible for administration of any and
all tort claims or legal suits that may arise from the use of this land
by both military and civilian personnel as covered under the Federal
Tort Claims Act.
7. This permit shall not be sublet, reassigned, nor will the permittee part with the possession of the whole or any part of said premises without the written consent of the Secretary of the Interior.

8. Should the premises covered by this permit be abandoned or not used for a continuous period of 6 months or longer, the Secretary of the Interior or his duly authorized representative may take possession of said premises and at his option terminate this agreement.

9. Upon termination of the use of the area by the permittee all structures and facilities shall be removed and the area restored to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior.

10. The Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative must be provided access to the area under permit for the purposes of routine inspections and the policing of the conditions and provisions of this permit.

11. This permit is revokable at the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior.

Issued this ___ day of ___1972___

Russell E. Dickerson
Director, National Capital Parks

ACCEPTED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

This ___ day of ___1972___

William W. Shaffer
Director, Real Estate Division

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

COMMISSARY DIVISION

NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND

Building 57, Washington Navy Yard

Washington, D. C. 20350
APPENDIX TWELVE

NAVY LICENSE FOR 54 ACRES OF PARKLAND
MODIFICATION NO. 1

TO

Special Use Permit Issued 16 March 1972, Authorizing the Department of the Navy to Occupy and Use a Portion of Prince William Forest Park

1. Paragraph Number 11 of the Special Use Permit is hereby deleted with the following new paragraph substituted therefore:

11. This permit shall remain in effect until terminated by the mutual consent of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Navy.

2. All other terms and conditions of the Special Use Permit remain unchanged.

Issued this __________ day of _______________ 1984

(signed)

For the Department of the Interior

Title:

Accepted for the Department of the Navy this __9th___ day of __August____ 1984

(signed) Everett Pyatt

Title: EVERETT PYATT

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY
(SHIPBUILDING AND LOGISTICS
The watershed of the Quantico Creek is defined as including those areas of drainage as outlined by the U.S. Geologic Survey mylar produced in 1983. Approximately 57% of the watershed lies within the boundaries of Prince William Forest Park. Thirty percent (approximately 3,500 acres) lies on the Marine Corps Development and Education Command, Quantico, Virginia adjacent and west of the park. The headwaters of the South Branch are on Marine Corps land and activities conducted in that area of the Base directly affect the water quality as it enters the park.

I. Objective

The Departments of Navy and Interior share a common concern for the quality of the water resources of the Quantico Creek. Public Law 736, approved June 22, 1948, directs the Secretary of the Navy to "guarantee the potability and the undamaged source of water of the South Branch of Quantico Creek to the lands lying east of Route 619...".

The Department of Interior is mandated to protect the resources of Prince William Forest Park in order to provide recreational opportunities in a natural setting. The park represents a prime example of a protected watershed in a Piedmont Hardwood Forest which is utilized by educational institutions and scientists for the study of a natural stream ecosystem.

II. Provisions

The stream, surrounded by land with highly erodible soil, is fragile and is vulnerable to sedimentation. In order to reduce the likelihood of damage to the Quantico Creek, while providing a suitable military training environment and otherwise comply with the directions of Public Law 736, the following provisions for the management of the watershed of the Creek are hereby established:

A. Water quality, including the level of sedimentation, nutrients, and metals will be monitored by both agencies where Quantico Creek crosses Route 619 on a regular basis. The two agencies will work together to effect an immediate solution to any water quality problems which should occur.

B. The use of pesticides, herbicides and other chemicals will be kept to absolute minimums. The types of products used and methods of application shall be in accordance with Environmental
Protection Agency (EPA) standards as well as State and local practice. A listing of products which may be used will be provided from time to time as an addendum to this plan. The Marine Corps will notify the Department of the Interior if at any time it would become necessary to use products not previously identified in the Plan.

C. The disposal of petroleum products or other wastes in the watershed shall be prohibited. Accidental spillage of any significant amount of chemicals and/or fuel which should occur will be cleaned up immediately and park officials will be notified. Reasonable measures will be taken to prevent unauthorized dumping and littering.

D. Forest Management will be carried out in accordance with the Virginia Best Management Practices for Forestry. The Secretary of Interior or his designated representative shall be notified in advance of any logging operations.

E. No agricultural out-leasing will be permitted in the watershed.

F. Special precautions will be taken to monitor the area for wildfire during the fire season (October 15 - December 31 and February 15 - May 15), as well as during training exercises in which flares or other incendiaries are utilized. Wildfires will be suppressed immediately. Appropriate fire fighting methods which protect the water resources and assure stable streambank vegetative cover will be applied. Controlled burns determined to be necessary in the watershed will be coordinated with the Department of the Interior and the Virginia Division of Forestry.

G. No ordnance destructive to the water resources will be used in the watershed. Deliberate use of forest resources as targets will be limited to specified areas of specialized training such as the Combat Village area. The use of flares and tear gas will be kept at the minimum level necessary for Marine Corps training purposes.

H. The Secretary of Interior or his designated representative shall be notified of any permanent structures or roads planned for construction in the watershed. Construction will be conducted in accordance with the guidelines contained in the Virginia Sediment and Erosion Control Act. The clearing of wooded areas for construction will be kept to a minimum.

I. Subject to the availability of funding, existing paved roads and roads with graded improved surfaces will be maintained in accordance with the State Highway Standards. Unimproved dirt roads, paths, and trails over which vehicles travel will be
maintained in accordance with the Best Management Practices for Forestry as outlined in the chapter on Woodland Access Roads and Trails (Std. and Spec.1.0). Vehicular travel through wooded areas not containing a road, path or trail for their use will be kept at the minimum level necessary for Marine Corps training purposes. Where vehicle use has detrimental effects on water quality, immediate corrective action will be taken.

J. The Secretary of the Interior or his designated representative will be notified in advance of the establishment of any utility corridors in the watershed.

K. Fish species not native to the Quantico Creek will not be stocked in the creek. Park officials will be notified prior to the stocking of native species.

L. Settling ponds to contain sediments resulting from military use of the watershed will be provided on the advice of the Soil Conservation Service subject to availability of project funding.

III. Administration

A. It is understood and agreed that the Superintendent of Prince William Forest Park is the designated representative of the Secretary of the Interior as referred to in the above provisions. The Commanding General, Marine Corps Development and Education Command (MCDEC) is the representative of the Secretary of the Navy.

B. The Secretary of Interior, or his authorized representative, will be allowed access for routine inspection of the watershed. Access/admittance will be coordinated with Marine Corps Development and Education Command, principally the Range Control Officer.

C. An exchange of information shall be maintained between MCDEC and Prince William Forest Park. A continuing dialogue will be maintained concerning significant environmental problems which may occur, including wildfires, forest pests, etc., in the area covered by this agreement. The park will be provided with copies of the Marine Corps Development and Education Command Long Range Natural Resources Management Plan upon request.

D. Should the Department of Navy at any time determine that there is no longer a need for the 3,500 acres in the watershed of the Quantico Creek (or any part of the watershed) for military purposes, and it is declared excess, it will be offered to the Department of Interior for inclusion in Prince William Forest Park to the extent then allowed by Federal Statute and Property Management Regulations.
E. Significant cultural resources known to exist in the area herein defined shall be protected from destruction as far as is practical for possible future interpretation.

F. The Secretaries of Interior and Navy, by their signature below, approve the provisions of this plan, to be effective as of the date signed. The plan will be reviewed at least every five years.

FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

[Signature]
AUGUST 09, 1984

FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

EVERETT PYATT

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY
(SHIPBUILDING AND LOGISTICS)
In Reply Refer To:
L1425

Memorandum

To: Regional Director, National Capital Region
From: Superintendent, Prince William Forest Park
Subject: Report of Non-Federal Lands in this Park

Immediately upon receipt of advice from Mr. Rowell last Wednesday that The House Committee on Appropriations had requested a report from each Park to show the non-federal acreage, estimated value, and number of land owners, we started collecting data to assemble the attached report. This report represents all land owners of record within the exterior boundaries of this Park. Park Ranger Daugherty spent about three days collecting the data from the land office in Manassas, and Park Naturalist McCutchen assisted him one day. With the constant subdividing which has taken place during the past few years, our records of the original tracts were out of date.

It will be noted that the present inholdings total 271; and the total acreage is 1,687.85.

The estimated cost was arrived at through discussions with local real estate dealers, appraisals made by county officials for tax assessment purposes, and our own knowledge of real estate sales. In some instances the estimated values were purely a guess, as time would not permit a personal inspection of each of the tracts involved.

L. T. Davenport
Superintendent

Attachment
[Reprint from Original]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OWNER</th>
<th>ACREAGE</th>
<th>ESTIMATED COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School (Washington Reid)</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertha Burke</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles W. Davis</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fannie H. Cole</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Peace</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>4,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constance Reid &amp; Joan Johnson, Jr.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry L. and Violet Early</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>18,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leroy &amp; E. M. Bullock</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>16,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. E. Chapman Estate</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Cole Estate</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Cole Estate</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. &amp; J. H. Moore</td>
<td>17.75</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles S. Johnson</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>23,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George L. &amp; Lucille V. Wilson</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>22,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold &amp; Barbara Dyke Lowe</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert W. &amp; Dorothy Seelen</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George L. &amp; Lucille V. Wilson</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry D. &amp; Betty R. Wilson</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James N. Johnson</td>
<td>172.15</td>
<td>26,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard G. &amp; G. B. Starkey</td>
<td>13.95</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmer C. &amp; Rosie A. Redman</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. H. &amp; T. I. Lawhorne</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Redman</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. E. Sisson &amp; Frank Badalson</td>
<td>82.81</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald E. &amp; Gloria Bankenbush</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Taylor</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John &amp; Bertie D. Cebula</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cebula</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Katsarelis</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old School Baptist Church</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Greenwood Estate</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. A. &amp; Oliva Carter</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>14,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall C. &amp; Ollie E. Hummer</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard D. Levine</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeman R. Bradford</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clara Thomas</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>8,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Thomas</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethel &amp; Herman Porter</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John &amp; Sarah Thomas</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Thomas Reid</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Thomas Reid</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. A. Brown Moller</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. A. Brown Moller</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>4,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. B. May Estate</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Elizabeth King Estate</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>8,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. A. Brown Moller</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. F. Davis</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew &amp; Beulah V. Watson</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Flory</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Samuel &amp; Edna Marie King</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Eldridge Johnson</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>ACREAGE</td>
<td>ESTIMATED COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowell C. Baker Estate</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Miller</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>8,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick Finley Liming</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred F. Liming</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William R. &amp; Muriel L. Fouts</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>9,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd B. &amp; Estelle Stanley Liming</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey L. Timmons</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William W. &amp; Fannie L. Liming</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William W. &amp; Fannie L. Liming</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flossie Cole</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John D. &amp; Lucille Moore</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John D. &amp; Lucille Moore (2 lots)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd F. &amp; Mary E. Barker</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene T. &amp; Irene Sisson Cornwell</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John W. Liming</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Liming</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John W. &amp; Ella Milky Liming</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>13,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Liming</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby Liming Davidson</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby Liming Davidson</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>12,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John W. Liming, Jr.</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>14,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred F. Liming</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Williams</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>10,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William D. Carter</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel D. Grayson</td>
<td>33.60</td>
<td>23,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esler O. &amp; Florence L. Slingerland</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>19,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garnel Bates</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James E. Anderson</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elnoria &amp; Leroy Bowman</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrietta &amp; Dan Nash</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Bates</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Bates</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosie Lee Kendall</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsie Queen</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>4,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. L. Williams &amp; D. Kendall</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelma Williams Lucas</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leroy H. Horne</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Matthew Williams &amp; Lillian Nash</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillian Nash</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>10,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillian Nash</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>11,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilda Howard</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. &amp; C. Dove</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazel Williams</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phennie Williams</td>
<td>12.56</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James A. Ferrell</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>17,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John H. Steed &amp; Bessie Mays</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby Williams</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>12,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence Johnson</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>10,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernice &amp; James Howard</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lula Mae Ferrell</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Culley</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George H. &amp; Lottie A. Lawhorne</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>ACREAGE</td>
<td>ESTIMATED COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel &amp; Martha Bell</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine Jackson</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Ira and Amita L. Williams</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Williams</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Matthew Williams</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>4,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Matthew Williams</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Chapman</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>15,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Cole</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James M. Williams</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>15,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mack &amp; Colonial Lucas</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert &amp; Mary B. Johnson</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>15,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Johnson</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>11,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William M. &amp; Idea L. Martin</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Porter</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Porter</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William L. Artis et ux</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston Williams</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeal Williams</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulion &amp; Sadie Johnson</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landon Bates</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willie Abel</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Bates</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hester &amp; Gary P. Lewis</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addie Bates</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond Rynds</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Odell Johnson</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris Ira &amp; Linder Irene Howard</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris Ira &amp; Linder Irene Howard</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George F. &amp; Mary E. Ferrell</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuben W. Abel</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert G. &amp; Vernice F. Kirk</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>22,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman S. &amp; Peal V. Rose</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powie M. &amp; Daisy M. Johnson</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beulah Pearson</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubert R. &amp; Lavern V. Johnson</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey Williams</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger &amp; Bertha Ferrell</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Reid Estate</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leona &amp; Floyd Thomas et als</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley E. Johnson</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd D. Johnson</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Claywood &amp; Maureen Porter, Jr.</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>7,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles H. &amp; Frances S. Williams</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazerine Chapman</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phennie Williams</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd M. Johnson</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lester M. Johnson</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avedis &amp; Laura H. Soghoian</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>11,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Terembes, Jr.</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medford R. Cosner</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. S. Abel</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>12,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. S. Abel et als</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>10,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>ACREAGE</td>
<td>ESTIMATED COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Porter</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack &amp; Lula Thomas</td>
<td>42.50</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie Davis Estate</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Bates</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>17,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church (Batetown)</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tazewell Bates</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>11,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace Reid</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Bates</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Bates</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willie &amp; Aline Cole</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl Olivia Bates</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French N. &amp; Gracie Bates</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alder &amp; Anna May Reid</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Ann Porter</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cline &amp; Angeline Bates</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard &amp; Laura Reid</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>13,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard &amp; Laura Reid</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Walker</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dora R. Popel Gebo</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate M. Keys</td>
<td>69.34</td>
<td>24,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. &amp; Virginia M. Reynolds</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold F. Smith</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold F. Smith</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold F. Smith</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold F. Smith</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold F. Smith</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. L. &amp; B. Debruhl</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>16,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aubrey M. Winfree</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>19,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Davis Estate</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus Cole</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John A. &amp; Myrtle K. Adair</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John A. &amp; Myrtle K. Adair</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Elizabeth King Estate</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary L. Garrison Estate</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fannie Irdella Cole</td>
<td>76.60</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie M. Mills</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dora R. Gebo</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard L. Lonas, Jr.</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fannie S. &amp; William E. Lloyd</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard L. Lonas, Jr.</td>
<td>18.76</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Cole</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Newman</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle Williams Estate</td>
<td>17.81</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Frank Carter</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruby Jane Williams Humphries</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottie Carter</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>10,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William G. &amp; Jane Virginia Hogan</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillian Nash May</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Miller &amp; Gene B. Jeffrey</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Miller &amp; Gene B. Jeffrey</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey L. Timmons</td>
<td>36.70</td>
<td>20,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. E. &amp; R. L. Davidson</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>27,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Acreage</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edna M. and David M. Peel</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Virginia Peel</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edna Marie King</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William E. &amp; Edna Marie Snyder</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska &amp; Victoria M. Reynolds</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>16,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeWayne W. Hoffert et als</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace &amp; Carol P. Wessel</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>30,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. E. Barron</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>26,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald L. &amp; Shirley A. Fogg</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>27,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew P. &amp; Eleanor R. Boquet</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>26,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph B. &amp; Cedelia B. Lieb</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. E. Barron</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>54,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Howard &amp; Thelma I. Lawhorne</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>21,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George E. &amp; Virginia L. Mouzakis</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>31,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Alice Brown</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>30,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Cole Bates</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>11,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John A. &amp; Ruth A. Holloway</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John A. &amp; Pearl W. Franklin</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>15,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret P. Wray</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>15,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French R. &amp; Cleo Bates</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace P. Tate</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>15,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll F. Lillian Porter</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>14,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Alice Brown Moller</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dewitt &amp; Gladys Bates</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher Bates</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Lonas, Jr.</td>
<td>23.45</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Bates Estate</td>
<td>11.35</td>
<td>10,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. T. Johnson, Jr.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. &amp; Mary Coles</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemuel Welford Kyer</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth E. Carter</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>18,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrietta &amp; Lloyd A. Spence</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Chinn</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>12,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Ora Johnson</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kendall</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>9,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrietta Henderson</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrietta Henderson</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. W. Hardy</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James E. Thomas</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James W. Sarah Winfield Kendall</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Kidd &amp; Bennie J. Covington</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah Bates Estate</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archie Bates Estate</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hardy</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>11,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lula Thomas</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel &amp; Ethel Reid</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>7,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roena Reid</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>8,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoma Thomas</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George &amp; Louise Buckner</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>16,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria L. Johnson Estate</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th by Bates</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie Reid Estate</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWNER</td>
<td>ACREAGE</td>
<td>ESTIMATED COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. S. Abel et als</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. H. Williams Estate</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph F. &amp; Thelma W. Hebda</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>17,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Burwell</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfe Thomas Estate</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles E. &amp; Reece M. Williams</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis L. Butler</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred Bolognese</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>41,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert West</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>9,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willie G. Thomas</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eula Holmes</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,687.85</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,322,750</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX FOURTEEN

## RECREATIONAL FACILITIES BUILT SINCE 1950

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature Center</td>
<td>1974 (1960)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegraph Road</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Grove Picnic Area</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loop Road</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Ridge Camp Ground</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey Run Camp Ground</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Village</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegraph Ball Field</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>