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INTRODUCTION

Of the thousands of cultural resources administered by the Forest Service none holds more profound significance for the Forest Service itself than Grey Towers, the home of its founder, Gifford Pinchot. But Grey Towers is significant to the whole nation, and not solely on account of its association with the celebrated forester, who was one member of the remarkable family that made their home from 1885 to 1963 in the fine estate overlooking Milford, Pennsylvania.

James Wallace Pinchot, who built the house, was a wealthy merchant, prominent philanthropist, patron of the arts, an active conservationist as early as the 1870s, and an associate of the major intellectual, artistic, and political figures of his day. His striking, chateauesque mansion—itself important in the history of architecture—on its elaborately landscaped grounds suited his station in life, provided him and his family a respite from the summer heat of New York City, and evoked the sense of social responsibility that he as one of the world’s more fortunate men felt very strongly. A gentleman of the preindustrial age, he fathered two sons who devoted their lives to fashioning a politics for the industrial era. Gifford, the elder, was the first Chief of the Forest Service, a crusading conservationist, a progressive reformer, a pioneering exponent of utility regulation, and twice governor of Pennsylvania. Amos R. E. Pinchot, James’ younger son, became one of the seminal liberal reformers of the 20th century, a key figure in the Progressive Party, a founder of the American Civil Liberties Union, a spokesman for labor law reform, and a dedicated antimilitarist. Around the Pinchot family revolved much of the political history of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Grey Towers is a window to their world.

In 1963, under the authority of the National Historic Sites Act of 1935, the Secretary of the Interior designated Grey Towers a National Historic Landmark, honoring its significance to the history of the nation. The same year, through the generosity of the Pinchot family, the estate passed into public ownership. It has since that time quartered the Pinchot Institute for Conservation Studies, a program established to further the protection and wise use of the nation’s resources—a cause that Gifford Pinchot made his life’s work.

After several years of changing directions, the Pinchot Institute has gained a new lease on life and a redefined mission. At the same time, a new look at Grey Towers has become advisable. In 1963-64, the natural evolution of the property through eight decades of residential use came to an abrupt end. Today, conversion of the structures to accommodate uses quite different from those for which they were originally intended would, in historic preservation jargon, be termed “adaptive use.” In 1963 that concept was almost unheard of, and most of the federal government’s conscious experience with historic structures was in restorations of singular places for monumental purposes—Independence Hall, for instance. The cultural value of building fabric and contents was only an infrequent

Figure 1. This engraved book plate was used by Gifford Pinchot and is dated 1922. From the collection of the Pinchot Institute.
consideration in 1963, as is understandable in the context of the time. Nowadays the effort to transform Grey Towers into an institutional facility would take a different course, founded on recognition of the structure's inherent significance.

The alterations made a decade and a half ago have not only become badly dated in their own right, but they are incompatible with the character of the structure. There has been a growing public visitation to the property, to accommodate which a factual interpretive program is required. Both circumstances call for action in accord with historic preservation principles. It was to deal with the multiple problems of a historic monument growing in popularity being used for institutional purposes, and about which there were more questions than answers, that this historic structure report was requested.

We as a nation have become increasingly sophisticated in dealing with the tangible, manmade elements of our heritage. We have learned that preservation and restoration projects should neither be shaped by romantic notions of history nor compromised by careless or expedient repair work, lest the structures lose their integrity and utility. The task of preserving a historic building—whether for public enjoyment as a monument, or for some modern, practical use, or a combination of the two—required a reasoned and disciplined approach.

Before developing a preservation scheme, a team of specialists—architects, historians, preservation technologists, curators, engineers, archeologists, and others as needed—assemble all known documentary materials relating to a property, conduct a comprehensive survey of existing building fabric and analyze the particular ills of structures and grounds. By setting forth the historical development of a property, those procedures establish the cultural significance and evaluate the condition of the entire resource. Once such an analysis has been accomplished, plans for preservation can be formulated in a logical, sequential manner, without whim or uncertainty. This approach helps to insure that the historical and esthetic integrity of the preserved structure will survive extensive renewal.

Much of the information contained in a historic structure report is too detailed, technical, and comprehensive for casual reading. It is necessary, however, to explicate the building's history and condition in detail to attain a thorough understanding. In its most basic form, a historic structure report is a complete record before restoration or adaptive rehabilitation begins, and is therefore a working tool for the architect. But the report provides as well technical and historical information of value to others concerned with the preservation, management, use, or interpretation of the building. A historic structure report can thus contribute to the general understanding of historic structures.

The purpose of this preliminary historic structure report is to collect the archival material on Grey Towers; examine the physical remains of the buildings, their contents, and the landscape; evaluate their significance; and offer recommendations for their future treatment. A major part of this task has been a thorough analysis of the existing building fabric of the main house to determine what has been done, when, and by whom. This analysis, coupled with archival research, has answered many questions regarding the property. It also provides a basis for establishing procedures for the future development and maintenance of Grey Towers that insure the preservation and enhancement of its historical, architectural, and environmental qualities while modern administrative uses are accommodated. It should be noted here that this report includes somewhat more historical information than is usual in a historic structure report, which ordinarily limits its attention strictly to the structures at hand. The immediate need for basic data to interpret Grey Towers to the thousands of visitors who are now coming to the site dictated the additional material.

Two other points should be noted. One is that this is a report, whose scope was limited by the funds and time available when it was initiated. It nonetheless sets the stage for the more detailed investigations and the plans and designs that must follow. The other point is that this is a consultant's report; its recommendations and commentaries do not represent decisions made by the Forest Service or the Department of Agriculture. It provides information that will be carefully considered in future planning.

This report promises to be an effective means of informing the people of the Forest Service, wherever stationed, about Grey Towers and why the programs conducted there are important. Further, the report provides a good account of the significance of Grey Towers and the Pinchots in the history of the nation, especially its conservation programs. It should therefore enhance Forest Service appreciation of its own heritage, its origins and original purposes by renewing the Service's contact with the first Chief, Gifford Pinchot. Finally, this report should serve as an instructive example of its type for the Service's historic preservation personnel, to help them become more familiar with the needs of the full range of cultural resources and with the full scope of the cultural resources management program, of which the preservation of Grey Towers is one part.

Persons who would like to comment on this report, on the future of Grey Towers, or on the Pinchot Institute for Conservation Studies (the mission of which is set forth in the appendix) are invited to direct their remarks to the Director, Pinchot Institute for Conservation Studies, USDA Forest Service, Grey Towers, Milford, Pennsylvania 18337.

David A. Clary
Head, History Section
USDA Forest Service
Washington, D.C.
HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

GIFFORD PINCHOT

SUMMARY OF GIFFORD PINCHOT'S FAMILY BACKGROUND

Gifford Pinchot's great grandfather, Constantien Pinchot, emigrated to the United States from France in 1816. As mayor and merchant of the small town of Breteuil-sur-Noye (approximately fifty miles north of Paris in the département of l'Oise), Constantien raised and equipped a company of soldiers, with his son Cyrille Constantien Desiré Pinchot at its command, prior to the Battle of Waterloo. Largely as a result of the defeat of Napoleon and the restoration of the Bourbons, the Pinchots left their native land with much of their stock of merchandise.

While in New York City, the father purchased four hundred acres of land known as the "French lot" in Dingman Township, Pike County, Pennsylvania. In 1818, he and Pierre Joseph Mauclère settled in Milford and opened a store together. Upon Constantien's death six years later, his son Cyrille continued the business. C.C.D. Pinchot, in partnership with John H. Wallace, became a leading merchant of the community through freight wagon trade to and from New York. In addition to his mercantile interests, Gifford's paternal grandfather engaged in both farming and lumbering.

Following the death of his first wife in 1821, C.C.D. Pinchot married her cousin, Eliza Cross; both women were granddaughters of a Belgian immigrant named Josephus Jacobus de Aerts, an erudite Milford newspaper publisher who was supposedly a personal friend of Lafayette. By this second marriage, five children were born: Edgar (1826), James Wallace, Gifford's father (1831), John F. (1833), Cyrille H.P. (1838), and Mary A. (1839).

Because of C.C.D. Pinchot's business orientation toward New York, it is not surprising that his two eldest sons moved to that city to establish their careers. Edgar, following his start as a grocer in 1854, became a partner in the Fulton Street drug firm of Pinchot, Bruen and Seabury during the early 1860s. However, he returned to Milford and later became active in Republican politics as an associate judge of Pike County. His younger brother, James, succeeded in business so well that he remained a permanent resident of New York. Beginning his career as a clerk in a dry goods store in 1850 at the age of 19, by 1856, James Pinchot had become a partner in the Cortlandt Street firm of Partridge, Pinchot and Warren, which specialized in imported paper hangings. A decade later, as Pinchot, Warren and Company, the firm was advertised as the manufacturers and importers of wall paper and window shades and the sole agents in the United States for Heywood, Higginbottoms, Smith and Company of Manchester, England. James Pinchot began to travel widely in pursuit of his business interests and by 1870 was "reckoned one of the wealthy men of America." His financial success enabled him to retire from business in 1875 at the age of 44.

In 1864, James Pinchot had married Mary Jane Eno, the daughter of one of New York's most prominent and wealthy men, Amos Richards Eno. Because the Eno family had such a strong influence on Gifford Pinchot's early life, a factor that has been neglected in most of his biographies, it is important to understand their background. Amos R. Eno was born in 1810 in Simsbury, Connecticut, where the Eno family had been established since the late 1600s. He left the store that he had started in partnership with his cousin, John J. Phelps. Their firm soon became one of the city's leading wholesale houses, and from its success, Eno laid the foundation of his eventual fortune. When the partnership was dissolved in the early 1850s, Eno continued his role as a prominent merchant of dry goods under various successor firms in that decade: Eno, Mahoney and Company; Eno and Roberts; and Eno, Roberts, Rhodes and Company.

Soon Eno's judicious investments in New York real estate eclipsed his mercantile interests, and by 1860, he was devoting full time to acquiring and developing property. In 1859, he built the Fifth Avenue Hotel (at 198 Fifth Avenue, between Twenty-third and Twenty-fourth Streets), which became one of New York's most important hotels. Located in the building was the Second National Bank, of which Eno was one of the organizers and principal stockholders. At the time of his death in 1898, Gifford Pinchot's grandfather owned some of the most valuable real estate parcels on Manhattan Island, which were valued at more than $20,000,000.

BIографICAL SKETCH OF GIFFORD PINCHOT

On August 11, 1865, Gifford Pinchot was born at Simsbury, Connecticut, in the house of his maternal great grandfather, Elisha Phelps. His parents had been spending the summer there. Amos R. Eno had recently purchased the house, which had long belonged to his father-in-law, Phelps, a distinguished politician who had served as the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives during the 1820s. For many years of his early life, Gifford spent his summers with his mother's relatives in Connecticut, living the rest of each year in New York City with his parents and her relatives there.

When James Pinchot and Mary Eno were married in 1864, they had moved into the residence of Mary's father at 26 East Twenty-third Street in New York City. A few years later, the family moved to the new residence that Amos R. Eno had built at 233 Fifth Avenue, at the corner of Twenty-seventh Street. The broad, four storey, red brick mansion continued to serve as the Eno family's home until around 1890, when it was converted into a clubhouse by the Reform Club, of which Amos R. Eno was a member. During Gifford's boyhood at the Twenty-seventh Street home of his grandfather, his extended family included
many Enos and aunts who also resided there for various years, including Uncle Amos F. Eno, a merchant and real estate broker, Uncle Henry Clay Eno, a physician, and Uncle John Chester Eno, a banker. It was not until Gifford was about twelve years old that his father moved his family to their own residence at 18 East Twenty-ninth Street; two years later, they again moved to 212 Madison Avenue.

Because of James W. Pinchot’s business interests abroad, the family travelled extensively while Gifford was a child. At the age of six, he left with his parents and younger sister Antoinette (Nettie) for a three-year sojourn in Europe. While the family was living in Paris in 1873, Gifford’s brother Amos was born. At age fifteen, Gifford again accompanied his parents abroad, to England and the Continent. From the details known of his early life, Gifford clearly enjoyed a privileged childhood and maintained a close relationship with the Eno family.

Gifford prepared for college at Phillips Exeter Academy, and in the fall of 1885, entered Yale University.16 (This same educational pattern had been followed by his mother’s brothers11 and is an example of their early influence on his life.) While still in his first semester at Yale, Gifford became interested in pursuing a career in forestry, an interest which was both fostered and reinforced by his father. James Pinchot was active in the early years of the American Forestry Association. Because no formal course of training for this profession then existed in the United States, upon graduation from Yale in 1889, he left for a thirteen-month period of study in Europe. His education there was guided by the famous German forestor, Dietrich Brandis, who encouraged him to enroll in the Ecole Nationale Forestière in Nancy. He observed forest management in Zurich, the Vosges, and the French Alps, and in the summer of 1890, toured Germany and Switzerland with the English Forestry School under Brandis’ direction. However, Gifford was impatient with the forestry courses at Nancy and believed he would gain more from practical experience. He dropped out before the fall term and returned to the United States in 1891.

He was first employed by the Phelps-Dodge Company for a survey of their forest lands in Pennsylvania and Arizona. (He had declined an offer from Dr. Bernhard E. Fernow, chief of the Federal Division of Forestry.) His opportunity to put into practice his brief instruction and observation of forest management came in February 1892, when he began work on a forest tract of the Biltmore estate of George Washington Vanderbilt near Asheville, North Carolina. Selected largely on the recommendation of the landscape architect who had conceived the idea of America’s first managed forest, Frederick Law Olmsted (an old friend of James Pinchot), young Pinchot set about to try to prove that timber could be produced profitably as a crop with a nearly constant annual yield, while the general condition of the forest was improved. In conjunction with this work, he prepared

Figure 3. Gifford Pinchot is shown standing behind his seated parents on the original south porch of Grey Towers, circa 1900. The French door, later modified by Gifford and Cornelia, is seen in its original form. From the collection of the Pinchot Institute.
an exhibit on forestry for the 1893 Columbian Exposition in Chicago. Later that year he established an office in New York as a consultant forester and became involved in a variety of new projects, including a management plan for Ne-Ha-Sa-Ne, a private preserve in the Adirondacks, which added to his practical experience and knowledge of forests of the country.

By this time he was deeply committed to his profession although it was not very financially rewarding, and in August 1894, Gifford Pinchot resigned his grandfather Eno's second offer to join the family business. Early in 1895 he left the Biltmore project and was succeeded by a German forester, Carl A. Schenck. In 1896, the National Academy of Sciences appointed a National Forest Commission to make recommendations to the Federal government regarding the development and management of public forest lands. This commission, of which Pinchot was one of seven members and its secretary, was responsible for laying the groundwork for much of the country's future forest policy. Following a year's travel through the West as a special forest agent to the Department of the Interior, in 1898 he accepted the position of Chief of the Division of Forestry in the Department of Agriculture.

Pinchot soon demonstrated his outstanding ability as an administrator and infused a rare “esprit de corps” into his small initial staff of twelve employees. Through an intense information campaign implemented by means of press releases and articles furnished to newspapers and magazines, the Division educated the public on the need for forestry and began to influence public opinion. Because the nation's forest reserves were then under the control of the Department of the Interior, Pinchot’s agency was limited to offering advice to those who solicited its help. However, there were but few Americans then who shared Pinchot's knowledge of forest resources or understood the problems of their management as well as he did.

In 1901, the division was elevated to the status of the Bureau of Forestry and its staff expanded commensurately to include nearly two hundred employees. Four years later, Congress passed a bill that consolidated forest administration with the newly renamed Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture. By this act of February 1905, 86 million acres of forest reserves (renamed national forests in 1907) were transferred from the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. This move, which Pinchot had worked toward from the beginning of his Federal service, was strongly influenced by the recommendations of the American Forestry Congress held the month before, which the bureau chief had done much to help organize in the hope of molding Congressional opinion. In addition to the authority that the Forest Service was then given over the nation's Federal forest reserves, the act allowed the moneys derived from the sale of resources to be channeled into a special fund for the administration, improvement and extension of forests. This privilege, although limited to a few years' duration, did much to expand the bureau's capacity to reach its objectives. Pinchot extended Federal regulation to all resources in the national forests, including grazing (which, rather than lumbering, ranked then as the number one problem), the regulations of water power dam sites, and the control of mineral rights. In nine Supreme Court cases that challenged the broad interpretation of the Federal government's control over public lands, the Forest Service's positions were upheld.

The close personal relationship that existed between Gifford Pinchot and Theodore Roosevelt, who became President in September 1901, upon William McKinley's death, strongly affected the achievements of the conservation movement of the early 1900s. The two men held common interests, shared inherited attitudes of “noblesse oblige,” and maintained a friendship fostered by their love of outdoor sports. Pinchot soon became a confidant and a member of the President's inner circle, advising him on all conservation questions and frequently writing his speeches and policy statements. Roosevelt's dynamic view of executive leadership and his adept, political diplomacy did much to implement the ideas of the Chief of the Forest Service. During the two presidential terms, the two men worked closely towards the same goals, one of their major coups being the creation of several million acres of “midnight forests” in March 1907, shortly before a bill was enacted that required Congressional approval for the appointment of all new forest lands. By the time Pinchot left the Forest Service in 1910, there were 149 national forests with a total of 193 million acres; when he became the division chief in 1898, there had been only 32 forests with 40 million acres.

Pinchot also served on a number of Roosevelt's commissions, many of which were established at the forester's urging. In 1903, he was a member of the Commission on the Organization of Government Scientific Work and the Commission on Public Lands; in 1905, the Commission on Departmental Methods; in 1907, the Inland Waterways Commission; and in 1908, the Country Life Commission. An event that brought conservation dramatically to public view was the 1908 Governors' Conference on Conservation, which Pinchot not only induced Roosevelt to call, but largely financed from his personal income. Attended by the governors of most of the states, members of Congress and the Cabinet, Supreme Court judges and prominent private citizens, it was the first meeting of its kind to address the problem of the protection and management of natural resources. Shortly thereafter, Pinchot was appointed chairman of the National Conservation Committee, whose task it was to prepare an inventory of the United States' natural resources. In February 1909, the North American Conservation Conference convened at the forester's suggestion, and plans then followed for an international conference to be held at The Hague, an event that was aborted by the change in administrations.
Pinchot did not share with the new president, William Howard Taft, the personal relationship that he had enjoyed with Roosevelt. When it became clear that Taft was not the strong advocate of conservation policies that his predecessor had been, Pinchot became involved in a long political controversy with the new Secretary of the Interior, Richard Ballinger, a business-oriented Seattle attorney. The immediate incident involved Alaskan coal lands in the public domain, although the larger issue was over the policies that had been made during the Roosevelt administration concerning resource regulation. Many chapters have been written regarding the complex series of events in the controversy, and interpretations as to its significance vary widely. Pinchot's motives have been viewed as a blend of idealism and ambition, but whatever explanations are given, the fact remains that Pinchot was dismissed from office by President Taft in January 1910, for insubordination. The public outcry against Pinchot's firing and his continued popularity undoubtedly supported his thoughts on future political office.

The National Conservation Association, of which Pinchot was president and financial angel from 1910 to 1925, served as an outlet for his concern for keeping conservation issues (and himself) in the public eye. The organization's two main objectives were to fight the movement to give the national forests over to the states' control, and to control waste power development on government property. Its policies were strongly marked by partisan influences. When Roosevelt failed to win the Republican presidential nomination from Taft in June 1912, Pinchot took an active role in founding the new Progressive Party, commonly known as the Bull Moose Party. The forester represented the more radical wing of the party's politics and made strong statements on the need for stricter antitrust laws and innovative social reforms. In 1914, running on the Progressive platform, Pinchot became a candidate for an elective office for the first time with his bid to win the United States Senate seat from Pennsylvania. His well-worn political slogan, "public good comes before private profit," had its origin in this unsuccessful campaign.

That same year, at the age of forty-nine, Pinchot was married for the first time to Cornelia Bryce, great-granddaughter of industrialist Peter Cooper and daughter of Lloyd Bryce, the distinguished publisher of North American Review, U.S. minister to the Netherlands, congressman and novelist. A wealthy woman in her early thirties, Miss Bryce had already begun an independent political life as a champion of the working girl and an advocate of women's suffrage. Roosevelt had complimented her as having the best political mind among all the women of his acquaintance. During the years following his marriage, Pinchot served on the Committee for Relief in Belgium, and in 1920, became the Commissioner of Forestry for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Pinchot was elected to his first term as Governor of Pennsylvania in 1922, largely through the support of rural counties and the new women's vote. During his 1923-1927 administration, his major goals were the regulation of electric power companies and the enforcement of Prohibition. In a crusade for "clean politics," he did away with many long-standing political practices and was known for his accessibility to the public. The state government was reorganized under the authority of the administrative code, one of the most important pieces of legislation passed during his term. There was also an emphasis upon economy and a balanced budget, and within two years, the $30,000,000 deficit that had existed at the outset of Pinchot's governorship was eliminated. In his own estimation, the settlement of the anthracite coal strike of 1923 was one of Pinchot's greatest challenges.

Because the Pennsylvania governor was then prohibited from successive terms, Pinchot turned his political aspirations toward another bid for a Senate seat, but his 1926 campaign was unsuccessful. However, in 1931, he began his second term as Pennsylvania's governor. His accomplishments during this administration were tempered by the problems of the Depres-
American History

Analysis of Gifford Pinchot's Role in American History

In assessing Gifford Pinchot's place in American history, it is important that his contributions not be exaggerated or overstated, thereby obscuring the validity of his true accomplishments. The tendency to create a myth around a historical figure often inhibits our understanding of his accomplishments. The tendency to create a myth around a historical figure often inhibits our understanding of his accomplishments.

Shortly before his death, he completed a ten-year effort to write an autobiographical account of his work between 1889 and 1910 and his part in the development of forestry and conservation in the United States. Breaking New Ground, the title excerpted from a Roosevelt accolade, was published posthumously in 1947. Other writings that Pinchot had authored included The Fight for Conservation, a dozen monographs on forestry subjects, a popular book on his journey to the South Seas, and approximately 150 published articles, reports, bulletins, lectures and addresses. On October 4, 1946, at the age of eighty-one, Gifford Pinchot died in New York City of leukemia.

In assessing Gifford Pinchot's place in American history, it is important that his contributions not be exaggerated or overstated, thereby obscuring the validity of his true accomplishments. The tendency to create a myth around a historical figure often inhibits our understanding of his accomplishments. The tendency to create a myth around a historical figure often inhibits our understanding of his accomplishments.

At the time that Gifford Pinchot decided upon a career in forestry, the Eastern forests had been drastically reduced by decades of burning to create farmland, consumption of wood for construction and fuel, a growing demand for pulpwood for newsprint, and simple waste. In 1873, a crisis over the diminishing flow of the Hudson River and Erie Canal system, which was a threat to cheap water transportation and the prosperity of commerce, had led to a New York State study of the relationship between rainfall and the forests. This event created some awareness of the destructive effects that wanton lumbering was having on the country's watersheds. A state commission recommended the establishment of a state forest reserve, and although twelve years passed before the state legislature created the first forest preserve in the nation, a new public consciousness was beginning to dawn. In 1873, a member of the commission, Dr. Franklin B. Hough, convinced the prestigious American Association for the Advancement of Science to petition the U.S. Congress to create a Federal forestry commission. Hough was appointed the first Federal forestry agent in 1876 and became the first chief of the Division of Forestry in 1881. The American Forestry Association was organized in 1875, primarily to foster the aesthetic appreciation of the forest and the botanical study of arboriculture.

Meanwhile, most Americans considered wood to be an inexhaustible resource. In the West, as in the East, settlers in wood-covered regions continued to burn trees as the most expedient method of clearing land. Since the country's first degree program in forestry was not established until 1898 (when Chief Fernow left the Division of Forestry to organize the school at Cornell), Pinchot's decision to enter the field of forestry was a remarkable demonstration of foresight. His brief education in Europe had made him the first native American to have received any professional training in the science of forest management; with his work at Biltmore, he became the first person to practice it in the United States. The experiment at this significant site in the history of forestry was a difficult but important one. Scientific management had entered in competition with the traditional, quick-profit methods of lumbering American forests.

Much of the reason behind Pinchot's choice in careers stemmed from his desire to do something "of greatest service." This same motivation later turned the concept of conservation into a moral issue for him. He once explained his attitude toward devotion to public service and his life's work in the following way:

My own money came from unearned increment on land in New York held by my grandfather, who willed the money, not the land, to me. Having got my wages in advance in that way, I am now trying to work them out.

Indeed, he had the opportunity to gain greater fortune by carrying on his grandfather Eno's business affairs but declined the offer. In writing of the invaluable service that Pinchot had rendered to forestry although having no financial reason to work, President Roosevelt described him as "not content to be an idler on the earth's surface." This understatement reflects the strong moral commitment behind Pinchot's work, which was recognized as one of his finest qualities.

The concrete accomplishments for which Pinchot is best known today were made while he was chief of the Forest Service. By deliberately limiting his autobiographical book, Breaking New Ground, to the years 1889-1910, he made his own evaluation of that period as the most important of his life. When he entered the Division of Forestry, he promoted the pragmatic concept of the multiple use of forest resources. His practical knowledge, broad approach, and organizational ability earned him deserved respect in handling complex resource problems. William B. Greeley, later Chief of the Forest Service, described Pinchot's entrance into government service in 1896 in the following way:

He brought into it a fervor of religious intensity and a magnetic personal leadership that have rarely been equalled in the American drama. For the next fourteen years, the astonishing vigor of the planning and execution of successive moves for national conservation greatly expressed the zeal and energy of Gifford Pinchot.

Samuel P. Hays, whose book Conservation and The Gospel of Efficiency remains one of the best analyses of the movement's early history, also assessed the personal attributes of the forester that contributed so greatly to the success of his ideas:

Through sheer force of personality and conviction, Pinchot drew many enthusiasts into different phases of the forest movement. His vigor and drive captured the interest and loyalty of a number of young men. His detailed knowledge of forestry and his concern for making forestry pay attracted the friendship of many practical lumbermen.

Through what has been called a "missionary spirit," Pinchot inspired many followers, both within the Forest Service and in the private sector, to carry out his policy. Because of his concern about the country's lack of trained foresters, he took an active role in promoting forestry education. Together with his father and brother, he founded the Forest School at Yale University in 1900. Many of his immediate associates, who were instilled with his philosophy, became associated with forestry schools and thereby disseminated his ideas.
In his autobiography of 1913, Theodore Roosevelt concluded that the enactment of a conservation program was the greatest contribution that he had made to the domestic policies of the United States. In speaking of Gifford Pinchot's role in this work, the former President stated that:

... among the many, many public officials who under my administration rendered literally invaluable service to the people of the United States, he, on the whole, stood first.18

In personal correspondence, Roosevelt spoke of Pinchot as a friend "in whose integrity I believe as I do my own," and upon leaving office, the president acknowledged that he owed the forester "a particular debt of obligation for a very large part of the achievement of this administration."19 The unique relationship between the two men has been described as an "ideological and political symbiosis" by Elmo Richardson, whose book, The Politics of Conservation, contains the following explanation of their joint efforts in conservation.

The President readily identified his own interests as a naturalist and his faith in dynamic executive power with the forester's personal crusade for planned conservation and use of resources. Pinchot, as a secondary official, had slight means to implement his programs, but because he was Roosevelt's most trusted advisor, his proposals were enshrined in the authority and prestige of the Presidency. By securing an act transferring jurisdiction over forests from the Interior Department to the Department of Agriculture, in 1905, Roosevelt removed the last obstacle to the fulfillment of Pinchot's ambitions.20

Pinchot's biographer McGeary referred to his subject as "the unofficial crown prince in the Roosevelt realm" and concluded that his ability to accomplish so much over a short period of time has seldom been equalled by any government official.21

President John F. Kennedy, at the occasion of the 1963 dedication of Grey Towers, called Pinchot "the father of American conservation." He has also been singled credited with elevating the conservation of resources from an unknown experiment to a nationwide movement, and some claim that he made the term "conservation" a household word. As so frequently happens with the aggrandizement of historical figures, Pinchot's role, although significant, has often been assigned maximum importance at the expense of others. George Perkins Marsh, who in 1864 wrote Man and Nature (retilted in its second edition, 1874, Earth As Modified by Human Action), has been called the "fountainhead of the conservation movement" by critic Lewis Mumford.22 Concerned with man's destruction of the balance of nature, Marsh was one of America's first proponents of scientific forest management (and was much admired by Pinchot in his college days). Historian Hays explains that the movement to conserve water in reservoirs gave rise to both the term and the concept of conservation, and he credits W. J. McGee as being the key figure in disseminating the ideas of the conservation movement.23 By Pinchot's own account, it was he who, while riding in a park near Washington in February 1907, had the idea suddenly flash through his mind that there should be a coordinated approach to managing all natural resources.24 This "newborn idea" or "brain child" of his was then introduced to McGee (whom Pinchot acknowledged as a leader of the new movement) and was christened "conservation" by Pinchot's assistant, Overton Price, or by Pinchot. While the actual "father of conservation" question is a dubious one, it is important to realize that a large number of leaders were involved in the movement, a fact which is often obscured.

Because the term "conservation" has grown to include new meanings and associations since the early 1900s, Gifford Pinchot often has been called, erroneously, a preservationist. On the contrary, he always stressed the utilitarian value of the national forests and believed that they should be managed for regulated commercial use for the general good, with local needs coming first. This stand helped greatly to win public and Congressional support for the reservation of vast tracts of forest land. Thoroughly pragmatic, he was strongly opposed to transforming forest reserves into national parks and game preserves and often derided the "nature lovers" who sought to bring about these changes. One example of the fight between conservationist and preservationist ideals was the Hetch-Hetchy controversy of the early 1900s which severed ties between the leaders of the two groups, notably Pinchot and John Muir of the Sierra Club. Pinchot minimized the value of preserving the scenic beauty of this remote, heavily wooded river valley in Yosemite National Park as a recreation area; instead, he joined advocates pressing, successfully, for use of the site as a reservoir for San Francisco. An earlier, bitter issue that revealed Pinchot's belief that public forests should be open for resource development was that over management of the Adirondack Forest Preserve. At the beginning of the controversy, the New York State constitution was amended in 1894 to prohibit all timber cutting in the preserve. Pinchot, as well as Muir, fought against the "forever wild" clause that prohibited forest management there.

The Ballinger-Pinchot controversy has been the subject of a great deal of historical scrutiny, and its significance has been evaluated with resulting conflicts in opinion. In 1908 and 1909, when the leaders of the Roosevelt administration's conservation efforts were faced with opposition in the Congress and from the new President, they made an increasing appeal to the public for support. When he believed that the policies he had worked to accomplish were threatened with reversal, Pinchot mounted an attack on Ballinger and Taft and consequently was brought into the limelight. In the ensuing Congressional investigation of the affair and its wide coverage in the press, Pinchot was identified with all the contributions of the Forest Service in the public's eye. He was touted as a martyr who had sacrificed his own position to forward the cause of conservation and the fight against monopolies. Historian Richardson interpreted the controversy as an exercise of Pinchot's ambition, backed by the force of popular opinion, whereby the forester gambled on discrediting Ballinger in hopes of promoting his own position. This view challenges the common oversimplification that Ballinger was a corporate lawyer whose opinion represented the West's hostility to resource regulation. Pinchot's behavior reflected his growing tendency to classify any disagreement with his philosophies as abject and unprincipled opposition. His inability to compromise or tolerate even slight disagreement eventually alienated nearly every one of his political allies, including Roosevelt. Conclusions vary in regard to the political damage done by the controversy to Taft and the orthodox Republican party. Roosevelt's biographer, Pringle, claims that the affair was historical while other authorities maintain that it was responsible for widening the breach between Taft and Roosevelt, thus resulting in organization of the Progressive Party.

After Pinchot's dismissal from office, he continued to exert an influence on legislation and resource policy because of his respected practical knowledge of Western problems, his many devoted supporters, and his National Conservation Association. However, his influence was far less than it had been during the Roosevelt years. In summing up the overall contributions of Pinchot's lifelong concern for natural resources, Hays presented the following critique:

One must also reassess Pinchot's wider role in organized conservation affairs. Without question the Chief Forester contributed more than any other individual to public awareness of forestry and water power problems. He firmly planted the idea of conservation in the minds of the American people; he built up the United States Forest Service as a highly effective government agency and almost personally staved off measures which would have granted public utility corporations unlimited franchises. Yet, Pinchot also helped to retard the movement. His vigorous attempt to direct conserva-
tion into those limited channels he preferred to stress, and his refusal to compromise with those with whom he differed, played a large role in splintering conservation organization, contributed to conflicts among resource groups and to personal bitterness among their leaders, and alienated many who hesitated to become involved in the tense atmosphere surrounding such a controversial figure.\textsuperscript{25}

Many conservationists regretted that Pinchot ever ran for political office, since it diverted his talents from the progress of the movement. He was criticized for political opportunism and for relegating forestry to a secondary concern. However, his accomplishments as Pennsylvania’s governor should not be ignored or omitted from an overall evaluation of the man’s contributions. Pinchot himself viewed his two terms in the governorship as the most interesting and challenging years of his life. His biographer McCeary, who made a thorough study of his subject’s political career, concluded that there was “considerable concurrence that his first Administration, all things considered, was superior to that of any other governor in Pennsylvania.”\textsuperscript{26} Because Pinchot had taken a strong stand as the underdog against the Republican Party’s “Old Guard,” the public’s confidence in their governor was considerable. His accomplishments in fiscal management, reorganization of the state bureaucracy, and regulation of power companies all earned him esteem. As a tribute of respect to Pinchot, the Pennsylvania government offices were closed the day of his funeral. It would therefore be a mistake to neglect the contributions of Gifford Pinchot’s later years of public service, and more consideration should be given toward assessing his involvement in such national issues of the 1920s and 1930s as labor relations and public relief.

**GREY TOWERS’ PLACE IN GIFFORD PINCHOT’S LIFE**

Letters from Gifford Pinchot to his mother during the early part of 1886 reveal the great interest he had in the construction of Grey Towers. At that time, he was in his first year of college at Yale, and Mrs. Pinchot was on an extended tour of Europe with her daughter, Nettie. When his mother inquired as to whether he would like to spend the summer abroad, he declined the offer, explaining that “it would take away all my chance to have a hand in fitting up the house.”\textsuperscript{28} Gifford apparently expressed much the same sentiments to his sister, since she informed her father that “he could scarcely wait to see it finished and is awfully anxious to begin arranging his part of it.”\textsuperscript{29} Gifford’s eagerness to participate in this endeavor undoubtedly stemmed from the fact that most of his childhood had been spent in his grandfather’s house in New York City. Because Grey Towers was the only house expressly built for the James Pinchot family, its construction elicited considerable enthusiasm from the children. During the Easter holidays in Spring, 1886, Gifford met his father and his younger brother Amos (affectionately known as “Toots”) at Grey Towers, so that together they could review the construction progress on the house. The following extracts are from a letter that Gifford wrote to his mother about the visit.

I have just returned from a very pleasant trip to Milford with Papa & Toots, & I want to tell you how delighted I was with the house and the general appearance of things there . . . I cannot tell you how entirely it met my expectations & how I want to get into it. From the village it looks as if it had been where it stands before the memory of the oldest inhabitant began to operate, and it is certainly built in a way
calculated to make it outlast the memories of all the inhabitants for the next half-dozen generations. It seems to me the most attractive situation I know anything about. It is with great difficulty that I can talk of anything else.\textsuperscript{36}

It must have pleased Gifford greatly that the special occasion of his twenty-first birthday on August 11, 1886, marked the Pinchot family’s first meal in their newly completed home. Mrs. Pinchot noted in her diary that the party drank a toast to her son’s health as they had tea in the billiard room.\textsuperscript{31} While at Yale the following fall, Gifford was most anxious that the next holiday, Thanksgiving, be spent with the family at Grey Towers. In a letter to his father that November, the sophomore asked:

\begin{quote}
Have you yet decided where you will spend Thanksgiving? If Milford is to be the place, as I hope it will, please send me an Erie timetable \ldots Would you like me to bring some fellows up with me and if so, how many?\textsuperscript{32}
\end{quote}

Gifford apparently enjoyed bringing his college classmates to his Pennsylvania home during vacations, and the following summer he again asked his parents about inviting friends to Milford for the summer.\textsuperscript{33}

In January 1887, James Pinchot purchased a house on the west side of Gramercy Park in New York City.\textsuperscript{34} Similar to the private, residential parks in urban London, Gramercy Park was designed in 1831 and has remained since that date one of Manhattan’s most fashionable addresses. Because of their club memberships, charitable interests, art collecting and fondness for cultural events, Mary and James Pinchot led a very active social life. The year-round occupancy of a home in a comparatively isolated, rural corner of Pennsylvania was therefore not part of their life style. Although the pattern varied from year to year, during the first decade of Grey Towers’ history, the Pinchots usually would leave New York in May and return in November. It had long been their habit to seek relief from urban summers at such places as Simsbury, Connecticut, and Far Rockaway, Long Island.

During the summer of 1891, following his return from his education in Europe, his employment with Phelps-Dodge, and his disillusionment with Chief Fernow of the Division of Forestry, Gifford spent a few months at Grey Towers playing tennis and trying to write a primer on forestry. The opportunity to pursue these two activities, recreation and writing, was to attract him to Grey Towers for many years to come.

Around 1900, Mr. and Mrs. James Pinchot established a home in Washington, D.C. at 1615 Rhode Island Avenue on Scott Circle. (They had sold their Gramercy Park house when they decided to reside in the capital.) This move was motivated by their desire to be closer to their son, who was beginning to gain prominence for his work in the Division of Forestry. While Gifford lived with his parents at this address (which was six blocks north of the White House), the home was the scene of many social events that served to broaden his acquaintanceships in government circles. Once President Roosevelt disregarded precedent and addressed a meeting of the Society of American Foresters in the Pinchot home. Until Gifford’s dismissal from the Forest Service in January 1910, visits to Grey Towers, even during the summer, were limited by the demands of these extremely active years. The death of his father in February 1908 also had an influence on discouraging trips to Milford.

The situation changed in 1910 when political motivation led Pinchot to establish official residency in the State of Pennsylvania. Until this time, he had been a legal resident of New York, and this factor was regarded as a detriment to his future in politics. At one point during the Roosevelt administration, Pinchot was rumored to have been considered for the position of Secretary of the Interior; however, the President explained to the forester that the appointment was prevented by his New York association. With an eye toward political opportunity in Pennsylvania, Grey Towers became his newly adopted legal residence. In the Fall of 1910, when he was at the point of physical exhaustion from strenuous campaign activities, Pinchot retreated to his family estate. Favorite outdoor sports, such as fishing and hunting, and the rest offered by a quiet life brought about a renewal, as they would again many times. The estate was also a summer retreat for his brother Amos, which added to Gifford’s attraction to the home.

Part of bachelor Pinchot’s courting of Cornelia Bryce apparently took place at Grey Towers while the two enjoyed a day’s fishing together in the Sawkill in June 1913. The following summer, the couple was married, ten days before the death of Gifford’s mother. Although the newlyweds maintained a Washington address, they regularly spent their summers at the inherited estate. Gifford’s longstanding fondness for Grey Towers was complemented by his wife’s interest in making improvements and modernizations to the house’s interior and in landscaping and developing the grounds. Grey Towers soon became the scene of frequent entertaining, and once again, a place to broaden political contacts. In September 1919, a unique reception was held on the estate grounds for all the recently returned soldiers of Pike County.\textsuperscript{35} This post-war celebration, in which a borrowed airplane and tank were used as props, served as an occasion for the Pinchots to practice some politicking while establishing rapport with the locals. In the late 1920s and early 1930s, a summer picnic for neighboring county residents became an annual event at Grey Towers; it incited such activities as dancing, baseball, and swimming, in addition to cake and ice cream eating. Sometimes as many as 4000 guests were attracted by the Pinchot’s open invitation.
Cornelia Pinchot was particularly interested in fostering her public relations in the Milford area, since it was her home district in her repeated bids for a Congressional seat. She was an active member of the local school board for many years and established an experimental school for children at Grey Towers. Both Pinchots took an interest in community welfare. Gifford, Amos and Nettie donated their paternal grandfather's house on Broad and Harford Streets to Pike County to house the library and historical society, a purpose it had already been serving courtesy of James Pinchot. The couple's participation in Milford's August 1945 celebration of Japan's surrender, when he spent his childhood there, while his biographer McCready has erroneously concluded that he spent his early life at Gramercy Park. As will be pointed out further on, the Pinchot family did not reside at Gramercy Park until 1887.

During the years 1923-1927 and 1931-1935 when Pinchot was governor, the couple's primary residence was necessarily at the state capital, Harrisburg. For certain years, such as 1918-1919, 1922, and 1936, the Pinchots also resided in Philadelphia for the later years of his life that the family estate became more remembered as an example of their friendliness with the townspeople.
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ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY OF GREY TOWERS

CONSTRUCTION OF GREY TOWERS

The Client and the Architect

Following his retirement from business in 1875, James W. Pinchot was enabled to devote more time to pursuing his interests. As an avid art collector, he was considered one of New York’s foremost patrons of fine arts and later became one of the first subscribers to the Metropolitan Museum of Art fund. Although he remained a resident of New York City, he began to take an increasing interest in family affairs in Milford. His father, C.C.D. Pinchot, had died in 1873, leaving large land holdings, farming and lumbering to be managed by his three surviving sons. After having lived in Amos Richard Eno’s household for about ten years, James Pinchot moved his family to two successive residences in the city, although they proved to be of short-term duration and therefore were not permanent homes.

In 1884, a financial scandal involving Amos’ son, John C. Eno, then President of the Second National Bank, caused a great crisis that was to have its effect on all members of the family. Through John’s misuse of funds for private speculation, the institution was in danger of bankruptcy. In the panic that ensued, Amos R. Eno lost three or four million dollars when he personally absorbed all demands on the bank. As a consequence, family relations were strained; James Pinchot wrote to his wife that due to the “unfortunate . . . distressing influence” of the Eno house at Twenty-seventh Street and Fifth Avenue, he would never be willing to go back there to live. All of these circumstances together prompted Gifford’s father to start planning for his own house in his old hometown. Grey Towers’ construction proved to be one of his most devoted interests in the mid-1880s.

The man chosen to design Pinchot’s new home was Richard Morris Hunt, one of America’s foremost architects and a close family friend. Their personal relationship had apparently been established for many years before their client/architect relationship. They may have come to know one another through their wives or through mutual associates such as William T. Sherman or Frederick Law Olmsted. The Pinchots’ daughter Nettie was best of friends with the Hunts’ daughter Katherine (Kittie), and during the winter of 1884/1885, Nettie lived with the Hunts at their home in Newport and attended school there. In March 1885, Gifford Pinchot became engaged to Miss Hunt, and the Pinchot family was delighted with the prospects for marriage (which never materialized). When Mrs. Pinchot and Nettie traveled in Europe while the new house was under construction, they visited the Hunts in Paris in November 1885, and during the following spring. They also delayed their return home so that they could sail with the Hunts. All of these social contacts demonstrate the close, personal ties that existed between the two families during the mid-1880s. In addition, the two men worked together pursuing their mutual interests in the New York art and architectural scene.

Pinchot and Hunt may have met one another for the first time at the famous West Tenth Street Studio Building, which Hunt had designed in 1856 as the first building built expressly for studio and art exhibition purposes. In addition to the architectural studio that Hunt maintained, there were many well-known artists whom James Pinchot is known to have patronized, including Sanford R. Gifford (the namesake of Pinchot’s first-born son), E. L. Henry, Eastman Johnson, and Jervis McEntee. It was the center of New York’s art world during the 1860s and 1870s and the unofficial headquarters of the National Academy of Design, of which Pinchot was a member.

While it is not definitely known how the two men became acquainted, it would have been natural for their common interest in art collecting and their frequenting of the same building to have brought them together.

In 1877, Pinchot, a member of the Century Club, was chosen to serve on the executive committee appointed to superintend the erection of “Liberty Enlightening the World”, better known as the Statue of Liberty, by the French sculptor, Frédéric Auguste Bartholdi. He worked on procuring the legislation necessary for providing a site and maintaining the statue and was a part of the campaign to raise funds for the pedestal. For his efforts, he, along with the other seven members of the committee, was rewarded with an inscription on a bronze memorial tablet at the site. The architect chosen to design the pedestal for the colossal statue was Richard Morris Hunt. He and Pinchot may have formed their acquaintance with their joint work on this project. It is more probable that they were already well acquainted, in which case Pinchot may have been instrumental in Hunt’s selection. In August 1886, after the completion of two years’ work on the pedestal, the architect wrote to Pinchot and asked him, as a personal friend, to use his influence with the committee to resolve the thousand dollar unpaid balance due him. Based upon their family ties and working relationship, it would have been surprising if James Pinchot’s first choice for the architect of his new home was anyone other than Hunt, who had already established an outstanding reputation in residential architecture.

Construction Chronology

In Mrs. Hunt’s recollection of her husband’s architectural practice in late 1884, she stated: “In addition to other work, he was building Dr. Paxton’s house at Princeton, and it must have been at about this time that he was making plans for Mr. Pinchot’s home, ‘Grey Towers’.” Although her memory of the dates of projects is not always the most reliable source—for example, she was off by two years in her estimate of Grey Towers’ completion—Mrs. Hunt was probably correct about the start of the architect’s plans for the house. In October 1884, Mr. and

Figure 10. Grey Towers from the south shortly after construction, circa 1886. Note the two original porches that were later removed by Gifford and Cornelia Pinchot.
Mrs. James Pinchot went to Milford for a six-day visit, and although no information was noted in Mrs. Pinchot's diary concerning plans for a new house, it is very likely that they chose an appropriate site at this time. The following spring, Gifford's father made several lengthy trips to his home town, undoubtedly to supervise the initiation of construction. By June 6, 1885, the day that Hunt and his family left for an extended trip to Europe, all plans and working drawings must have been completed and the house was probably well underway.11

In mid-September, Gifford and his father were in Milford together for a few days. In referring to this visit in a letter written several months later, Gifford mentioned that, at that time, the walls of the house were completed up to the third floor level.12 In October the entire family (excepting Gifford, who was at Yale), went to Milford, and Mrs. Pinchot made note in her diary of her first view of the new home. During their two week stay, the family enjoyed afternoon visits to the building site, supplemented by drives through the surrounding countryside and hikes to natural sites within the bounds of the estate. (Sawkill Falls and Picnic Rock, two favorite destinations for nearby excursions, remained important attractions for the Pinchots during their successive visits to Grey Towers.)

At the end of October 1885, Mrs. Pinchot and her daughter left for an eight-month sojourn in Europe. The letters exchanged between family members during this separation reveal a good deal of information about the house under construction. At the end of November, Mrs. Pinchot wrote from Paris that she supposed the house was by then ready to be plastered, thereby increasing its chances for occupancy the next summer. In December she expressed the hope that the staircases and railings had been installed, since she worried about her husband's safety.13 Mr. Pinchot was spending a great deal of his time during these months in Milford and wrote periodically that the house was progressing well. From the brief references to the house in all of the above-mentioned diary and letter extracts, it is clear that the majority of construction work was completed during the 1885 building season.

The most detailed letter describing the house's progress, excerpts of which follow, was written by James Pinchot at the end of February 1886.

The house at Milford is getting on very well. The past week I have had the estimates made for building the main stairs and putting on the front door. The first price asked was $1,000. I have found a man now who will take the contract for $500. Stair rail and balusters of mahogany—steps of oak: The hall is to be panelled in oak to the top—with oak cornice. Front door of oak—The plastering is all finished but the first floor—By the time you and Nettie are home in May or Early June the house will be nearly finished—except the last things—14

The person who undertook the contract for the front door and the main stairs was Henry Edwards-Ficken, an English architect who had recently established his own office in New York after several years working as a draftsman for other architectural firms in the city. (A brief discussion of Edwards-Ficken's life and work follows in a separate section.) With Richard Hunt then in Europe, James Pinchot needed the assistance of another professional architect for the completion of the interior. Although the room plan had been established in the drawings supplied by Hunt's office, questions as to the interior finish, such as the main floor paneling, had not been resolved before Hunt's departure.

Expense was obviously a consideration in Pinchot's choice of Edwards-Ficken, since his bid was half as much as the first estimate. In a letter to his wife in January, Pinchot had discussed the state of their separate finances and then concluded, "I will try and finish the hall in a quiet inexpensive way."15 Perhaps some more elaborate plans had been made originally, but financial limitations forced a compromise. The only surviving letter between Edwards-Ficken and his client reveals that the architect was involved with more work on the house than just the front door and stair.16 Enclosed was a tracing of a design that Edwards-Ficken had executed for the columns of the second storey hall, and mention was made of other elements of the interior design, such as details of the first floor hall. The architect stated that "Those columns as I have designed them can be made cheaply," once again emphasizing Pinchot's concern over costs. Apparently Edwards-Ficken was not entirely reliable in his work for Pinchot. In the letter, he apologized for the delay in sending full-size drawings of hinges for the front door and alluded to the fact that there had been many similar delays.

In early July 1886, after Mrs. Pinchot and Nettie's return to the country, the whole family went to Milford.17 Because the new home was not yet complete, they stayed at Fauchères, their usual accommodations while in the village. Many days were spent at the house in preparation for the move; on August 3, for example, Mrs. Pinchot noted that she spent the day helping to paper. Gifford's birthday the following week marked their first meal at Grey Towers, and on August 21, "moved to house" was noted in Mrs. Pinchot's diary. Although many finishing details undoubtedly continued, moving day signalled the new residence's completion.

The following month, James Pinchot's mother died at her home in Milford and his wife became ill. Despite these unfortunate circumstances, moving activities continued: in September the curtains were hung and the candelabra was installed; in October, a piano was moved in and the numerous paintings of Mr. Pinchot's collection were hung; in November, the carpet was installed in the library. On November 13, invitations were sent for an event that would have served as a grand official housewarming for Grey Towers: a breakfast reception for the sculptor of the Statue of Liberty. Unfortunately, Monsieur Bartholdi had sailed for France that same day, due to the illness of his mother, and invitations had to be recalled.

The Pinchots returned to New York in mid-November, where they purchased their Gramercy Park residence the following month. Thus, their yearly pattern of spending only the milder months in Milford and having their family joined them in Europe when the work in progress was at its peak, was maintained. At the end of November, the residence's completion.

Materials and Workmen

An important aspect of the architectural history of Grey Towers is the origin of its construction materials. An October 1924 interview with Henry McCarty, an employee of the Pinchots during the early 1900s whose lands bordered the estate, provides the bulk of information currently known about the provenance of certain materials. In the absence of a building account or a collection of letters and financial papers dealing with the house's construction, Mr. McCarty's recollections form the basis of this section.

The timbers used in the house were purchased by Arthur McCarty; Henry's father, from two rafts of hemlock that were being transported down the Delaware River.18 The roofing slate came from Lafayette, New Jersey, across the river, according to McCarty's memory, though it is possible that they were actually from the slate works at Newton, New Jersey, five miles from Lafayette. In the contractual agreement between James Pinchot and builder E. S. Wolfe for the construction of Forester's Hall in 1904, slate from Newton was specified for the roof.19 Cole's lime kiln "just across the Jersey bridge" supplied the lime used in construction, and McCarty claimed that no cement was used in the mortar. However, a June 1886 letter to James Pinchot from Charles P. Stone, the Chief Engineer for the Statue of Liberty project, indicated that ten barrels of Portland cement were sent to Pinchot as ordered.20 Its intended use was not mentioned, and by this date, the exterior construction of the house was virtually finished. A large amount of the building stone was probably derived from the site. In Pinchot's instructions to his
workmen for the winter of 1888/1889, he directed them to haul stones from the fields for use in building projects he had planned, such as the stone wall along the driveway.22

An important element of the interior decor of the house was its great variety of wallpapers. These undoubtedly were obtained from Warren, Fuller and Lange of New York (the successor firm to Pinchot and Warren’s paper hangings), which advertised imported papers from France, England, Germany and Japan. A surviving bill from this firm indicates that nearly one hundred and fifty rolls of paper were sent to James Pinchot in May 1890.23 It appears that the partnership of John Laun and Joseph Saile of New York was responsible for providing some of the decorative woodwork inside the house. The previously cited letter between the architect Ficken and James Pinchot referred to the fact that the design for the wreaths, which appear in the Hall’s paneling, had been sent to Laun and Saile. These men were variously listed in the directories of the mid-1880s as cabinetmakers, furniture dealers, and decorators.24

Labor for the house’s construction was provided by local Milford residents, many of whom had probably worked for Pinchot in connection with the farming done on the family’s lands. Andrew Armstrong was the contractor for the stone work and the plastering, and all the other laborers and craftsmen worked under his supervision. The Armstrong family had come to Milford from the north of Ireland in the early nineteenth century. Andrew’s father and uncles had also been masons and contractors, and they had built many of the important buildings in the Milford/Port Jervis area, in addition to building projects in New York City.25 Alex Rivere, Jake Wacker, and Morris Steele assisted Armstrong with the masonry work. Cornelius Quick did all of the stone cutting for Grey Towers’ buildings, and Gilly Williams, who lived on the adjoining farm, drew the stone to the construction site. Other teamsters were George Gregory and William Drake. Carpentry work was done by “old man Burse,” with the assistance of another Milford resident, Frank P. Dewitt, who is known to have made the window frames.26 Obviously many more men worked on the construction of Grey Towers than those above who were mentioned in McCarty’s recollections; the house could not have been completed in such a short period of time without additional labor. It also must be assumed that James Pinchot, through his frequent trips to Milford, played a large role in the on-site supervision of the construction.

Sources for Grey Towers’ Design

James Pinchot’s French heritage is clearly expressed in the choice of a design for his new home. A second generation American (his father had immigrated at age nineteen), Pinchot had traveled extensively in France, spoke the language fluently, and was a decided Francophile in his cultural interests. An obituary later written by the Century Club, which Pinchot belonged to for forty-five years, began with the statement that he “signally exhibited the finest qualities of the Gallic American.”27 As a demonstration of his admiration for French culture, Pinchot chose to turn to examples of French architecture for Grey Towers’ inspiration.
In a letter from Gifford to his mother in Europe in December, 1885, he described the Christmas activities at home and wrote: 

“To Papa we gave a home made chateau with three towers & a draw-bridge & a french flag on top.”

This gift, which must have greatly pleased Gifford’s father, underscores its owner’s conception of the new house as a representation of a medieval chateau. Although Grey Towers has frequently been called an example of sixteenth century French Renaissance architecture, its stylistic origins do not belong to this period but rather an earlier one. In its form, exterior appearance, and massing, the building is more reminiscent of feudal tradition. Although it is highly unlikely that any single French chateau served as a model for Grey Towers’ exterior design, James Pinchot may have been familiar with certain historic sites which contributed to his conception of what a “modern” chateau should look like. Breteuil-sur-Noye, the small town of the Pinchot family’s origin, had a chateau that was an important fortification and royal retreat during the Middle Ages. It was unsuccessfully besieged a number of times by the English during the Hundred Years War, notably in 1336 and 1386, but was demolished in the 1430s and finally abandoned as a fortification. Perhaps James Pinchot had heard family stories or traditions about Chateau de Breteuil which added to his romantic notions about Old World history. His exposure to the historic monuments of France through his travels would have been a more probable source of inspiration; however, little is currently known about the places he visited in the 1870s and 1880s.

Pinchot’s choice of an architect was based primarily on a familiar relationship gained through social and business contacts; however, Richard Morris Hunt’s French training and associations must have further endeared the architect in the client’s eye. Hunt was responsible for translating Pinchot’s ideas into an architectural expression, and he therefore contributed the largest share to the building’s design. As the first American architect to have received an education at the renowned Ecole des Beaux-Arts, Hunt had had ten years experience working in Parisian studios and had received a most thorough professional preparation. His wide travels, his extensive library of French architectural books, and his interest in various historical styles all made him one of the country’s most knowledgeable experts on French architecture. At the time of Grey Towers’ construction, Hunt was an honorary and corresponding member of the Academie des Beaux-Arts, a Chevalier of the Legion of Honor, and a member of the Société Centrale des Architectes Français.

It is important to understand that Grey Towers is a late nine­teenth century version of chateau and as such is a pastiche. Hunt was remarkably adept in his eclecticism and at times combined styles with liberty. The stylistic choices in his design for Grey Towers appears to correspond most closely with those chateaux of the late fifteenth century that represented a transition between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance of Francois I. The house’s squat, round towers with conical roofs and its compact plan are characteristic of the late medieval trend, as exemplified by the Chateau de Sully, built in the fourteenth century. The end of the Hundred Years War had marked a new era in France, and the introduction of the cannon had outmoded many structures’ defenses. During the fifteenth century, an evolution from military fortress to residence took place. Although greater comfort in the interior was expressed on the exterior by such elements as dormers and larger windows, certain elements of fortification carried over as an expression of prestige. For example, the Chateau de Chaumont, reconstructed from a tenth century chateau during the later part of the fifteenth century, retains the allure of a military fortress although it was built as a residence. Its round, corner towers served no defensive purpose and its machicolations were merely decorative—the exterior tradition survived while the interior function changed. At Chaumont, the main, arched entranceway was defensively framed by the two massive, flanking towers. The late fifteenth century Chateau d’Ussé is reminiscent of the military architecture of the reign of Louis XI; its exterior facade and design present a feudal aspect, although its interior, with its comfortable apartments, exhibits the transition to the Renaissance. Plessis-Bourée, built between 1468 and 1473, is another example of the chateau in transition between medieval fortress and residence. Grey Towers bears some resemblance to, or shares common elements with, all of the above-named French chateaux of the Loire region. While the Pinchot home was not intended to be a replica of any one of them, it appears that its predominant stylistic characteristics were borrowed from a generalized concept of the fifteenth century French chateau.

Francois I (1515-1547) is usually credited with introducing the classical forms of the Italian Renaissance to France. The first half of the sixteenth century, one of the most active periods of French architecture, produced such well-known, grand chateaux of the Loire Valley as Blois, Chambord, Amboise, Azay-le-Rideau and Chenonceau. Because of stylistic carry-overs from the fifteenth century (round towers with conical roofs being the major one), Grey Towers bears some relation to the buildings of this era. However, many hallmarks of French Renaissance style (sometimes labeled “Chateauesque”) are missing in Hunt’s design of the Milford residence. Sixteenth century chateaux exhibited a varied composition of many steeply pitched, high roofs; tall chimneys elaborately detailed; turrets, or tourelles, that corbel out from the structure from above the ground storey; and a picturesque mixture of Gothic and Renaissance decorative forms such as the arc-en-panier, the sprocket, stone tracery and so on. In 1879, Hunt had demonstrated his knowledge of the style with his design for the William K. Vanderbilt residence on Fifth Avenue in New York. This house, which has been considered one of his most successful residences, established Hunt as the leader of the revival of the French Renaissance style, of which Biltmore House (1890-1895) represented the culmination. The year that Grey Towers’ plans were being drawn, Hunt had built the Borden House on Lake Shore Drive in Chicago, which was another demonstration of the style. Ochre Court (1885-1889), the Newport residence of Ogden Goelet, is also a contemporary example of French Renaissance design. Therefore, although the architect was in the midst of his development of the sixteenth century chateau, Grey Towers, with its medieval associations, stood apart from it.

It is interesting that Pinchot’s house was not given a name that reflected its French inspiration. A February, 1886 letter from Mrs. Pinchot in Florence to her husband reveals some deliberation over the proper appellation for the new home. We don’t seem to find an appropriate name for our house. “The Towers” or “Saw-kill Towers” seem the best we think of so far—I am going to see if I can find any trace of the name Pincio in Italy when Mr. B. G. comes & perhaps a suggestion may come then.

If Mrs. Pinchot had discovered that one of the seven hills of Rome was called “Pincio,” there’s a possibility that the house would have taken on an Italian name. She may have referred back to her diary of October 1885, when, during her visit to the site, she repeatedly noted the “exquisite view under soft grey light.” The name “Grey Towers” probably was chosen for its reference to the predominant, architectural characteristic of the building. It has the decided connotation of an English manor. The architect Edwards-Ficken tried to please his client with two designs for columns of the second floor hallway. He noted his preference, because of its “being quaintier and having more of an old country-house air.” The English architect was clearly striving for a picturesque interior that resembled those of the estate houses of his own country. The combined romantic notions of Mr. and Mrs. Pinchot and their two architects produced rather heterogeneous results, all of which, however, were in the mainstream of the late nineteenth century.
Richard Morris Hunt

Much biographic information on Richard Morris Hunt has been revealed in previous sections of this report that deal with the construction history of Grey Towers. In evaluating the cultural significance of the house, however, a brief account of the life and works of this man, who has been called “one of the fathers of American architecture,” 34 is in order.

He was born in Brattleboro, Vermont, on October 31, 1827, and received his secondary education in Boston. Upon his graduation from high school, he accompanied his parents on an extended trip to Europe and soon realized his vocation. By October 1846, he had begun his preparations for entrance into the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris by working in the atelier of Hector Martin Lefuel, who was appointed chief architect to the Louvre in 1854. Hunt studied at the Ecole for eight years thereafter, during which time he traveled widely in Europe and the Middle East. In April 1854, he became an inspector at the Louvre under his mentor, and in this position, he designed the Pavillon de la Bibliotheque, a most important and sophisticated work for the new graduate. The significance of this European training cannot be underestimated, as the American architectural critic, Montgomery Schuyler, pointed out in the following excerpt:

This professional preparation would even now (1895) be unusually long and thorough, and was still more unusual then, when there was scarcely an architect in the United States who had served a regular apprenticeship to his calling. 35

Hunt returned to the United States in 1855 and soon established a successful architectural career in New York. (Although he spent much of the 1860s again in Europe and traveled there repeatedly in later years, his practice was limited to his native country.) One of his first important jobs came in March 1856, when he became the assistant of architect Thomas U. Walter, who was in charge of the extension of the Capitol in Washington. A few years later, while running a busy architectural office in his newly completed West Tenth Street Studio Building, Hunt accepted a number of aspiring, young architects who wanted an atelier-style education in their profession. Among the students who benefitted from Hunt’s influential training and extensive library of foreign, architectural books were Henry Van Brunt, George B. Post, Charles Gambrill, William B. Ware, and Frank Furness, all of whom went on to distinguished careers as architects of the late nineteenth century. At a time when no formal architectural schools existed in this country, Hunt’s generous, paternalistic attitude and his invaluable teaching did much to foster the architectural profession in America. He was also one of the founders of the American Institute of Architects and served as its president for a number of years.

A list of many of the buildings that Hunt designed follows this text; while it is not a complete compilation of every known work with which the architect was involved, it is a representation of a prolific career that spanned four decades. Among the highlights of his early works were two “firsts,” both located in New York City: the 1873 Tribune Building, the first “elevator building” and the prototype of the skyscraper, and The Stuyvesant, called the first apartment house, which was also equipped with an elevator. Hunt undertook a number of commercial buildings, the Guernsey building of lower Broadway being one of his most successful, and designed some cast-iron building facades. His Lenox Library was called “the most monumental public building in New York —certainly one of architect ornaments and architectural possessions of the city.” 36 In comparison with many other architects of his era, Hunt did very little ecclesiastical work, perhaps because of his persistance in avoiding Gothic architecture.

It was in domestic architecture that Hunt was acknowledged to have excelled, and his reputation was established in his early residences at Newport, Rhode Island. At this popular summer resort, the architect’s “cottages” helped to gain him the patronage of the wealthy. In 1879, his many social contacts through club memberships and his genial personality also contributed to his success at obtaining commissions. His house for William K. Vanderbilt on Fifth Avenue in New York marked a most successful new departure. Its representation of the French Renaissance style of the sixteenth century appealed to many of his opulent clients. In a number of homes undertaken for them following 1880, there were no monetary constraints to limit the execution of Hunt’s exuberant designs. Included in this category were the New York City residences of Elbridge T. Gerry, John Jacob Astor, and Henry G. Marquand; the Newport “palaces” of Ogden Goelet (Ochre Court), Oliver Belmont (Belcourt), Mrs. W. K. Vanderbilt (Marble House), and Cornelius Vanderbilt II (The Breakers); and the Asheville, North Carolina, chateau of George W. Vanderbilt (Biltmore). The Breakers has been considered the height of Hunt’s rendition of the Italian Renaissance palazzo, while Biltmore was the most extravagant of his creations for the wealthy, as well as the peak of his French Renaissance style. It is with these residences, undertaken in the last fifteen years of his life, that the architect is perhaps best remembered today. The acknowledged excellence of these buildings stems as much from their craftsmanship, opulence of materials, and scale as from their demonstration of the successful development of historic, architectural styles.

During his own lifetime, the work by which the architect was most popularly known was the Administration Building of the Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893. The white, classical palace occupied the Fair’s most prominent site and was a great success among the fairgoers. Critic Schuyler, who was quite enamored with the buildings of the Exposition, referred to it as “... not only the crowning achievement of its architect, but one of the chief triumphs of modern academic architecture.” 37 The public building for which Hunt is best known today would probably be the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. He designed the central portion of the Fifth Avenue facade of this building shortly before his death, although it was not begun until 1900. Following Hunt’s death in July 1895, his two sons, Richard Howland Hunt and Joseph H. Hunt, carried on many projects for their father’s clients. In 1901, the successor firm of

Figure 12. A photograph of Richard Morris Hunt, designer of Grey Towers, which was published in an article on the architect that appeared in an 1895 issue of The Architectural Record.
Hunt and Hunt was formally established. (Two of their better known works were "The Marble Twins," the Fifth Avenue houses of Amos Pinchot.)

Despite Hunt’s acknowledged contributions to the elevation of the architectural profession and despite his many successful designs, his reputation as an architect has suffered many vicissitudes during the twentieth century. He has been criticized for his dependence upon historical styles and for his narrow eclecticism, which consequently resulted in a lack of inventiveness and originality. His Beaux-Arts training supposedly repressed his individuality and prevented him from finding solutions to specifically American problems. These judgments have been placed on many other architects of the nineteenth century whose works were derivative of historical styles. In some instances, these thoughts reflect a lack of understanding of the cultural history of the era. Hunt’s reliance upon a patronage of the wealthy has also been criticized as the major factor in the success of his architectural practice. Because no major work has yet been published on Hunt and his works, it is difficult to evaluate objectively his contributions to the progress of American architecture. It is interesting to note, however, that at the time of the architect’s death, he had attained the apogee of his respect and acclaim. In a memorial address to the American Institute of Architects, architect Van Brunt claimed that R. M. Hunt and his brother, the artist William Morris Hunt, were “recognized by the civilized world as the most conspicuous and imposing forces in the development of our national art.”

Grey Towers is one of the least known of Hunt’s works. Much of this factor is due to the house’s location, since Milford has been comparatively removed from the New York sphere of influence. It had been built in a fashionable resort or a better known summer home locale, such as Newport or a Long Island resort, it undoubtedly would have received a greater measure of attention. The house was not published in the architectural journals of the day, nor has it been included in the studies of Hunt’s works that currently exist. In evaluating Grey Towers’ role in Hunt’s career, it is important to underscore the close family ties between the Hunts and the Pinchots. Although James Pinchot was a wealthy man, his resources by no means matched that of other Hunt clients of the 1880s, such as the Astors or the Vanderbilts. Hunt’s decision to design Grey Towers probably was based largely upon the favor of friendship. In November 1885, when Mary Pinchot was in Paris visiting the Hunts, she wrote to her husband:

Mr. Hunt asked a great deal about the house & was pleased with my account—wished to be remembered to you—says he enjoys thinking of how you enjoy building it—

Apparently, the architect took a strong, personal interest in the house, which was then under construction. This is reinforced by the fact that only two months after his return to the United States the following year, he went to Grey Towers for a three day visit. The Pinchots had just moved into their new house, and the architect clearly was anxious to see the realization of his design.

Although Grey Towers was not of the same calibre as some of Hunt’s best known residences of his later period, it does have an interesting place in the sequence of his domestic architecture. It was his only example of a home based on the medieval stylistic elements of the fifteenth century French chateau. James Pinchot’s conception of his house probably had the most to do with the architect’s choice of this style. A chateau-like house built in 1884-1885 by the prominent architectural firm, McKim, Mead and White, may have influenced Hunt’s design to some extent. The Mamoroneck, New York, home of Charles J. Osborn exhibits squat, stone towers with conical candle-snuffer style roofs. The towers predominate the design and bear a strong resemblance to those of Grey Towers. Another residence by Hunt, “Indian Spring” on Ocean Drive in Newport, appears to have been based on his design for James Pinchot’s house. Originally designed for William E. Dorsheimer, Indian Spring was completed in 1891, according to its original plans, by J. R. Busk. The seaside facade of the Newport house displays a striking similarity to the east elevation of Grey Towers. Between two stone towers, nearly identical to those of Grey Towers, stretches a long, five bay verandah. The porch supports, the French doors that open on to the verandah, and the staggered quoin detailing around the windows are all elements in common with the Milford residence. Because of the way the roof sweeps down to the first storey to cover the porch, the design for Indian Springs’ facade is more successful than that of Grey Towers’ east elevation. This would tend to suggest that the design for the Newport house was developed from the earlier design for Pinchot’s home. The Busk house has received its share of praise by architectural critics of both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, yet Grey Towers, which also merits attention for its place in American architectural history, remains in obscurity. The words of Catherine H. Hunt, who was familiar with nearly all of her husband’s works, as well as with many of the prominent buildings of her time, should be remembered: “The house has a character about it quite unlike anything in America.”

Figure 13. The design of “Indian Spring,” the Newport, Rhode Island residence of J.R. Busk, owes a large debt to Hunt’s earlier design for Grey Towers. This seaside facade bears a strong resemblance to the east elevation of the Milford residence. This photograph was published in: Montgomery Schuyler, “The Works of the Late Richard M. Hunt,” The Architectural Record (October-December 1893), 5:128.

PARTIAL LIST OF WORKS BY RICHARD M. HUNT

Pavillon de la Bibliotheque, Paris, France, 1854
Rossiter House, New York, NY, 1855
West Tenth Street Studio Building, New York, NY 1856
Travers Cottage, Newport, RI
Entrance Gates to Central Park, New York, NY, 1860
John Griswold Residence, Newport, RI, 1863-64
Stuyvesant Apartment House, New York, NY, 1869
Divinity School, Yale University, New Haven, CT
Tribune Building, New York, NY, 1873
Presbyterian Hospital, Administrative Building, New York, NY
Guernsey Building, New York, NY
Coal and Iron Exchange Building, New York, NY
Delaware and Hudson Canal Co. Bldg., New York, NY
Victoria Hotel, New York, NY
Col. Waring Cottage, Newport, RI, 1870-1871
Hypoteneuse, Newport, RI, 1870
Chateau-Sur-Mer (renovation) Newport, RI 1870-1874
Travers Block, Newport, RI, 1870-1871
Howland Library, Beacon, NY 1871
Marquand House, Newport, RI, 1872
Dr. Williams Residence, Boston, MA
Martin Brimmer Residence, Boston, MA, 1875
Lenox Library, New York, NY, 1875
Figure 14. Richard Morris Hunt's original drawing of the basement plan for Grey Towers.

Henry Edwards-Ficken

Because Henry Edwards-Ficken had a large share in the design of Grey Towers’ interiors, a discussion of his life and works is in order. Born in London and educated at the Greenock Academy in Scotland, Edwards-Ficken studied art in Europe before emigrating to the United States in 1869. He was first listed in the New York City directory for the years 1876-1877 as an artist (at his home address) and as an architect at 54 William Street, the office of the well-known architectural partnership of William Appleton Potter and Robert Robertson. While he was working as a draftsman for Potter and Robertson, many of his drawings were published in American Architect and Building News, the country’s first professional, architectural journal. In an article on late nineteenth century perspective drawing, an architectural historian had the following praise for the six drawings by Ficken that were published in 1876:

the rejection of mechanistic style, the freehand passages, the selective rendering of light and dark, and the slight projection of an overall impression of the building, which is more than just the simple catalogue of architectural details, place Ficken among the best perspective delineators working in the country in 1876.

The following year, Edwards-Ficken, at that time a junior member of the New York chapter of the American Institute of Architects, was awarded first prize for a library design done while working in the Potter and Robertson office. This award would indicate that he was involved in the actual design process, rather than being a mere delineator or “architect’s artist.”

In 1878, Edwards-Ficken began work in the office of Charles Smith at 57 Broadway. By 1883, he had established himself in his own office at 19 West Twenty-second Street, which he maintained through the late 1890s. At the time of his work for James Pinchot, at least two other men were working in his office, as is indicated by the one surviving letter between architect and client. Among the projects to his credit before his work on Grey

Scroll and Key Club, Yale University, New Haven, CT
Marquand Chapel, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ
St. Mark’s Church, Islip, NY
Fogg Museum, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA
National Observatory, Washington, DC
William K. Vanderbilt House, New York, NY, 1879
Marshall Field Residence, Chicago, IL
Prof. Shields Residence, Newport, RI, 1883
Borden Residence, Chicago, IL, 1884
Statue of Liberty Pedestal, New York, NY, 1884-1886
Dr. Paxton Residence, Princeton, NJ, 1884
Grey Towers, Milford, PA, 1885-1886
Indian Spring, Newport, RI, 1887-1891
Ochre Court, Newport, RI, 1888-1891
Marble House, Newport, RI, 1888-1892
E.T. Gerry Residence, New York, NY, 1891
Henry G. Marquand Residence, New York, NY
Archibald Rogers Residence, Hyde Park, NY, 1893
Belcourt, Newport, RI, 1892
The Breakers, Newport, RI, 1892-1895
John Jacob Astor Residence, New York, NY, 1893
Ogden Mills Residence, New York, NY
Bronson Residence, New York, NY
W. K. Vanderbilt Residence, Oakdale, NY
Levi P. Morton Residence, Rhinecliff, NY
Clark Hall, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH
Virginia and Academic Halls, Hampton Institute, Hampton, VA
Biltmore House, Asheville, NC, 1890-1895
Administration Bldg., Columbian Exposition, Chicago, IL 1893
Metropolitan Museum of Art (central facade) NY, NY 1900-1902
Towers, all of which were published in American Architect and Building News, were: Ferry Houses of the Hoboken Land and Improvement Company on the Hudson River (1882); Seabright Stores in the ocean resort of Seabright, New Jersey (1883); and Shops of the Hoboken Land and Improvement Company in that city (1885).

In 1885, he was involved in a legal suit against the New York Athletic Club over their default in his fees. Edwards-Ficken had been chosen as the architect for the design of the club's new headquarters at Fifty-fifth Street and Fifth Avenue, largely through his special qualifications as a gymnast and athlete. (In 1876, 1877 and 1878, he was a champion in the running high jump and the hurdle race.) After having worked months on design study and working plans, he was dismissed from the job for allegedly having delayed too long, and Charles Clinton continued the project. Eventually the suit, which received wide publicity, was decided in his favor, without appeal. Of special note in the publication of his drawings for the project is the rendering of the elaborately paneled main entrance hall. Certain elements of the design, such as the stairway with its archway, bear a strong resemblance to Grey Towers' first floor hall. If the architect reused some of his design studies on the Athletic Club for the interior of Pinchot's home, it might explain why his fees were only half of the owner's first estimate on the job.

In later years, Edwards-Ficken designed a variety of residential, commercial, and institutional buildings, including a lodge at C.F. Robert's estate in Oakdale, Long Island; the Ferguson Memorial Building in Stamford, Connecticut, and the Birmingham, Connecticut, town hall. One of his best known works was his Stone Trust Association Building in New Haven, of which "the cloister" and chapel served as the dormitory and assembly place of one of Yale's secret societies. This building received wide publication in the architectural journals of its day. From 1913 until his death in 1929, Edwards-Ficken served as the supervising architect and engineer of Woodlawn Cemetery in the Bronx, one of the country's foremost, landscaped "rural" cemeteries.

### ALTERATION TO THE HOUSE

#### Initial Modifications to the Architect's Plans

The original elevations and floor plans that were prepared for Grey Towers, which bear the seal of "Richard M. Hunt, Architect, Tribune Building, New York," survive to the present as a rare record of the pre-construction plans. By comparing these drawings with photographs taken of the building soon after its completion, it is possible to determine James Pinchot's personal modifications to the architect's design. Because Hunt was in Europe during most of the period of the house's construction, the owner was responsible for many of the decisions regarding changes. The photographs also document many of the original features of the house that have been assumed erroneously to be later alterations.

For the most part, Pinchot's changes to Hunt's plans were minor and involved decorative preferences; few alterations were made to the overall design, floor plan, scale, massing, or choice of building material. A few of the changes, most notably those regarding the porches, may have been caused by financial limitations during the late stages of construction. Other changes, such as the simplification of the intended, corbelled chimneys, may reflect the limited experience of the local building craftsmen. One basic change was brought about by the natural limitations imposed by the building site. Because of the bedrock exposed shortly under the grade level, the intention to raise the building on its foundation had to be abandoned. The plans called for flights of six stairs leading to the porches of the south and east elevations; instead, the porches rested on grade, creating the illusion that the building was implanted into the hill rather than set upon it.

The single feature that differed most from Hunt's drawings was the fenestration. The second storey windows were intended to have segmental arches; as built, they were rectangular. The semi-circular arches of the first storey's windows were supposed
Figure 18. Richard Morris Hunt's original drawing of the south elevation for Grey Towers. Compare this drawing to the photograph below showing the house shortly after construction.
The most significant changes to Hunt’s design of Grey Towers occurred on the south and east elevations, where the architect had intended a porch treatment completely different from that actually executed. To shade the first floor terrace areas between the massive towers, Pinchot attached two simple shed roofs (at the level of the second storey’s floor), which were supported by trellis-like decorative iron standards. On the south side, Hunt had designed a two storey porch whose roof was a continuation of the main hipped roof: the second storey portion was partially enclosed in a half-timbered effect, with slate or shingles specified between the vertical and diagonal “timbers,” while the three bays of the first floor of the porch were open. The porch that Hunt had designed for the east side, which was planned to take advantage of the views toward the town and the valley, was only a single storey in height. Like the main entrance porch, it shared the same carved, wooden supports and

to be glazed with three rows of small, square panes; as executed, mullions radiated from the center and were divided by a concentric circle. To accent the windows, Hunt had called for a dressed stone surround of the window arches. This detailing was then further elaborated by the addition of a special, staggered quoin, in which large and small rectangular dressed stones alternate down both sides of the windows. This decorative motif appears to have been a hallmark of Pinchot’s personal style, since it is repeated on many of the buildings that he was later responsible for erecting, both on the estate and in the village of Milford. The addition of a niche into the second storey’s central bay of the east elevation is another example of an architectural detail that Pinchot liked and later re-used. The choices as to the color scheme used and the window shutters installed (two original features now missing) undoubtedly were also made by the owner. The first storey’s paneled shutters, with their quarter moon detailing, and the second storey’s louvered ones were painted a light color, while the windows and dormer faces were painted white.
Figure 22. Richard Morris Hunt’s original drawing of the east elevation for Grey Towers.
central, splayed stairway. While Pinchot retained the same number of porch supports and the same spacing as called for on the drawings, his substitution effected a rather make-shift appearance on such a substantial stone structure. One other change, which skewed the symmetry of the south elevation, involved the main entrance. The door that appeared in the drawing was a double-leaf one with a vertical inset of six lights to each side. Pinchot chose to install a solid, elaborately paneled door, and the interior of the hall was illuminated instead by flanking sidelights.

Unfortunately, no photographs of the interior of Grey Towers during its early occupancy have been found. As has been explained in an earlier section, Henry Edwards-Ficken had a great deal to do with the completion of the interior, since Hunt was then abroad. It must be assumed, however, that Hunt's floor plans were followed in the organization of the rooms and spaces. From references in Mrs. Pinchot's 1880s diaries and letters to rooms such as the library, the billiards room and the hall, it seems logical to conclude that the first floor's internal arrangement, as well as the specific use of the rooms, followed that called for in the original plan.
Figure 26. Room 101 (the Hall), circa 1963. The room appears as it did during the Pinchot occupancy. From the collection of the Pinchot Institute.

Figure 27. Room 101, main stairway to the second floor, circa 1963. The woodwork was designed by Henry Edwards-Ficken. From the collection of the Pinchot Institute.
Cornelia Bryce Pinchot’s Renovations

In August, 1914, Gifford Pinchot and Cornelia Bryce were married. Although the couple maintained a home in Washington and, for certain years, an apartment in Philadelphia, Grey Towers was their regular summer residence. As Mr. Pinchot became increasingly involved in Pennsylvania politics, Mrs. Pinchot took a more active interest in transforming the 1880s house that the couple had inherited into a “modern” home, well-suited to their active life style and prodigious entertaining.

A reporter for the Saturday Evening Post, who was preparing an article on Mrs. Pinchot during Gifford’s first campaign for the governorship, observed the domestic scene at Grey Towers during a two day visit in August, 1922. She summed up the hectic activity, the many guests, and the entertaining at every meal by declaring: “It was a sort of political boarding house.” This same reporter encouraged Gifford Pinchot to discuss his wife’s alterations to the house, and the following excerpt then published was in response to the reporter’s compliments regarding the dining room in which they were then seated.

“It was all her idea,” said Mr. Pinchot, nodding down at his wife. “Originally this house was composed of many little cramped rooms, and the first thing my wife did was to break down the partition walls and let in light and air. In this particular room—originally two—the architects said she couldn’t do it, for it involved removing partitions, beams and a central fireplace. But she did. And, of course, it’s a vast improvement. She’s revised and edited and altered this house practically beyond recognition.”

“No,” he shook his head humorously, “she has permitted them to stand. But she will never have done. As soon as one thing is finished, and I think we’ll have peace, she breaks out in a fresh spot, and the hammering and revising begin anew.”

From the above, it appears that the majority of changes to the house itself occurred during the first ten years of the couple’s residency at Grey Towers. The most significant alterations were made to the first floor plan. The original dining room and library indicated in Hunt’s plan were combined to form an enlarged dining room, while the former billiard room and salon were joined to create the large library. The extension of the dining room necessitated the destruction of a central fireplace wall that had served to separate the two small rooms. The subsequent removal of the fireplace to the north wall was probably accompanied by the change in the fenestration of that wall. The enlargement of the library brought about the removal of the wall with sliding doors between the two original small rooms, the removal of the salon’s fireplace, the covering of two doors to the hall, and the eastward shift of the window in the south wall. Mrs. Pinchot’s desire to “let in light and air” and eliminate “many little cramped rooms” greatly altered the late nineteenth century character of the first floor interior. Many modernizations were effected throughout the house, such as the addition of closets, the insertion and closing off of doors to improve patterns of circulation, and the installation of many conveniences, such as additional bathrooms. However, the major structural changes were made in conjunction with the creation of the large spaces on the first floor.

Cornelia Pinchot’s interest in interior decoration found an outlet in her renovation of Grey Towers. The enlarged dining room was one example of the direction of her design talents. Coincident with the change in plan, the newly created room was totally redecorated in a very personal style. The following
complimentary remarks were printed in the Post reporter’s article on Mrs. Pinchot.

I admired the noble proportions of the room in which we were dining, a fine spacious apartment paneled with huge old Dutch pictures, chiefly marines yellowed with age, the walls further embellished by various stuffed finny denizens of the deep very cunningly mounted on plaques painted to represent translucent sea waves, so that the fish, though dead as Pharaoh, seemed alive and floating in their own native element in a kind of dreamy immortality.53

The mural-like painting of a naval battle along the south wall of the room was supposedly brought from Holland by Mrs. Pinchot, who personally transported it in her shipboard stateroom on a voyage home from Europe. She also was said to be responsible for the design and execution of the marbelized, walnut woodwork and the scrolled overmantel in that room. All of this redecoration was completed before 1922, however, and not following the Pinchot’s South Seas journey in 1929.54

Many of the doors of Grey Towers’ first floor rooms date to around 1830 and are typical of the Greek Revival style of architecture. This interesting fact has led to speculation as to whether or not Mrs. Pinchot installed the doors as a reflection of her taste in early Americana. In 1937, a fire destroyed the old carriage house, which was then being used as a garage and storage area, with a caretaker’s apartment above. An inventory of the articles consumed in the blaze included “one door from Old House in New York bought a few years ago by Mrs. Pinchot” and “doors, stairs, rails and banisters stored in the back room.”56 It is possible that Mrs. Pinchot collected old architectural elements, in the same manner as she collected antiques, with a view of reusing them at Grey Towers. However, it is also possible that James Pinchot was responsible for reusing the 1830s doors from an earlier house, at the time the house was originally constructed.
Figure 30. Room 105 (the Library), circa 1963. From the collection of the Pinchot Institute.

Figure 31. Room 201 (Second Floor Hall), looking toward Gifford Pinchot’s Bedroom Suite, circa 1963. From the collection of the Pinchot Institute.
Figure 32. Room 204 (Gifford Pinchot's Bedroom), circa 1963. Note the small oval framed photograph above the bed. It is included in this report as figure 3. From the collection of the Pinchot Institute.

Figure 33. Room 218, looking northwest, circa 1963. Note the doorway to the Bathroom (221) that is now walled over. From the collection of the Pinchot Institute.

Figure 34. Room 301 (Third Floor Hall), circa 1963. The stairway rises to the attic. From the collection of the Pinchot Institute.
Figure 35. Room 204 (Gifford Pinchot's Bedroom), circa 1963. Note the wallpaper and Federal-style mantel. From the collection of the Pinchot Institute.

Figure 36. Room 304, looking north, circa 1963. Note the bookcases that match the woodwork of the Library (105). From the collection of the Pinchot Institute.

Figure 37. Room 308-309, a bedroom, circa 1963. This room is now a bathroom. From the collection of the Pinchot Institute.
Conservation Institute Changes, 1963-64

Following the death of Cornelia Pinchot in September 1960, her son, Dr. Gifford B. Pinchot, and his wife, Sarah, became the surviving trustees of Gifford Pinchot's 1940 deed of trust. In May 1963, through a complicated process involving the Conservation Foundation, they donated the Grey Towers estate to the United States government, the Secretary of Agriculture being the grantee. Also included as a grantor in this transaction was Ruth P. Pinchot, widow of Amos R. E. Pinchot, who was the owner in fee of a one-half undivided interest in a portion of the premises conveyed. The tract of land, comprising 101.77 acres, was “Parcel C” of the 1921 indenture between the two brothers, Gifford and Amos, which was made during the division of their father’s large estate. In transferring the title of the estate to the government, the three Pinchots intended that the property be used for educational purposes in the field of the conservation of natural resources. As such, Grey Towers could be developed as a functional memorial to both Pinchot brothers, who had devoted so much of their lives to forwarding the principles of conservation.

The Conservation Foundation, a non-profit, membership organization incorporated in New York, was the buyer in the transaction, in that it was legally bound to pay the purchase price. However, its notes were cancelled by the Pinchots as a charitable donation. The newly established “Pinchot Institute for Conservation Studies” was operated through the custody of the Forest Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, in co-operation with the Conservation Foundation. It was hoped that Grey Towers would become the site of a national conservation center, which would be instrumental in the stimulation of new ideas in the field. In addition to the residence’s transformation into a conference center that would provide the proper “think tank” atmosphere, plans were made for the eventual development of classroom, laboratory and field work facilities. Significant activities in the first decade of the institution’s existence were to include: conferences on national policies and practices regarding natural resources, seminars on special problems in conservation, courses for educators in the field, and the preparation of publications necessary to disseminate instructional information and conference deliberations. The cooperation of several major universities was sought in the formulation of the educational programs.

To accommodate the proposed new functions, Grey Towers’ buildings were judged to be in need of repair and extensive renovation. The first phase of work provided for the installation of new mechanical systems. The water system and electric distribution system were considered to be obsolete and thus were replaced; the existing heating system was upgraded; the main residence was completely rewired and furnished with all new lighting fixtures; and new plumbing was installed with the
addition of bathroom facilities. Structural and architectural repairs to the main building were relatively minor, considering its age, because of the quality of the original construction and the continuous good maintenance that the building had received throughout the Pinchots’ occupancy. Problems of repair attended to by the Forest Service included the damage to the floor system, which had been caused by termite infestation and moisture problems, and the construction of a foundation drainage system to minimize the basement’s damp condition.

In the residence’s metamorphosis to a conference center with lecture rooms, administrative offices, and overnight accommodations for guests, much of the character of the house as Gifford Pinchot knew it was removed. Certain rooms with obvious, strong associations with the former Chief Forester, such as his office and his bedroom, were retained in their existing state as “museums.” The architectural firm retained to design the renovations that took place in 1963-64, Allen, Rodda, and Hauck of Wilkes-Barre, was directed to “retain present decor” in selected first floor rooms and Pinchot’s second floor tower bedroom. The remaining rooms were to be given no special consideration, other than that the wall finishes were to be suitable for the new purpose for which the room was to be used. This meant that, in an effort to institutionalize the house, a great portion of the historic building fabric was discarded and replaced by modern materials. Decisions regarding the removal of certain elements, such as the mantel pieces of various rooms, apparently were made arbitrarily or without regard to the house’s status as a historic building. One of the rooms that suffered most from this treatment was the dining room. The large painting along the south wall was retained, but Cornelia Pinchot’s unique designs for the remaining wall surfaces were obliterated because they were considered unsuitable for a conference room. The resulting loss of such irretrievable historic fabric has altered the building’s integrity as a historic resource. (More detailed information on Grey Towers’ alterations, throughout the three periods of its occupancy, is contained in the Existing Conditions section of this report.)
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SITE PLAN
THE SITE

THE OUTBUILDINGS

Introduction

James Pinchot owned over a thousand acres of land which comprised the Grey Towers estate. Because of the complexity of the acquisition of the various parcels of land, through inheritance or through his own purchase, a complete title search has been deemed beyond the scope of this preliminary report. Little is known about the history of the occupancy or the use of the land before the mid 1880s, though it is clear that a farm was located in the immediate vicinity of the new house prior to its construction.

In James Pinchot's memorandum of work to be done at Grey Towers, for winter 1888/spring 1889, there are references to "the farm house," the "old stable—fill up the hole where it stood," the "old barn," and the "new road." These indications are interspersed with his instructions regarding site work, planting, and maintenance of the new house. In an early photograph of the west facade of the house taken from the hillside above, a farmhouse and some other frame structures can be seen in the distance to the south. Noted in a 1937 inventory of the buildings of Gifford Pinchot that were then insured were: the Beck Farm dwelling and barn, the Quick Farm dwelling and barn, a framebuilding known as the "Farm House," and various ancillary farm outbuildings such as sheds, milkhouses, chicken houses, etc. It is likely that tenant farmers were then occupying farm structures that pre-dated Grey Towers' construction.

While additional research is necessary to unravel the early history of the site, at this point it is important to realize that the estate was not created anew from previously unoccupied land. The brief summaries of outbuildings that follow focus on those built after 1885 for which historical information could be obtained. The two major outbuildings under consideration in this report, the Bait Box and the Letter Box, both constructed during the 1920s, will be discussed in a subsequent section of this report.
The Stable

Location: Northwest of main residence.

Description: Large, frame barn, L-shaped in plan, gabled roof. Sheathed with weathered, unpainted clapboards.

History: A February, 1886 letter from James Pinchot to his wife reported on the progress of the house's construction and also mentioned:

Willie's plans for the stable are now finished and I shall put them in the hands of the Carpenters at once—Early in the season I hope to have the stable and Gardners house under way to be finished before autumn.3

A reference in the next line to "Willie and Alice" being at the house would seem to indicate that the man responsible for the plans for this building was William Phelps Eno, Mrs. Pinchot's younger brother. Daughter Nettie's concern over the fact that the unfinished stable would inhibit her riding that summer probably prompted her father to complete the building as quickly as possible.

The Carriage House

Location: Southwest of the main residence.

Original Description: Large, two storey structure, masonry construction on first floor, frame on second. Slate, gablet style roof; second storey loggia; characteristic staggered, stone quoins around windows.

History: The original architectural style of the carriage house would indicate that it was built around 1890, when most of the outbuildings constructed by James Pinchot were erected. When the father's estate was divided, the boundary line between Parcel B, which went to Amos, and Parcel C, which went to Gifford, passed directly through the building, thus bisecting it into equal north and south sections.4 In the 1920s, the first floor of Gifford's section of the building was converted into a garage, while the second floor was later made into an apartment for Gifford Pinchot's employee, Morris E. Gregg, and his family. On October 21, 1937, a fire destroyed all frame portions of Gifford's building, leaving only the lower stone walls.5 A fireproof wall that separated the two sections of the building saved Amos' part from destruction. Financial loss was estimated at $50,000, including the four cars within the garage and the entire contents of the apartment. Although the firm of Delano and Aldrich of New York City was retained in connection with the reconstruction of the garage,6 it remained in ruins for many years before its removal by the Forest Service in 1963/64. The building that exists today is a remodeled version of Amos' south section of the old carriage house.
The Gatehouse

Location: At east entrance to property, old Route 6.

Description: One and one-half story stone structure faced with concrete, with slate covered, high hipped roof. Characteristic staggered, stone quoins; seven triangular dormers.

History: According to Henry McCarty's recollection, the building was constructed in 1902 and 1903. This statement is supported by the fact that the July, 1904 contract for Foresters' Hall, on Broad Street in Milford, makes several references to certain specifications, such as roofing details, on the gatehouse. (See note 22.) From this information, it seems logical to infer that E. S. Wolfe was Pinchot's builder for both the gatehouse and Foresters' Hall. It is equally probable that, because of stylistic similarities, the design for the gatehouse came from the office of Hunt and Hunt.

Ice House

Location: To immediate north of main residence, opposite service wing.

Original Description: Small, square, one storey stone structure, built into the bank of a slope, with hipped roof and dormer.

History: The ice house was built in 1886 by David Cole, coincident with the completion of the main house. The building was more than doubled in size by a matching addition to its west side at a later unknown date.

Springhouse

Location: West side of garden wall.

Description: Small, square one storey building with hipped roof and tall, corbelled brick chimney. Very similar to the original ice house.

History: The springhouse was constructed after the stone walls of the square, rose garden were built, presumably circa 1890. In later years, the building was known as the pump house.

The Garden Cottage

Location: Southwest of the main residence, near the southwest corner of the walled garden.

Description: Two storey stone structure, second storey faced with concrete, simulating stucco. Slate, gable roof. Apsidal addition on north end of building. Predominance of French Renaissance style decorative elements, such as second storey tourelle and elaborate pediment of dormer.

History: Included in section on Yale School of Forestry. See note 21.

Squash Court Building

Location: Northwest of main residence, present site of parking lot.

Description: Stone building with frame roof.

History: According to Mrs. Amos Pinchot, the squash court building was constructed in the early 1900s by her husband, but was later converted into a laundry. At the time of the Forest Service's acquisition of the property, the building had been used as a maid's quarters. It was removed sometime during 1963, when its site was used in the construction of a visitors' parking lot.
NINETEENTH-CENTURY LANDSCAPE HISTORY

James Pinchot's obituary mentioned the man's "love of gardening" and stated that in 1875, he had retired from business "to devote the balance of his days to forestry and horticulture." The landscaping of his Grey Towers estate was one of his chief interests in the years during and after the completion of the house.

After young Gifford's visit to the building site in April 1886, he enthusiastically wrote to his mother of the construction progress and mentioned the following concerning the site.

There are already enough trees on the place to take away any feeling of bleakness that might have made itself felt without them. The garden is being made, Papa has had over a hundred trees planted & among other things 200 rose bushes, including twenty varieties. We shall have some of our own vegetables in the summer this first season.

The creation of flower and vegetable gardens was thus one of James Pinchot's first priorities in the early years of his improvements to the site, and "the Gardner's house" was one of the first outbuildings undertaken. The 1888/1889 memo referred to previously includes such horticultural instructions to his workmen as: "plough side hill for grapes," "plant three cherry trees in front of farm house," "examine young apple trees in April," and "haul stones from young orchard." Charles Killilea, who apparently worked as the estate's gardener in 1890, wrote to his employer in April of that year to request certain varieties of seeds and to report on the progress of the rose bushes and "Abrevoiter." He also mentioned that work was about to commence on "the grape vine ground" and the seeding of the lawn.

The following day, Maitland Armstrong wrote to James Pinchot about a proposed trip to the Newburgh, New York, area to look at prospective grape vines. From early photographs of the Garden Cottage [also known as Foresters' Cottage] and of the carriage house, it appears that the grapes were placed on a stepped terrace to the west of these two outbuildings. That same spring of 1890, another orchard was planted on the top of the hill to the west of the house. James Pinchot had traveled from New York to supervise the planting, but was obliged to return due to an unexpected late snowfall. All of these activities are indications of the elder Pinchot's informal attempts to alleviate the barrenness of the land immediately surrounding the house, a condition which is evident from the early photographs taken after the building's completion. Because of Milford's early history as a lumber center, it is probable that much of the site has been subjected to clearcut lumbering, the land then being burned to clear all brush in preparation for farming.

In April, 1893, Pinchot wrote to his old friend, Frederick Law Olmsted, the country's foremost landscape architect, who was renowned for his plans for New York's Central Park, the grounds of the U.S. Capitol, and the Columbian Exposition in Chicago. He invited him to come to Milford for a day that month and stated that he needed "professional advice as to planting and laying out the grounds and roads at my place there." The repeat of this same request in other letters to Olmsted during the next two years would tend to suggest that the landscape architect never found the time to favor his friend with a visit to Grey Towers. However, in 1906, his son, Frederick Law Olmstead, Jr., was involved in the design of a family cemetery plot on the site. Whether or not any other professional landscape architects assisted James Pinchot in his improvement of the grounds remains unknown at this time.

TWENTIETH-CENTURY LANDSCAPE HISTORY

It is likely that almost all the major features of the present landscape setting of Grey Towers postdate 1914, the year Gifford and Cornelia Pinchot were married. Just as the house was remodeled and modernized to suit the younger Pinchot's extremely active political and social lifestyle, so the landscape was extended and rationalized to contemporary standards of taste and comfort. Unfortunately, the scope of research for this preliminary report could not include an investigation of documentary evidence for the various twentieth-century landscape scenes at Grey Towers. However, scanning of account books and bills for the decade between 1918 and 1928 make clear that during their initial years at Grey Towers, Gifford and Cornelia Pinchot spent large sums on landscape development including plant materials, walks, walls, and garden buildings. Existing drawings confirm that this activity continued into the 1930s. It may be speculated that some of the major landscape modifications at Grey Towers were undertaken by the Pinchots as make-work projects for out-of-work Milford residents during the Depression.

A stylized domestic landscape as pretentious as that at Grey Towers may be divided into three very closely related parts: the natural setting of the estate including its aspect, topography, natural vegetative cover, etc.; the park — by which is meant the

Figure 52. In an 1886 letter to his mother, Gifford Pinchot mentioned the two hundred rose bushes that his father had already planted, well before the completion of the house. The foreground of this early photograph gives a good view of the roses of the walled garden. From the Hunt Collection, A.I.A. Library, Washington, D. C.

Figure 53. Grey Towers from the southwest, circa 1910. Note the development of the landscape as compared to that seen in figure 21.
man-made setting of the house including the siting and approach; and the home precinct, which includes landscape features immediately adjacent to and functionally supportive of the main house.

James Pinchot was primarily responsible for the natural setting of the estate. He chose the site, initiated reforestation and began development of the landscape. The park, although begun by James Pinchot, is today probably very different from what he knew. The greater part of the present planting of the park can be attributed to Gifford and Cornelia Pinchot. They, at one time, had a staff of seven gardeners and are known to have planted and moved mature trees. The large masses of single species of trees and the overplanting of trees in the vicinity of the house do not conform to late-nineteenth-century landscape taste. The present drive to the house also would be unlikely in a late-nineteenth-century landscape. The outline of the former, more gentle, approach designed to gradually reveal the house is still visible on the east lawn. The present efficient drive very likely dates from shortly after the introduction of automobile transport to the estate.

However, it is the home precinct that today would be least recognizable to the builder of Grey Towers. This area has been altered, particularly to the north and east of the house. Here Cornelia Pinchot created a series of outdoor landscape spaces that, but for their consistency of materials, might be considered alien to the house. The style of these features is one that developed in England in the late-nineteenth century and became an American rage during the early twentieth century. The style, which developed in reaction to formal gardens (as represented at Grey Towers by the Rose Garden), was characterized by strong architectural forms softened by extensive vegetation including shrubbery, vines and herbaceous material. Definite compartmentalization of outdoor space is a hallmark of this style and is very evident at Grey Towers. The fact that the transition between outdoor spaces is not always successful in the Grey Towers gardens gives rise to the theory that the landscape was planned and executed at different periods and probably by different designers.

Following is a brief summary of the major landscape features added to the home precinct of Grey Towers during the first half of the twentieth century.

THE MOSAIC TERRACE
This outdoor space immediately adjacent to Room 107, the dining room, is undated but stylistically conforms to Cornelia Pinchot’s taste with its marine motifs. It may be contemporary with her enlargement of the dining room before 1922. The tanks for aquatic plants are in keeping with early twentieth-century landscape practices.

THE EAST LAWN
The features on the East Lawn including the informal allee (now partially obscured) and the semi-circular arrangements of yew are again meant to dramatize and draw the eye to and from the prospect of the house. The lawn is probably the result of many years of work, but could not possibly predate the realignment of the entrance drive.

THE AMPHITHEATER
The function of this enormous outdoor space is undoubtedly linked with the political activity of both of the younger Pinchots. It perhaps is an enlargement of an earlier family theater on the same spot.
THE WALK

Leading to the Bait Box from the Letter Box is a double walk divided by a shallow canal. The walk is now planted with yew. However, it is likely that it was once lined on the west side with a herbaceous border. The massive retaining wall of the swimming pool was probably also screened with plant materials. The design of the walk is probably contemporary with the Bait Box.

THE SWIMMING POOL

This raised pool is enclosed on three sides by a pergola of stone piers and wooden trellis work. On the west side is a gazebo or summer house. The pool area repeats the materials of other features in the area, though its design is much more linear. For safety reasons, the pool itself has been filled in. Its construction date is not yet established.

THE FINGER BOWL

This unique outdoor dining table is in the form of raised pool surrounded by a flat ledge of sufficient width to accommodate a place setting. Chairs were pulled up to the pool and food was passed on platters floated on the water. Surrounding the Finger Bowl is a very large double-walled pergola with a complicated, almost baroque, plan of intersecting apses and semi-circles. The pergola is roofed with a wooden trellis to carry vines. Although the exact date of the Finger Bowl and Pergola are not yet established, it is likely that they were an early development, as they were originally illuminated by candlelight and only later electrified.

THE ENTRANCE DRIVE

The Entrance Drive has been discussed earlier in this report. According to Mrs. Amos Pinchot, the present drive dates from 1919 and was built when the Grey Towers property was divided between her husband and Gifford Pinchot.

THE EAST TERRACE AND MOAT

This terrace was established to dramatize the prospect from the house. The wall below it also dramatizes the view of the house from the present approach drive. By visually heightening the house from below, the design echoes Richard Morris Hunt’s original intention of a taller foundation for the building. The “moat” is a clever play on the chateau style of the house. Construction dates for these features have not yet been established.
Figure 58. Looking toward the “Finger Bowl,” winter 1978.

Figure 59. The “Finger Bowl,” located north of the main house, circa 1963. From the collection of the Pinchot Institute.

Figure 60. The “Moat” figures prominently in this view of the east facade of Grey Towers. Constructed around 1940 by Cornelia and Gifford Pinchot as part of the overall landscaping development of the site, the moat added to the romantic conception of the chateau image. From the Gifford Pinchot Papers.
THE YALE SCHOOL OF FORESTRY

Through his early years of work in the Division of Forestry, Gifford Pinchot realized the urgent need for trained foresters to carry out the resource policies then being initiated. Because of the limited opportunity for American students to study forestry in their own country, Pinchot soon interested his parents in the idea of helping him to found a graduate school of forestry in association with his alma mater, Yale University. In March 1900, Yale accepted the gift of a $150,000 endowment from the Pinchot family.\(^{(19)}\) (This original endowment eventually was doubled by the financial contributions of various other members of the Pinchot and Eno families.) In accepting the gift, the University was obligated, for a period of twenty-one years, to maintain a summer school of forestry at the Pinchot's Grey Towers estate. James W. Pinchot placed a forest tract, located on the southern bounds of his land holdings, at the disposal of the school.

The Yale School of Forestry opened in the Fall of 1900, and summer sessions then followed on the estate. The program was originally designed as a six-week period of elementary instruction for those students interested in an introductory course in forestry. From 1904 through 1926, Grey Towers was the site of an annual twelve-week summer term of the professional training course leading to a Master's degree in forestry. Students were afforded the experience of learning through field work in the woodlands and forest plantations of the estate. This opportunity to supplement their academic education through on-site training proved to be invaluable to the young foresters, many of whom came from urban environments.\(^{(19)}\)

Gifford's former classmate at Yale and his assistant in the Division of Forestry, Henry S. Graves, became the first director of the school. Pinchot was a member of the governing board and also served on the faculty of the forestry school from 1900 to 1903 as a special lecturer in forest policy. He then continued as a non-resident member of the faculty, giving annual lectures at New Haven and Milford until 1936. At that time, he reached mandatory retirement age and became a professor emeritus. So committed was he to the cause of the forestry school that Cifford Pinchot realized the urgent need for trained foresters to carry out the resource policies then being initiated. Because of the limited opportunity for American students to study forestry in their own country, Pinchot soon interested his parents in the idea of helping him to found a graduate school of forestry in association with his alma mater, Yale University. In March 1900, Yale accepted the gift of a $150,000 endowment from the Pinchot family.\(^{(19)}\) (This original endowment eventually was doubled by the financial contributions of various other members of the Pinchot and Eno families.) In accepting the gift, the University was obligated, for a period of twenty-one years, to maintain a summer school of forestry at the Pinchot's Grey Towers estate. James W. Pinchot placed a forest tract, located on the southern bounds of his land holdings, at the disposal of the school.

The Yale School of Forestry opened in the Fall of 1900, and summer sessions then followed on the estate. The program was originally designed as a six-week period of elementary instruction for those students interested in an introductory course in forestry. From 1904 through 1926, Grey Towers was the site of the annual twelve-week summer term of the professional training course leading to a Master's degree in forestry. Students were afforded the experience of learning through field work in the woodlands and forest plantations of the estate. This opportunity to supplement their academic education through on-site training proved to be invaluable to the young foresters, many of whom came from urban environments.\(^{(19)}\)

Gifford's former classmate at Yale and his assistant in the Division of Forestry, Henry S. Graves, became the first director of the school. Pinchot was a member of the governing board and also served on the faculty of the forestry school from 1900 to 1903 as a special lecturer in forest policy. He then continued as a non-resident member of the faculty, giving annual lectures at New Haven and Milford until 1936. At that time, he reached mandatory retirement age and became a professor emeritus. So committed was he to the cause of the forestry school that Gifford Pinchot impetuously bequeathed all of his wealth, with the exception of a few small legacies to members of his family, to the institution. (This first intention was later revised.) In 1925, Yale University awarded him an honorary doctorate in appreciation of the outstanding contributions he had made in the field of forestry education.

James Pinchot took a strong paternalistic attitude toward fostering the success of the forestry school, which he regarded as a pet project during the later years of his life. In addition to the use of land on his estate, he generously provided for the construction of various buildings and facilities for summer instruction. The students' living quarters were provided by two rows of tents that formed the camp's "street." In addition, frame structures, such as the kitchen and the clubhouse, were built to serve the camp.\(^{(20)}\) During the early years of the school, an outbuilding that was begun around 1890, probably to Richard Morris Hunt's design, served as a classroom facility and instructors' residence.\(^{(21)}\) Known then as "the school house" or "Foresters' Cottage," this building was located southwest of the main residence, near the southwest corner of the walled garden. (Around 1917, it was expanded to serve as the summer residence of Amos Pinchot and his family, who had inherited it in the division of his father's estate, and was called "the Garden Cottage."

In July, 1904, James Pinchot contracted the construction of a multipurpose structure, on Broad Street in the village of Milford, which was to be known as Forester's Hall.\(^{(22)}\) C.C.D. Pinchot's former store was razed to clear a site for the new building, which adjoined, and stylistically matched, the 1880s post office building at the corner of Broad and Hartford Streets. Designed in December 1903 by Hunt and Hunt (the successor firm of Richard M. Hunt, who died in 1895), the building's first storey was divided into commercial shops, while the upper storeys were used as a classroom facility for the forestry school, as well as a meeting place for fraternal organizations.

Beyond the financial expenditures that the elder Pinchot...
made toward promoting the welfare of the school, an effort was made to establish amicable relations between the students and the family. In an early 1900s letter to her son, Mrs. Pinchot wrote that the couple was gradually getting acquainted with the fifty-six forestry students at Grey Towers, and she was planning to invite them to tea that week. This custom was apparently maintained by the family through 1926, since Cornelia Pinchot similarly invited the foresters to the home that last year of the school's field course there. The relationship was undoubtedly mutually beneficial, since the students performed important studies of the estate's forest tracts in their fieldwork on the site. As one example of this work, in 1906, students prepared a map of a tract of James Pinchot's land, which was to be used for study and planning purposes for the proposed cemetery by Frederick Law Olmstead, Jr. There was also a considerable degree of tree planting carried out by the students. Pine and hardwood plantations at the "forest experiment station" site south of Milford are still detectable by their straight rows, and a plantation of white pines is to be found on the hill overlooking Grey Towers.

In a 1904 article about the Yale summer school, James Pinchot summarized the forestry activities at his Milford home, their importance to him, and his wishes for the future.

In the forest work at Grey Towers, the experiment station represents advanced study and research, while the students of the summer school and of the Yale Forest School stand for the beginning and the middle of a forester's training. It is to be hoped that Grey Towers may have in the future, through instruction and original investigation in the lines I have attempted to describe, a wide and continuing influence in all matters relating to forestry.

NOTES


5. Grey Towers Garage Burns with 4 Cars," Port Jervis Union, October 22, 1937. Newspaper clippings of the fire and four excellent photos of the damage are found in the Cornelia Bryce Pinchot Papers, Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Series I, cont. 425.


8. Ibid. Also, Cole's name is inscribed on this building.

9. Ibid. For view of building, see snapshot numbered 23-1 in group of photographs taken in 1903 by unidentified Yale Forestry School student. GP Papers, Series IV, cont. 2785.

10. Interview with Mrs. Amos Pinchot, July 2, 1969, by B. C. Yates. USFS history files at Grey Towers.


13. See note 3.


15. Letter from Maistland Armstrong to JWP, April 21, 1890. Amos Pinchot Papers, Series I, cont. 1, folder 1890.


17. Letter from James W. Pinchot to Frederick Law Olmsted, Sr., Virginia Beach, April 1, 1893. See also: Letter from JWP to FLO Sr., Biltmore, NC, March 28, 1894, and Letter from Gifford Pinchot to John C. Olmsted, New York, June 1, 1895. Letters from Olmsted Associates in Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, cont. B216, file 3164. Note: There were no answers to these letters recorded in the files. Researched by William Tweed, History Section, USFS, August, 1977.


19. For a statement upon the importance of the fieldwork at Grey Towers in the education of the forester, see: "Emmanuel Fritz: Teacher, Editor, and Forestry Consultant," An Interview conducted by Elwood R. Maunder and Amelia R. Fry (Santa Cruz and Berkeley, Ca.: Forest History Society and Regional Oral History Office of the Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, 1972), pp. 20, 24.

20. A group of snapshots taken in 1903 by an unidentified student of the Yale Forestry School provides much information of the early years of the summer session at Grey Towers and the outbuildings that then existed on the site. All photos were numbered and brief identifications were pencilled on the back of each. GP Papers, Series I, cont. 2978, folder 1.

21. Information on the building's date of original construction and major addition were taken from the October, 1924 interview with Henry McCarty in GP Papers, Series I, cont. 2995. The predominate of its Renaissance detailing and its stylistic similarity to other structures designed at Grey Towers by Hunt, as would point to its design by the architect, though no documentation has yet been found to document this conclusion. When James Pinchot's estate was divided, "Parcel B," a twenty-one acre tract that included this building, was given to Amos Pinchot. For a draft of a survey of this tract done in December, 1920, see GP Papers, Confidential File, cont. 3015.

22. A copy of the contractual agreement made in July, 1904 between James W. Pinchot, owner, and E. S. Wolfe, builder, is among the files of the Pike County Historical Society. This twelve page document is a complete record of the building's specifications. The historical society also owns a stereopticon view of the west block of Broad Street before Foresters' Hall's construction (which shows C. C. D. Pinchot's store and the existing post office) as well as one of the building soon after its completion. Two preliminary sketches of Hunt and Hunt's floor plans for Foresters' Hall, which date to December, 1903, can be found in the Hunt collection at the American Institute of Architects' Library in Washington, Box 16 of the catalogued documents.


24. Telegram from Mrs. Cornelia Pinchot to GP, August 20, 1926. GP Papers, Series 4, cont. 263. As a provision of the acceptance of the original 1900 endowment, Yale was obligated to carry on a summer school on the estate for a period of twenty-one years, which ended in 1926.


ANALYSIS of EXISTING CONDITIONS

DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING BUILDING FABRIC

The information included in this section has been developed from extensive examinations of the buildings, supplemented with historical research including both written and graphical material. This section describes and dates the various building components of each structure. The original building fabric of Grey Towers is labeled "1885-86." Extensive renovations were made by Gifford and Cornelia Pinchot, beginning in 1914 and extending through the 1920s. These changes are identified as "ca. 1915" and "ca. 1920," with the earlier date signifying those charges that are known to have been made first. Because the remodeling was fairly continuous, it is very difficult to determine exactly what changes were made when. Hopefully, future research will provide more detailed information regarding these alterations.

After government purchase of the property in 1963, a number of alterations were made to accommodate institutional uses. These changes are labeled "1963-64."

EXTERIOR

The L-shaped plan of the House consists of a rectangular, central block, with three circular, corner towers, and a long wing that extends from the northwest part of the main section. The house has two full storeys, with a finished third floor and rough attic space under the hipped roof. Below the entire house is a basement and crawl space.

The following materials or elements are typical of the exterior construction and finish of the house:

Above a bluestone water table, the walls are laid up in rubble stone that is coursed up to the second floor. Various areas have been repointed with Portland cement mortar. The window and door openings are surmounted by either semicircular or flat bluestone arches, and they have bluestone quoins and sills. The molded wood cornice, ogive in profile, supports a painted molded copper gutter, from which 4" diameter copper leaders extend. The hipped roofs, as well as the conical tower roofs, are covered in a fish-scale pattern in the original New Jersey slate. Various areas show patching.

The stone chimneys are of the double-hung variety, with narrow muntins. The five tall brick chimneys are flanked by massive dormer windows which contain their original 8/8 double-hung sash. The central chimney dates from the early twentieth century.

East Elevation—This elevation is composed of a broad, low, two-storey stone mass with a hipped roof that is flanked by two massive, round, three-storey towers topped with conical roofs. The third storey of each tower cantilevers from the main walls on three courses of bluestone. In the stonework above the first-floor French doors, there is evidence of the roof line of the missing cast-iron porch. The seven arched openings of the first floor contain their original French doors with glazed fan lights. They are now covered by aluminum storm doors dating from about 1973. The stonework between these openings is stuccoed to a height of 4', a treatment that dates from the construction of the house. All of the first-floor openings are original, except for the broad, central arched opening in the north tower which dates from the early twentieth century. The second-floor windows contain their original 8/8 double-hung wood sash. The central bay's niche, finished in stucco, contains a cast-bronze bust of Lafayette. Although all of the shutter brackets are still in place, the shutters and blinds are no longer extant. There is evidence, above the middle French door, of the location of the metal and canvas awning that is shown in a photograph dating from circa 1940.

South Elevation—This elevation is dominated by the two massive, three-storey stone towers. The main body is divided into two bays. The entry retains its original paneled door, semicircular glass fanlight, and paneled reveal. The hardware including the wrought-iron strap hinges, is original. The elaborate "Dragon" knocker, as well as the suspended light, were added after 1963. The narrow windows flanking the door contain the original casement sash, while the decorative wrought-iron grilles are of a later date. The arched window opening in the east bay was moved slightly to the right in the early twentieth century, when changes were made to the interior at that time. On the stone above the door and on the towers there are indications of the roof line of the missing porch. The carved, white marble sundial, decorated with lead figures, was probably placed on the west tower early in the twentieth century. The cornice was repaired at some unknown date, using plain boards that do not duplicate the original molding. The massive dormer contains two windows with 8/8 double-hung sash and a central wood panel with decorative, rope molding. The small shed-root dormer, containing a louver panel, is a later addition to the roof. The south elevation of the wing is divided into five bays; the seven windows have plain, stone lintels, stone quoins, and the original 8/8 double-hung sash. The aluminum storm sash dates from after 1963. The entry contains an "antique" six panel door, leaded glass transom and paneled reveals. It was probably removed from another building of circa 1830 vintage and reused here. The entry porch with its curved roof and slender wood columnar supports is an early twentieth-century addition that was possibly salvaged from a late eighteenth-century house. The large circular panel set into the stone wall west of the porch, although of unknown function, has been in that location since the construction of the house. The three dormers contain their original 6/6 double-hung sash and post-1963 aluminum storm sash.

West Elevation—The fenestration and massing of this elevation are much more complex, the window and door placement being asymmetrical. All the window openings contain their original double-hung sash and shutter brackets. An important feature is the now unused entry containing an "antique" eight panel door, leaded glass transom and paneled reveals. The door was probably removed from a circa 1830 building. Above the first floor ached window next to the tower is a brick patch of unknown origin. The central portion of the stone wall extends up past the roof line of the third storey and is covered by a slate hip roof that extends from the main roof. The large central dormer extends down into the stone wall, breaking the cornice line. It contains four openings, each with the original 6/6 double-hung sash. The small dormer high up on the roof, north of the central chimney, does not appear in early photographs and was probably added early in the twentieth century.

North Elevation—This long, low elevation exhibits the same details as found on the other sides of the building. The fenestration of the wing is as constructed and retains the original 8/8 sash. The only change may be the addition of the doorway into the kitchen; the door was blocked in the early twentieth century, when the three original arched windows were removed and replaced by the present stone chimney and two large rectangular casement windows and door. The garden wall abutting the house dates from the early part of this century.

Figure 65. (Left) The east elevation of Grey Towers, circa 1963. From collection of the Pinchot Institute.
INTERIOR

BASEMENT

Room B-1
Room B-1 is the original basement stairhall. During the 1963-64 renovation, original 1885-86 openings in the north wall were closed in, and the original wood stairway to the first floor was removed. The room is now separated from Room B-2, the boiler room, by a modern steel fire door. The floor level of this room was lowered in 1963-64 exposing sections of the foundation footings.

Floor Poured concrete (1963-64).
Ceiling Textured plaster on metal lath (1963-64).
Walls Coursed rubble (1885-86), repointed with Portland Cement mortar (1963-64). Concrete block infill in east and west walls (1963-64).
Windows Two fixed 2-light wood sash and wood frames (1885-86).
Heating Insulated heating pipes, copper wire with fins (1963-64).
Lighting Three ceiling-mounted incandescent fixtures (1963-64).
Plumbing Exposed copper and iron pipes (1963-64).

Room B-2
Room B-2 was created during the 1963-64 renovation by the construction of the concrete block north and south walls. As originally constructed, Rooms B-2 and B-3 formed a large furnace room that also included a section of the space north of Room B-2. At the west end of Room B-2 were two smaller spaces, now used as hallways, which were originally coal storage bins. The floor was excavated in 1963-64 to provide additional headroom. This exposed sections of the foundation footings.

Floor Same as Room B-1.
Ceiling Same as Room B-1.
Walls East & West Walls. Same a Room B-1. North & South Walls. Concrete block (1963-64).
Doors #B21—Same as B11. #B22—Same as B11, except louvered panel at borrom. #B23—Same as B12.
Windows One fixed 2-light sash and wood frame (1885-86). One original opening with aluminum louver and screen (1963-64).
Lighting Six ceiling-mounted incandescent fixtures (1963-64). Main distribution panel for electrical system, panel box for exterior lighting and panel box for basement lights and boiler (all 1963-64). Main distribution panel for fire detection system (1963-64).
Plumbing Insulated heating pipes and open floor drain (1963-64).
Other Features Two brick piers supporting first-floor stairhall columns (1885-86).

Room B-3
Room B-3 was originally part of Room B-2, and was the location of coal bins. It was partitioned off during the 1963-64 renovation and is now used for storage.

Floor Natural rock outcropping and soil (1885-86 condition).

Room B-4
Room B-4 is a circular tower room that is used for storage.

Floor Same as Room B-3.
Ceiling Exposed first-floor framing consisting of circular sawn 3" x 12" joists (1885-86) and two steel I-beams (1963-64).
Walls Coursed rubble (1885-86).
Windows One original opening with aluminum louvred (1963-64).
Heating Same as Room B-3.
Lighting Same as Room B-3.
Plumbing Insulated heating pipes (1963-64).
Other Features Automatic natural gas emergency generator marked “KOHLER ELECTRICAL PLANTS” (1963-64).

Room B-5
Room B-5 is a single large, unfinished space. It was modified during 1963-64 by the installation of steel framing members to reinforce the original first-floor framing.

Floor Soil, rubble stone, and debris (1885-86 condition).
Ceiling Exposed first floor framing consisting of circular sawn 3" x 12" joists (1885-86) and two steel I-beams (1963-64). Three longitudinal steel I-beams supported by 4" diameter hollow steel columns resting on 18" square concrete pads (all 1963-64).
Walls Same as Room B-1. At the north end of the west wall an opening has been filled with brick.
Windows One original opening in east wall closed with concrete block (1963-64). One original opening in north wall closed with wood plank (ca. 1920). Parts of original wood sash on floor.
Lighting Four ceiling-mounted incandescent fixtures (1963-64).
Plumbing Insulated heating pipes (1963-64).
Other Features Three coursed rubble stone chimney foundations (1885-86). Underside of first-floor stone hearths are visible above south and middle chimney foundation. Remnants of historic building fabric of house removed during subsequent remodelings including fireplace tiles, marble tiles, carved stone brackets, and marble slab and column. One white marble tile (7" x 7") marked “Lolol Pinchot”.

Room B-6
Room B-6 is another circular tower room.

Floor Same as Room B-5.
Ceiling Same as Room B-4.
Walls Same as Room B-4.
Windows Same as Room B-4.
Other Features Remnants of historic building fabric removed during subsequent remodelings including slate, marble, and various types of tile.
**FIRST FLOOR**

**Room 101**

The main entrance of Grey Towers opens into Room 101, the large reception room, known historically as the Hall. Opening off the Hall are the dining room, the library, a small circular tower room, and stairway to the second floor. The Hall woodwork was designed by architect Henry Edwards-Ficken. It retains its original spatial configuration and design features, including the inglenook and fireplace, elaborate wood stairway and wood wall paneling. During the 1960s renovations, the major alterations were the installation of a textured plaster ceiling and new lighting fixtures.

**Floor**

- 3 1/2" wide tongue-and-groove boards (1885-86).
- Refinished (1963-64).

**Ceiling**

- Textured plaster (1963-64).
- 4 transverse beams in molded wood casings (1885-86).

**Walls**

- Wood paneling with molded baseboard, chair rail, panels, and cornice incorporated into composition (1885-86).

**Doors**

- #101. 9-panel wood door with decorative brass knob, mortise lock and 3 hinges (all 1885-86). Single light arched transom and two 8-light sidelights (all 1885-86).
- #102. 8-panel wood door, Antique Circa 1830, with 2 brass butt hinges, nickel-plated brass mortise lock and wood knob (all 1885-86).
- #103. Same as #102 but with nickel-plated brass knob (1885-86). Patch above knob.
- #104. Double 8-panel sliding doors with brass mortise lock and escutcheon and iron track (early 19th cent., reused 1885-86). Lock is marked "PAT MAR 10 1855."
- #105. Same as #102 but with nickel-plated brass knob (1885-86).
- #106. Design incorporated into staircase panelling. Black porcelain knob in Room 101 and white porcelain knob in Room 103 (1885-86). Molded wood trim in Room 103. (1885-86).

**Heating**

- Fireplace in inglenook with Federal-revival-style wood mantel, brick firebox surround and 7" square quarry tile hearth.

**Lighting**


**Stairway**

- Paneled wood stairway with 3 risers to first landing and 19 risers to second landing. Three differently turned balusters at each tread and turned newel post. Two turned wood Ionic columns supporting second-floor stair soffit (all 1885-86).

**Room 102**

It appears that Room 102 was originally a hallway with doorways leading to the exterior, Room 101 and Room 113. During Gifford Pinchot's period of ownership the room was remodeled as a small powder room and the exterior door in the west wall was covered over leaving only the leaded-glass transom exposed. The room was further modified during the 1963-64 renovations when the south wall was completely removed and a rear wall constructed. The doorway in the north wall was also removed at that time. The room is now used as a public toilet room for the handicapped.

**Floor**

- 1" square ceramic tile (1963-64).

**Ceiling**

- Plaster on sheetrock (1963-64).

**Walls**

- 4" ceramic tile with plaster on sheetrock above (all 1963-64). Entire north wall rebuilt (1963-64).

**Doors**

- East wall. 5" wide molded wood trim (1963-64).

**Windows**

- Lead-glazed window on exterior and wood mullions on interior (reused ca. 1920). Molded wood trim (1885-86, reused ca. 1920).

**Heating**

- Convection unit built into west wall (1963-64).

**Lighting**


**Room 103**

Located beneath the main stairway, Room 103 was originally used as a small toilet room. In 1963-64, it was remodeled for use as a coat closet.

**Floor**

- Same as Room 101.

**Ceiling**

- Painted plaster (1885-86).

**Walls**

- North, east and west walls—Beaded board wainscoting, 38 1/4" high with painted plaster above 1885-86. South wall—Beaded board wainscoting (1885-86, removed and reinstalled 1963-64).

**Windows**

- 2, 4-light hopper sash with 2-light fanlight above (1885-86).

**Heating**

- Convection unit along west wall (1963-64).

**Lighting**

- Wall-mounted, porcelain, incandescent fixture (1963-64).

**Other Features**

- Wood coat hook rail (1963-64).
- Evidence of built-in cabinet or shelving on west wall (probably 1885-66).

**Room 104**

Circular in plan, this room was probably originally used as a small reception room and later served as Cornelia Pinchot's office. It is now used as an office and as a room for distributing publications to visitors. Room 104 has survived with its historic building fabric intact, except for the ceiling and lighting fixtures.

**Floor**

- Same as Room 101.

**Ceiling**

- Textured plaster (1963-64).

**Walls**

- Plaster on wood lath (1885-86).

**Baseboard**

- 12" molded wood baseboard (1885-86).

**Chair Rail**

- 4" molded wood chair rail (1885-86).

**Cornice**

- Wood picture molding (ca. 1920).

**Doors**

- #1041. Same as #1012. Molded wood trim (1885-86).

**Windows**

- 1 8/8 double-hung wood sash with arched fanlight above (1885-86). Double French doors, each with 4 lights and 1 wood panel (1885-86). Molded wood trim (1885-86).

**Heating**

- Fireplace with carved wood mantel (early 19th cent., reused ca. 1920) with octagonal tile hearth and glazed tile around firebox opening. Cast-iron surround and grate with sheet-metal firebox cover (all 1885-86). 2 convection units along west wall (1963-64).

**Room 105**

Originally this space was divided into two rooms known as the Billiard Room and the Salon in the original floor plan. Circa 1920, the partition with large double sliding doors which separated the two rooms, was removed, and the present large room was created for use as a library. Much of the room's existing building fabric dates from this remodeling. The major changes during the 1960s were the installation of a new ceiling and lighting.

**Floor**

- Random width boards, 5 1/2"-14" wide (ca. 1920).

**Ceiling**

- Same as Room 104. The previous ceiling was of smooth plaster with a coved cornice (ca. 1920).

**Walls**

- Wood bookcases with molded panels and adjustable wood shelves (ca. 1920).

**Baseboard**

- 9" molded wood baseboard incorporated into bookcase panelling (ca. 1920).

**Doors**

- #1051. Same as #1015. Molded wood trim (ca. 1920).
- #1052. Same as #1015. Molded wood trim (ca. 1920).

**Windows**

- East wall—5 sets of double French doors, each door with 12 lights (1885-86). Molded wood trim (ca. 1920).
- South wall—Double French doors, each door with 12 lights (ca. 1920). Molded wood trim (ca. 1920).
When Grey Towers was first constructed, this space consisted of two rooms, the Library at the east end and the Dining Room at the west end. The rooms were separated by a wall containing back-to-back fireplaces, which was in line with the existing wall between Rooms 101 and 103. The fireplaces and wall were removed ca. 1920 when a single large dining room was created. At that time, the existing fireplace along the north wall was constructed, and the walls were redecorated to Mrs. Pinchot's design.

During the 1963-64 remodeling, Room 107 suffered more than any other major room in the house. In an attempt to convert the space into a conference and lecture room, virtually all of the existing historic building fabric (except for the floor, part of the south wall and the fireplace mantel) was removed and replaced with new materials. The alterations drastically altered the unique character of the room.

**Floor**
Same as Room 101. Wood patch in center indicating location of original partition (removed ca. 1920).

**Ceiling**
Same as Room 101.

**Walls**

**Baseboard**
6½" molded wood baseboard (1963-64).

**Chair Rail**
3" molded wood chair rail (1963-64).

**Corbels**
Molded wood corbels (1963-64).

**Doors**
#1071. Same as #1015, reused and automatic closer installed (1963-64).
#1072. 4-light glass and wood door with two 10-light sidelights (ca. 1920).
#1073. Same as #1015, except diamond window cut into panel (ca. 1920). Automatic closer installed and door rehung on east jamb (1963-64).
#1074. Same as #1015 except automatic door closer installed (1963-64). Molded wood trim, all doors (1963-64).

**Windows**
North wall—Four 10-light casement window sash (ca. 1920). East wall—Two French doors. Same as Room 106.

**Heating**
Fireplace with carved marble mantel (European, pre-19th century, reused ca. 1920) with marble hearth (ca. 1920).
5 convection units behind woodwork of east wall (all 1963-64).

**Lighting**
3 ceiling-mounted fluorescent fixtures and 11 recessed incandescent ceiling fixtures (all 1963-64).

**Room 108**
Room 108 was probably created during the 1920s renovation as a small powder room between Rooms 107 and 109. All of the building fabric of the room dates from the twentieth century except for an existing door and casing that were reused. A water closet and lavatory were removed during 1963-64, and the space now serves as a hallway.

**Floor**
Same as Room 101. Refinished (1963-64).

**Ceiling**
Plaster on sheetrock (1963-64).

**Walls**
Plaster (1963-64).

**Baseboard**
7" molded wood baseboard (1963-64).

**Lighting**
Ceiling mounted incandescent fixture (1963-64).

**Room 109**
Before the 1963-64 renovation, this room was similar to Room 106. At that time, the room was heavily modified for use as a small conference room. The original fireplace was removed, and all of the finishes, except for the flooring, were removed and replaced with new materials.

**Floor**
Same as Room 101. Refinished (1963-64).

**Ceiling**
Same as Room 107.

**Walls**
Plaster (1963-64).

**Baseboard**
7" molded wood baseboard (1963-64).

**Doors**
#1091. Same as #1015. Molded wood trim (1885-86).

**Windows**
2, 8/8 double-hung wood sash with arched fanlights (1885-86).

**Heating**
Three convection units (1963-64).

**Lighting**
Ceiling-mounted fluorescent fixtures (1963-64).
Room 110

Room 110 is not original to the 1885-86 construction of Grey Towers. Instead it appears to be an early modification, probably dating from circa 1920. It served as a vestibule connecting the Dining Room with the Pantry. An exterior door is located in the north wall. The room now serves as a small hallway leading to Room 111, the men's room.

Floor
Vinyl asbestos tile (1963-64).

Ceiling
Plaster (1963-64).

Walls
North wall—Plaster on masonry (1885-86).
East, south and west walls—Plaster (ca. 1900). Wood shelving (ca. 1920) located along east wall removed (1963-64).

Baseboard
11 1/2" molded wood baseboard along south, east and north walls (ca. 1920).

Doors
#1101. 12-light wood door with white porcelain knob and iron mortise lock (1885-86). Molded wood trim (1885-86).

Heating
1 convection unit (1963-64).

Lighting
Same as Room 108.

Rooms 111 and 112

When Grey Towers was originally constructed, Rooms 111 and 112 formed a single, large pantry space separating the kitchen and Dining Room. The pantry survived until the 1963-64 renovation, when it was divided into two spaces. The original doorways in the west wall, one in Room 111 and the other in Room 112, were filled in. Another original doorway, lining up with the new partition separating the two rooms in the east wall of Room 112, was completely removed and a new wall constructed approximately 16" to the south. The south wall of Room 111 is now used as a men's room and Room 112 serves as the projection room for Room 107.

Both Room 111 and 112 have been stripped of all of their original finishes, and neither bears any resemblance to its historic appearance.

Room 111

Floor
1" sq. ceramic tile (1963-64).

Ceiling
Same as Room 110.

Walls
4" sq. ceramic tile wainscoting with plaster above (1963-64).

Doors
#1111. Same as #1015. Molded wood trim (1885-86).

Windows
One 8/8 double-hung wood sash (1885-86) with textured glass (1963-64).

Heating
Same as Room 110.

Lighting
Same as Room 108.

Plumbing
Ceramic lavatory, water closet and urinal (1963-64).

Room 112

Floor
Same as Room 110.

Ceiling
Same as Room 110.

Walls
Plaster (1963-64).

Windows
East Wall—3 projection openings with metal door (1963-64).

Lighting
Same as Room 108.

Other Features
Projection platform with hardwood floor (1963-64).

Room 113 and 114

Originally forming a single space that served as the hallway for the service stairway, these rooms were separated by the construction of a hall during the 1963-64 renovation. Before Room 112 was extended in 1963-64, Room 113 was approximately 16 inches wider. A small elevator that was installed in 1939 in the east end of Room 114 was removed circa 1963-64.

Room 113

Floor
Same as Room 110.
Room 116

Retaining its original spatial configuration, Room 116 has always been a service entrance hall.

Floor  
Same as Room 110.

Ceiling  
Same as Room 110.

Walls  
Same as Room 112.

Baseboard  
Same as Room 115.

Cornice  
2" wood cove molding (1963-64).

Doors  
#1161. Same as #1131.
#1162. 5-panel wood door with two decorative cast-iron hinges and white porcelain knob (1885-86).
#1163. Same as #1162, except knob missing.
#1164. Same as #1162.
#1165. Same as #1162.
#1166. 6-panel wood Creek Revival door with two cast-iron hinges and transom with lead (exterior) and wood (interior) mullions (all first half 19th century, reused 1885-86).

Windows  
Same as Room 114.

Heating  
Two convection units along south wall and 1 along north wall (1963-64).

Lighting  
One ceiling-mounted fluorescent fixture (1963-64).

Other Features  
Wood, china cabinet along east wall (1885-86).

Room 117

Originally known as the Laundry, Room 117 is now used as a maintenance shop. It survived relatively intact until the 1963-64 renovation, when the original fireplace was removed and all of the room finishes were replaced. The original wall between Rooms 117 and 118 was removed at that time, and a new wall was constructed about 16" to the north, reusing some of the old framing members.

Floor  
Same as Room 110.

Ceiling  
Same as Room 110.

Walls  
Same as Room 112.

Baseboard  
Same as Room 113.

Doors  
#1171. Same as #1152 except for nickel-plated brass knob, molded wood trim (1885-86).

Windows  
Same as Room 115. Textured plaster (1963-64).

Heating  
2 convection units (1963-64).

Lighting  
Same as Room 116.

Room 118

Originally known as the Stores, this room is still used for storage. Like Room 117, this room was heavily remodeled during the 1963-64 renovation when all of the room finishes were replaced. Room 118 is now about 16" wider than it was prior to 1963 when the north wall was relocated.

Floor  
Same as Room 110.

Ceiling  
Same as Room 110.

Walls  
Textured plaster (1963-64).

Baseboard  
Same as Room 113.

Windows  
Same as Room 116. Molded wood trim (1885-86).

Heating  
Same as Room 110.

Lighting  
2 ceiling-mounted fluorescent fixtures (1963-64). Lighting panelboard and telephone switch gear on west wall (1963-64).
Figure 69. The main stairway leading to the third floor from Room 201. Note the steel bracket and two rods that were added to help support the stair.

SECOND FLOOR

Room 201

Room 201 retains its original spatial integrity and much of its historic building fabric. It still serves as the central stairhall for the second floor. Its major architectural feature is the main stairway with its elaborate balusters and newel posts.

Floor 3½" wide tongue-and-groove boards (1885-86).

Ceiling Plaster (1885-86).

Walls Plaster (1885-86) Wallpaper (1963-64) above chair rail, painted (1885-86) below.

Baseboard Molded wood (1885-86).

Chair Rail 4" molded wood chair rail (ca. 1920).

Cornice Molded plaster (ca. 1920).


Heating Two convection units (1963-64).

Lighting 12-light ceiling-mounted incandescent chandelier in center of room and incandescent ceiling fixtures over stair landings (all 1963-64).

Stairway Wood stairway with one riser to landing and eighteen risers to third-floor. Turned balusters and newel posts. Two box columns supporting third floor stair soffit (all 1885-86). Steel tensile rods hung from third floor (1963-64).

Other Features Electric clock on south wall (1963-64).

Room 202

Room 202 is an extension of Room 201.

Floor Same as Room 201.

Ceiling Same as Room 201.

Walls Same as Room 201.

Baseboard Same as Room 201.

Chair Rail Same as Room 201.

Cornice Same as Room 201.

Doors #2021. 6-panel wood door with two decorative cast-brass hinges, wood knobs, brass mortise lock and wood key escutcheon cover (1885-86). Molded wood trim (1885-86).

Lighting Incandescent ceiling fixture (1963-64).

Room 203

Room 203 was probably originally used as a dressing room or sitting room for Room 204, a tower bedroom. It may have been the “Blue Room,” referred to in family papers in both the 1880s and the 1920s. Room 203 is now used as a lounge for the public toilet rooms.

Floor Same as Room 201, 3", 3 1/4", and 3 1/2" wide.

Ceiling Same as Room 201.

Walls Same as Room 201. Walls in southeast corner constructed (1963-64).

Baseboard Same as Room 201.

Chair Rail 3" molded wood chair rail (ca. 1920).

Cornice Same as Room 201.

Doors #2031. Same as #2021. Molded wood trim (ca. 1920). Doorways to Rooms 205 and 206 cut through (1963-64).

Windows Same as Room 201. Molded wood trim with panel between windows (ca. 1920).

Heating Fireplace with carved wood Federal-period wood mantel (early 19th century, reused ca. 1920) with polychromed tile firebox surround and hearth. Iron coal grate (all ca. 1920). Cast-iron fire back “W. LYLE AIR FURNACE NEW YORK 1768” (reused ca. 1920).

Lighting Six-light ceiling-mounted incandescent chandelier (1963-64).

Other Features Built-in wood cabinet with double glass and wood door in northwest corner (ca. 1920). Triangular corner cupboard located adjacent to built-in cabinet, possibly part of the original 1885-86 dining room woodwork.
Room 204

Room 204 is a circular tower room that was used as a bedroom by Gifford Pinchot, and probably by James Pinchot before him. It appears to have been remodeled about 1920. The room still retains much of its pre-1963 building fabric.

Floor
2¼" wide tongue-and-groove boards (ca. 1920).

Ceiling
Coved plaster (1885-86).

Walls
Same as Room 201.

Baseboard
Same as Room 201.

Chair Rail
Same as Room 203.

Cornice
Wood picture molding (ca. 1920).

Doors
#2041. Same as #2021. Molded wood trim (1885-86).

Windows
One 8/8 light double-hung wood sash (1885-86). One set double French doors, each door with 8 lights (1885-86) which provided access to summer sleeping porch over main entrance during Gifford and Cornelia’s occupancy. Molded wood trim (1885-86).

Heating
Fireplace with reproduction Federal-period wood mantel with Biblical Delft tiles around firebox opening.
Polychromed glazed tile hearth, cast-iron firebox liner (all ca. 1920).
One convection unit (1963-64).

Lighting
Wall-mounted incandescent fixtures (1963-64).

Rooms 205 and 206

Rooms 205 and 206 were created as public toilet rooms during the 1963-64 renovation. They replaced an original bathroom located between Rooms 202, 203, and 207 and a closet which opened off the bathroom. Room 205 is used as a men’s room and 206 as a women’s room.

Room 205

Floor
1" square ceramic tile (1963-64).

Ceiling
Plaster (1963-64).

Walls
4" square ceramic tile wainscoting with plaster above (1963-64).

Doors
#2051. Same as #2021, reused (1963-64). Plain wood trim (1963-64).

Windows
One 8/8 double-hung wood sash (1963-64).

Heating
One convection unit (1963-64).

Lighting

Room 206

Floor
Same as Room 205.

Ceiling
Same as Room 205.

Walls
Same as Room 205.

Doors
#2061. Same as #201, reused (1963-64). Plain wood trim (1963-64).

Lighting
Same as Room 205.

Plumbing
Two ceramic water closets, two ceramic urinals, and one ceramic lavatory (all 1963-64).

Room 207

Rooms 207 and 208 form a two-room bedroom suite, one of three such suites on the second floor. It may have been the “Green Room” referred to in family papers of the 1920s and it was probably used by Mary Pinchot as her sitting room. Now used as the director’s office, Room 207 was remodeled about 1920. Originally, a bathroom opened off the west wall of this room. The doorway to the bath, located to the south of the fireplace, was closed off when Rooms 205 and 206 were created in 1963-64. Originally Rooms 210A, 207A and the south part of 209 were part of Room 207. They were divided off for use as closets about 1920.

Floor
Parquet hardwood (ca. 1920).

Ceiling
Same as Room 201.

Walls

Baseboard
Same as Room 201.

Chair Rail
Same as Room 203.

Cornice
Same as Room 201. Bottom element is wood picture molding (ca. 1920).

Plumbing
Two ceramic water closets and one ceramic lavatory (1963-64).
Doors

#2071. Same as #2021 except door widened 1" (installed ca. 1920).

#2072. Same as #2021 (ca. 1920).

Windows

Same as Room 201.

Heating

Fireplace with carved white marble mantel (ca. 1800 reused ca. 1920) with polychromed glazed tile hearth (ca. 1920). Baseboard radiation along south and east walls (1963-64).

Lighting

Six ceiling-mounted fluorescent fixtures (1963-64).

Room 208

Room 208 was probably Mary Pinchot's bedroom, communicating with her sitting room, and was later similarly used by Cornelia Pinchot. The room was modified during the 1963-64 remodeling, primarily by the removal of a fireplace.

Floor

2¾" wide tongue-and-groove hardwood (1963-64).

Ceiling

Same as Room 201.

Walls

Same as Room 201.

Baseboard

Same as Room 201.

Chair Rail

Same as Room 201.

Cornice

Same as Room 201.

Doors

#2081. Same as #2021. Molded wood trim (1885-86).

Windows

Two, 8/8 double-hung wood sash (1885-86). One set double French doors (1885-86), with bottom light boxed in (1963-64). This door formerly communicated with a sleeping porch along the south facade of the building, which was used in the summers during Gifford and Cornelia's occupancy of the house.

Heating

Three convection units (1963-64).

Lighting

Ceiling-mounted fluorescent fixture (1963-64).

Rooms 207A, 209, 210, 210A, 211 and 212

Originally four of these rooms, 210, 211, 212 and part of 209 formed a single bedroom that opened off Room 201 through door #2112. During Cornelia Pinchot's early remodeling of the house, the bedroom was divided into smaller rooms that were used as closets, a bathroom, and a small bedroom. The following are the uses of the rooms during Gifford and Cornelia's occupancy of the house.

Room 207A-passageway between Room 207 and 210.
Room 209—closet or dressing room for Room 207.
Room 210-small bedroom.
Room 210A-closet for Room 210.
Room 211-bathroom.
Room 212-bathroom.

Room 207A

Floor

Same as Room 209, South Section.

Ceiling

Same as Room 209.

Walls

Plaster (ca. 1920).

Baseboard

Same as Room 201 (ca. 1920). Removed from East wall (1963-64).

Heating

Baseboard radiation along East wall (1963-64).

Other Features

Shelving along West wall made of reused moldings (ca. 1920).

Room 210A

Floor

Same as Room 209, South Section.

Ceiling

Same as Room 209.

Walls

Same as Room 209.

Baseboard

Same as Room 201 (ca. 1920).

Other Features

Shelving along South wall (ca. 1920).

Room 209

Room 209 is now used as a storage closet. When the house was originally constructed, a small, triangular closet existed in part of this space.

Floor

North Section. 2½" wide tongue-and-groove flooring (ca. 1920).
South Section. 3¼" wide tongue-and-groove flooring (1885-86).

Ceiling

Plaster (ca. 1920).
Room 212

During Clifford and Cornelia's occupancy of the house, Room 212 was a bathroom with doors to Rooms 211 and 213. At the time it was converted to a bath, an original fireplace in the northwest corner of the room was removed. A window opened to Room 210. The window and the door to Room 213 were filled in 1963-64 when the plumbing fixtures were removed.

Floor
2 1/4" wide tongue-and-groove boards (1963-64.)

Ceiling
Same as Room 209.

Walls
Same as Room 209.

Baseboard
5" molded wood (ca. 1920).

Chair Rail
Same as Room 210 (ca. 1920).

Cornice
Same as Room 210 (ca. 1920).

Doors
#2111. Similar to #2121 (ca. 1920).
#2112. Same as #2121 (1885-86).

Lighting
Same as Room 209.

Other Features
Shelving along East and West walls (1963-64).

Room 213

Room 213 was originally constructed as a family bedroom with two windows, a doorway to Room 201, and a doorway to Room 214. This room also was remodeled by Cornelia Pinchot about 1920, the principal modification being the construction of closets along the north wall and the rebuilding of the original fireplace in the southwest corner. Rooms 213A, 213B and 214A were once part of this room. Room 213 is now used as an office.

Floor
Same as Room 212.

Ceiling
Same as Room 201.

Walls
East, South & West Walls. Plaster (1885-86), wallpapered and painted over (1963-64).
North Wall. Plaster (ca. 1920), wallpapered and painted over (1963-64).

Baseboard
12" molded wood (1885-86) except on North Wall (ca. 1920).

Chair Rail
Same as Room 203.

Cornice
Same as Room 201.

Doors
#2131. Same as #2021.
#2132. Four panel wood door with raised panels, two brass plated iron hinges, and wood knob (ca. 1920). Key marked “SOLID STEEL YALE & TOWNE MFG. CO. PTD. MAR. 81’ 96.”
#2133. Same as #2102.

Windows
Same as Room 201.

Heating

Lighting
Same as Room 207.

Room 213A

Room 213A was constructed as a closet for Room 213 about 1920.

Floor
Same as Room 204.

Ceiling
Same as Room 209.

Walls
Plaster (ca. 1920).

Baseboard
North Wall. Same as Room 213.

Other Features
Coat hook rail with metal hooks on North wall (ca. 1920).

Room 213B

Room 213B was constructed as a passageway between Rooms 213 and 214 about 1920.

Floor
2 1/4-3 1/2" wide tongue-and-groove boards (1885-86).

Ceiling
Same as Room 209.

Walls
Plaster (ca. 1920).

Room 214

Rooms 214 and 215 form another two-room bedroom suite. Like the other bedrooms on the second floor, they were remodeled about 1920. Both rooms are now used as offices.

Floor
Same as Room 213B.

Ceiling
Same as Room 201.

Walls
Same as Room 201.

Baseboard
Same as Room 201.

Cornice
Same as Room 201. Wood picture molding at level of window heads (ca. 1920).

Doors
#2142. Same as #2132. Opening cut through (ca. 1920).
#2143. Same as #2132. Opening original (1885-86).
#2144. Same as #2132 except undecorated metal hinges (ca. 1920). Opening original (1885-86) passageway to Room 218.

Windows
Same as Room 201.

Heating
Fireplace with carved wood Federal period mantel (early 19th century, reused ca. 1920) with brick firebox surround and polychromed tile hearth (ca. 1920). Baseboard radiation along east and north walls (1963-64).

Lighting
Same as Room 207.

Room 214A

Now a closet for Room 214, this space was originally a passageway to Room 213.

Floor
Same as Room 213A.

Ceiling
Same as Room 213A.

Walls
Same as Room 213A.

Room 215

Like the other circular tower rooms of the second floor, this room was probably used as a bedroom.

Floor
Same as Room 212.

Ceiling
Same as Room 201.

Walls
Same as Room 201.

Baseboard
7" molded wood (ca. 1920).

Cornice
Wood picture molding (ca. 1920).

Doors
#2151. Same as #2081.

Windows
Three 8/8-light double-hung wood sash (1885-86).

Heating
Fireplace with carved wood Federal period mantel (early 19th century, reused ca. 1920) with polychromed glazed tile firebox surround and octagonal quarry tile hearth (ca. 1920). Three convection units (1963-64).
Room 216

Doorway #2144 was originally an opening connecting Rooms 214 and 218. During Cornelia Pinchot’s remodeling of Grey Towers about 1920, Room 216 was created as a bathroom serving Room 214. Its finishes were the same as Room 212, another bathroom constructed about 1920. Room 216 is now used as a storage closet.

Floor
Same as Room 212.

Ceiling
Same as Room 212.

Walls
Same as Room 212.

Baseboard
Same as Room 212.

Windows
One 2/2 double-hung wood sash (ca. 1920).

Heating
Baseboard radiation along North wall (1963-64).

Lighting
Same as Room 212.

Other Features
Shelving along West wall (1963-64).

Room 217

Like Room 202, Room 217 is an extension of Room 201 which existed in the original plan of the second floor.

Floor
Same as Room 201.

Ceiling
Same as Room 201.

Walls
Same as Room 201.

Baseboard
Same as Room 201.

Chair Rail
Same as Room 201.

Cornice
Wood picture molding (ca. 1920).

Lighting
Same as Room 202.

Room 218

Room 218, originally a bedroom, was remodeled by Cornelia Pinchot around 1920. The major modifications involved the reduction of the size of the room through the construction of Rooms 216 and 218A. At that time, a new mantel was installed around the original fireplace opening, and a doorway in the West wall to Room 221 was cut through. During the 1963-64 work, Room 218 was extensively remodeled for use as a conference room. The original passageway in the Southwest corner to the service hallway, Room 219, was closed, as well as the 1920 bathroom doorway.

Floor
Same as Room 212.

Ceiling
Same as Room 201.

Walls
East Wall. Plaster (ca. 1920). North, West, & South Walls. Same as Room 201.

Baseboard
Same as Room 201. East wall (ca. 1920).

Chair Rail
Same as Room 201.

Cornice
Wood picture molding (ca. 1920).

Lighting
Same as Room 202.

Room 218A

Room 218A was constructed about 1920 as a closet for Room 218.

Floor
Same as Room 201.

Ceiling
Same as Room 201.

Walls
Same as Room 201.

Baseboard
Same as Room 201.

Windows
Same as Room 201.

Heating
Fireplace with carved wood mantel (early 19th century reused ca. 1920) with brick firebox surround and polychromed glazed tile hearth (ca. 1920).

Lighting
Eight ceiling-mounted fluorescent fixtures.

Rooms 219-230

Rooms 219-230 are located in the west wing of the building, which was originally constructed as the service wing of the house. In addition to the eight servants’ bedrooms (Rooms 223-230) located off the long corridor (Room 220), the second storey of the wing contained two bathrooms (Rooms 221, 226) and a small maid’s closet located in the present space of Room 222. Two stairways led to the first and third floors of the wing. The stairway to the first floor remains as originally constructed in Room 219, while the one to the third floor was located in the present spaces of Rooms 220 and 222.

During the 1963-64 renovation, all of the rooms in this part of the house were stripped of all of their finishes and trim. The spatial configuration of the seven bedrooms and their hallway was retained, but changes occurred to the plan in the eastern part of the second floor wing. The stairway to the third floor, with its maid’s closet underneath, was removed at this time and Rooms 220 and 222 created in its place. A small elevator to the first floor, which the Pinchots installed in 1939, was removed from the Southeast corner of Room 219. Room 221 retained its bathroom function but was completely rebuilt. Very little existing building fabric was saved in the 1960s renovation. The only material that remains...
Room 301, the large, third floor, central hallway, is very similar in character to Room 201, its second floor counterpart. Room 301 may have been left semi-finished when the building was originally constructed. It appears that much of the existing building fabric dates from the early remodelings by Gifford and Cornelia Pinchot, about 1915. Room 301 is now used as a meeting room.

Floor
- Vinyl asbestos tile (1963-64)
- Room 221. 1" square ceramic tile (1963-64).

Ceiling
- Plaster on metal lath (1963-64).

Walls
- Plaster on metal lath (1963-64)
- Room 221. 4" square ceramic tile wainscoting with plaster above (1963-64).

Baseboard
- Vinyl (1963-64).

Doors
- #2191 & #2192. Steel fire doors and frames (1963-64)
- #2211, #2201, #2231, #2241, #2251, #2261, #2271, #2281, #2291, #2301. 6 panel wood door with 3 brass-plated hinges and brass-plated knob set (1963-64).
- Plain wood trim (1963-64).

Windows
- Eleven 8/8 double-hung wood sash (1885-86)
- Molded wood trim (1885-86).

Heating
- Baseboard radiation along North, West and South exterior walls (1963-64).
- Convection units in Rooms 219 and 222 (1963-64).

Lighting
- Ceiling-mounted incandescent fixtures in Rooms 219, 220, 221, and 223 (1963-64)
- Two ceiling-mounted fluorescent fixtures in all other rooms.
- Room 220. Telephone panelboard and fire alarm pull station and bell (1963-64).

Plumbing
- Room 221. Ceramic water closet, lavatory and shower/tub (1963-64).
- Room 222. Enamed cast-iron lavatory (1963-64).

Stairway
- Room 219. Wood stairway to first floor. See Room 114. Wood stairway with turned newel post and balusters to third floor (1963-64).

THIRD FLOOR

Room 301

Room 301, the large, third floor, central hallway, is very similar in character to Room 201, its second floor counterpart. Room 301 may have been left semi-finished when the building was originally constructed. It appears that much of the existing building fabric dates from the early remodelings by Gifford and Cornelia Pinchot, about 1915. Room 301 is now used as a meeting room.

Floor
- 3" wide tongue-and-groove boards (1885-86) refinished (1963-64).

Ceiling
- Plaster (ca. 1915).

Walls
- Plaster (ca. 1915).

Baseboard
- 12" molded wood baseboard (ca. 1915).

Windows
- South Wall. One 6/6 double-hung wood sash (1885-86).

Heating
- Three convection units (1963-64).

Lighting
- 12-light ceiling-mounted incandescent chandelier in center of room (1963-64).
- Fire alarm pull box and bell in northwest corner (1963-64).

Stairway
- Wood stairway to second floor. See Room 201. Wood stairway with turned newel post and balusters to attic along East wall (ca. 1915).

Rooms 302, 302A & 302B

Room 302 was originally a larger room that included the space now taken up by Room 302A. Doorway #3021 was shifted to the east when Room 302A was constructed. Room 302B was an original closet for Room 302. Prior to 1963, Room 302 was equipped as a bathroom. It now serves as an anteroom to the library tower.
THIRD FLOOR PLAN
Room 302
Floor
Vinyl asbestos tile (1963-64).
Ceiling
Plaster (ca. 1915).
Walls
Plaster (ca. 1915).
Baseboard
6¼" molded wood baseboard (ca. 1915).
Doors
#3021. 5-panel door with decorative cast-iron hinge, porcelain knob and escutcheon, brass key escutcheon with porcelain cover, and brass mortise lock (all ca. 1915). Molded wood trim (ca. 1900).
#3022. Double 6-panel closet doors, each with brass-plated hinges and knob (1963-64).
#3023. Same as #3021. Molded wood trim (ca. 1915)
#3024. Same as #3021. Molded wood trim (ca. 1915).
Windows
Two 8/8 double-hung wood sash with molded trim (ca. 1915).
Heating
Original fireplace in East wall removed (ca. 1915).
2 convection unit and baseboard radiation along East and South walls (1963-64).
Lighting
6 light ceiling-mounted incandescent chandelier (1963-64).
2 light incandescent wall bracket on East wall (1963-64).

Rooms 302A and 302B
Floor
Same as Room 302.
Ceiling
Same as Room 302.
Walls
Same as Room 302.
Baseboard
Same as Room 302.
Lighting
Incandescent fixture (1963-64).
Other Features
302A. Molded wood coat hook rail, no hooks (ca. 1915).
302B. Wood shelving supported by metal brackets (ca. 1920).

Room 303
Room 303 was a tower bedroom, circular in plan. When originally constructed, the room had a fireplace along the north section of the wall. However, it appears that the fireplace was removed during Cornelia Pinchot’s remodeling. Room 303 is now used as a library.
Floor
Same as Room 302.
Ceiling
Same as Room 302. 2' diameter circular opening in center providing access to attic space above.
Walls
Same as Room 302.
Baseboard
Same as Room 302.
Cornice
Wood picture molding (ca. 1915).
Windows
Two 8/8 double-hung wood sash (1885-86). Molded wood trim (ca. 1915).
Heating
Two convection units (1963-64).
Lighting
Two ceiling-mounted fluorescent fixtures.

Rooms 304 and 304A
Room 304 is a large room which retains its original spatial configuration. In the first years following the house’s completion, it served as young Gifford and Amos Pinchot’s room. After Gifford and Cornelia’s son was born in 1915, this may have been the Nursery that existed on the third floor. Originally it may have been constructed with only the north fireplace along the east wall. During Cornelia Pinchot’s remodeling the south fireplace along the east wall was constructed. Before the 1963-64 renovation, Room 304A was a small bathroom that contained a tub and water closet. It is now used as a closet. Another closet was located in the space on the other side of doorway #3043; however, it was closed off during the 1963-64 renovation. Room 304 is now used as a conference room.
Floor
Same as Room 302.
Ceiling
Textured plaster (1963-64).

Room 304A
Floor
Same as Room 302.
Ceiling
Same as Room 302.
Walls
Same as Room 302.
Baseboard
Vinyl (1963-64).
Doors
#3041. Same as #3021.
#3042. Same as #3021, except for brass hinges (ca. 1915). Opening not original
#3043. Same as #3021.
Windows
Heating
Two fireplaces with carved marble mantels (ca. 1830, installed ca. 1915) with decorative cast-iron firebox surround and small octagonal quarry tile hearths. Baseboard radiation along east and south walls (1963-64).
Lighting
Eight ceiling-mounted fluorescent fixtures (1963-64).

Room 305
Room 305 is another circular tower room. During the early 1920s, it probably served as a guest room. A fireplace and mantel along the south wall were removed during the 1963-64 renovation. It is now used as an office.
Floor
Same as Room 302.
Ceiling  
Same as Room 303.

Walls  
Same as Room 302.

Baseboard  
Same as Room 304.

Cormice  
Same as Room 303.

Windows  
Same as Room 303.

Heating  
Same as Room 303.

Lighting  
Same as Room 303.

**Rooms 306 and 306A**

Rooms 306 and 306A still retain their original spatial configuration. Room 306 was apparently used as a dressing room for Room 307. Room 306A was remodelled as a bathroom during Clifford and Cornelia's occupancy. During the 1963-64 renovation, a tub, water closet, and lavatory were removed, and the wall of the hallway to Room 307 was rebuilt. Room 306 originally had a fireplace along the west wall, but it was apparently removed during the remodeling carried out by Cornelia Pinchot. During the 1963-64 renovation, a small room similar to Room 306A was closed off on the north side of doorway #3063. A doorway to Room 308 in the West wall was also closed off.

**Room 306**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floor</td>
<td>Same as Room 302.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>Same as Room 302.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>Same as Room 302.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseboard</td>
<td>Same as Room 304.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Doors     | #3061. Same as #3021.  
            #3062. Same as #3021.  
            #3063. Same as #3021.  
            #3064. Same as #3021. |
| Windows   | Same as Room 302. |
| Heating   | Baseboard radiation along east wall (1963-64).  
            Two convection units (1963-64). |
| Lighting  | Seven ceiling-mounted fluorescent fixtures (1963-64). |

**Room 306A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floor</td>
<td>Same as Room 302.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>Same as Room 302.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Walls     | South and East Walls. Same as Room 302.  
            North Wall. Plaster (1963-64). |
| Baseboard | Same as Room 302. |
| Lighting  | Same as Room 302A. |

**Room 307**

Another circular tower room, Room 307 underwent the same alterations as Room 305 during the 1963-64 renovation when a fireplace and mantel were removed. A door that separated the circular tower section of the room from the hall was also removed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floor</td>
<td>Same as Room 302.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>Same as Room 303.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls</td>
<td>Same as Room 302.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseboard</td>
<td>Same as Room 302.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornice</td>
<td>Same as Room 303.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating</td>
<td>Three convection units (1963-64).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Same as Room 303.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rooms 308-312**

These five rooms all date from the 1963-64 renovation. Prior to that time, the area was a large bedroom, with closets and a bathroom. It may have been, "The Tutor's Room" during the early 1920s. Everything within the four walls that form the perimeter of Rooms 308 to 311 was gutted. Room 312 is a new enclosed stair hall dating from 1963-64. The present uses for the rooms are as follows:

- Room 308: Women's lounge.
- Room 309: Women's toilet room.
- Room 310: Men's toilet room.
- Room 311: Janitor's closet.
- Room 312: Stairhall to service wing.

**Room 308**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floor</td>
<td>Same as Room 302.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>Same as Room 304.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Walls     | Plaster on metal lath (1963-64).  
            North and east walls in original locations. |
| Baseboard | Same as Room 304. |
| Doors     | #3081. Same as #3021 in pre 1963 location. |
| Windows   | One 6/6 double-hung wood sash (1885-86).  
            Ceramic water closet and lavatory (1963-64). |
| Heating   | One convection unit (1963-64).  
            Ceiling-mounted incandescent fixture (1963-64).  
            One fluorescent fixture over large mirror on south wall (1963-64). |
| Plumbing  | Ceramic water closet and lavatory (1963-64). |

**Room 309**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floor</td>
<td>1&quot; square ceramic tile (1963-64).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>Plaster (1963-64).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Walls     | Same as Room 308.  
            North and east wall in original location. |
| Doors     | #3091. Same as #3021 (relocated 1963-64). |
| Windows   | One 6/6 double-hung wood sash (1885-86).  
            Ceiling-mounted incandescent fixture (1963-64). |
| Heating   | Same as Room 308.  
            Ceiling-mounted incandescent fixture (1963-64). |
| Plumbing  | Ceramic water closet and lavatory (1963-64). |

**Room 310**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floor</td>
<td>Same as Room 309.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceiling</td>
<td>Same as Room 309.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Walls  Same as Room 308. North and west walls in original locations.

Doors  #3101. Same as #3021 except relocated and rehung on new hinges (1963-64).

Heating  Same as Room 308.

Lighting  Same as Room 309. Fluorescent fixture over wall mirror (1963-64).

Plumbing  Ceramic water closet, urinal and lavatory (1963-64).

Room 311

Floor  Same as Room 302.

Ceiling  Same as Room 309.

Walls  Same as Room 308. East and South walls in original position.

Baseboard  Same as Room 304.

Doors  #3111. Same as #3101.

Lighting  Same as Room 302A.

Plumbing  Enameled cast-iron sink (1963-64).

Room 312

Floor  Same as Room 302.

Ceiling  Same as Room 309.

Walls  Same as Room 308. East and South walls in original position.

Baseboard  5" molded wood baseboard (1963-64).

Doors  #3121 and #3122. Steel fire doors and frames (1963-64).


Heating  Same as Room 308.

Lighting  Two ceiling-mounted and one wall-mounted incandescent fixture (1963-64).

Other Features  #313A. Closet with wood shelving (ca. 1920).

Stairway  Wood stairway to second floor. See Room 219.

Room 313

Floor  Random-width softwood boards between 6" and 12" wide (1885-86). Patch at east end (1963-64).

Ceiling  Same as Room 309.

Walls  Same as Room 308.

Doors  #3133. Double 4 panel wood doors on steel hinges (ca. 1920).


Heating  Ductwork for mechanical ventilating system at east end (1963-64). Hot water space heater along west wall (1963-64).

Lighting  Two surface-mounted incandescent fixtures (1963-64).

Other Features  #313A. Closet with wood shelving (ca. 1920).

Room 314

Floor  Same as Room 313.

Ceiling  Same as Room 309.

Walls  Same as Room 308.

Doors  #3141. 4 panel wood door on steel hinges (ca. 1915). #3142. 4 panel wood door with wood knob and escutcheon cover, brass key escutcheon (pre 1900, reused ca. 1915).


Heating  Same as Room 308.

Lighting  One surface-mounted incandescent fixture (1963-64).

Other Features  314A. Closet with coat hook rail, wood shelving and wood pole (all ca. 1915).

ATTIC

The Attic consists of Room A1, a large T-shaped unfinished space on two levels, and Room A2, a small enclosed storage area. The floor of the upper level of Room A1, located over Room 301, probably dates from about 1915 when Room 301 was remodeled. Room A2 also dates from about 1915. Both attic rooms are now used for storage. Their volumes are defined by the sloping of the roofs.

Room A1

Floor  Lower Level. Tongue-and-groove boards, 2½"-3½" wide (1885-86), running North-South. Upper Level. 5½" wide tongue-and-groove boards (ca. 1915), running East-West.

Ceiling and Walls  Exposed roof framing and sheathing, 2" x 9½" rafters, 18" on center. Random width sheathing 6½" to 18½" wide (1885-86).

Doors  Hatch to Third Floor. Six panel wood door, held open with window sash weight (19th century, reused ca. 1915). #A11, 4-panel wood door with decorative hinges (19th century reused ca. 1915).

Windows  Two dormers, (1885-86) closed with beaded board panels (ca. 1915).

Lighting  Ceiling-mounted incandescent fixture (1963-64).

Other Features  Aluminum radio antenna (1963-64). Two wood ventilators.

Room A2

Floor  Same as Room A1, Lower Level.

Ceiling  Horizontal tongue-and-groove beaded boards, 3" wide (ca. 1915).

Walls  Same as ceiling.

Baseboard  6½" plain baseboard (ca. 1915).

Windows  Dormer with 6/6 double-hung wood sash, added after the original construction.

Lighting  Same as Room A1.

Other Features  Built-in wood shelving with chamfered shelf supports (ca. 1915). Paper tags on shelves marked "PRINTS", "20 CRUCKSHANK ENGRAVINGS", and "OLD MUSIC". Cylindrical bronze water storage tank (ca. 1900).
OUTBUILDINGS

The Letter Box

During the late 1920s, a small masonry structure was built for Gifford Pinchot, on the hillside to the northeast of the main residence. The building became known as “The Letter Box,” since it served as the headquarters of the staff who answered the governor’s mail. Other political activities, such as the planning of campaigns and the interviewing of constituents, were centered in this outbuilding, thus isolating the office functions from the main residence. Following the government’s acquisition of the property in 1963, the building was remodelled to serve as the Conservation Institute’s publication office. At this time, the basement was extensively renovated to accommodate restroom facilities. In recent years, the main floor’s space has been used as an exhibition area of historic displays relating to Grey Towers.

Exterior Description

This one-storey building with full basement is rectangular in plan (18’9” x 30’9”). The walls, of coursed rubble stone, gray in color, have roughly dressed stone quoins at the four corners. A belt course of stone similar to the quoins accents the main facade’s parapet, which is capped by a roughly dressed bluestone coping. The gable roof was originally covered with copper, but is now covered with a built-up asphalt roof (circa 1963-64). The most prominent feature of the facade is a niche-like entranceway, from which a semi-circular portico of cast-concrete projects. Two elongated Corinthian columns support the plain entablature, while two pilasters flank the entranceway. The porch floor is a monolithic, circular bluestone slab (8’5” diameter). The heavily varnished eight-panel door is a replacement, installed circa 1963-64. The windows contain their original 15/15 double-hung sash. Below each window is a small, rectangular basement window, reglazed circa 1963-64. The roof is drained by four scuppers that penetrate the stone parapet and empty into decorative copper leader heads and pipes. The rear elevation has two large windows which contain their original 9/9 sash. Below are two openings: the one to the south dates from 1963-64, while the other is original. Both contain hollow metal doors circa 1963-64.

Interior Description

BASEMENT

This space was totally remodeled (circa 1963-64), creating two public toilet rooms and a boiler room. The floor level was lowered 8” after an early concrete floor was removed, and the present concrete floor was installed circa 1963-64. All finishes date from this remodeling.

FIRST FLOOR

This large room originally served as Gifford Pinchot’s “Campaign Headquarters.” The basic configuration of the space is as constructed, although the various finishes have been changed. The most drastic modifications, made circa 1963-64, were the removal of the fireplace on the east wall, the removal of a storage cabinet along the south wall, and the covering of the flagstone floor.

Room 101

Floor

Vinyl asbestos tile, 9” x 9”, brown and white (circa 1963-64).

Ceiling

Metal lath and acoustical plaster (circa 1963-64).

Walls

Metal lath and plaster (circa 1963-64).

Baseboard

Black vinyl base, 6” (circa 1963-64).

Doors

#1011. Exterior eight-panel oak door, top two panels are arched. Plain oak trim, 4”. Wrought bronze thumb latch on exterior, bronze handle on interior, three iron butt hinges (circa 1963-64).

Windows

Two, 15/15 double chain-hung sash.

Two, 9/9 double chain-hung sash, all with molded trim, 4½” and brackets for roll window shades (original fabric).

Heating

Six hot-air floor grates and one air intake grate (circa 1963-64).

Lighting

One large hanging glass globe (incandescent), seven small flat globes (incandescent), concealed fluorescent tubes around balcony (all circa 1963-64).

Other Features


Balcony, bolted steel framing, tongue-and-groove floor boards, 5¼” wide. Handrail with wood balusters, 2½” x 2½” and wood handrail 2” x 5½” (original fabric). Shelving was removed from this handrail and the present lighting and plywood installed (circa 1963-64).

Figure 78. The Letter Box interior, 1978.
The "Bait Box" is a small masonry and frame structure built on a hillside to the north of the main residence. It was constructed during the early 1920s as a childhood playhouse for Gifford B. Pinchot, born in 1915. The name "Bait Box" reflects the family's interest in fishing. The basement of the building was at one time used as a blacksmith shop. Much of the original interior fabric of this building was replaced in the early 1960s renovations.

Exterior Description

The Bait Box comprises two distinct structures: a wood frame structure, rectangular in plan (17' x 27'), one storey high with partial basement, and an elaborate "manneristic" stone facade with an octagonal forecourt. The facade is laid up in coursed rubble stone that rises to a stone parapet with a rough dressed stone coping. The most prominent feature of the front elevation is the entry bay, consisting of nail studded double entry doors and a carved, granite, crosseted architrave. Flanking this opening are two cast-concrete spiral columns with composite capitals in style, not unlike those Cornelia Pinchot added to the dining room. Set into the granite lintel above the door are the words "The Bait Box" cast in bronze. Above the entry is a broken pediment, with dressed stone coping, in which a carved stone cartouche, emblazoned with two intertwined dolphins, is set. The entrance is flanked by diagonally projecting bays, each having two windows that are surmounted by splayed flat stone arches. The forecourt walls are laid up in coursed rubble to match the facade, although they may be of a slightly later date. The east and west walls contain elliptical openings framed in rough cut stone. The forecourt entrance is flanked by two arched openings: the one to the east had a gate, now missing, while the one to the west has been closed with poured concrete to form a niche for a classical statue. The main portion of the building's structure is wood frame, covered with 4½" clapboards, set on a poured concrete foundation. The frame structure that projects from the rear basement level dates from 1963-64, while the porch with the decorative wrought-iron railing is original (although all wood members were replaced circa 1963-64). The hipped roof, originally of copper, is now covered with a built-up asphalt roof dating from 1963-64.
Interior Description

BASEMENT
The south section is an unexcavated crawl space. A wood storage shed was removed circa 1963-64. During the remodeling (ca. 1963-64) the concrete floor was patched, a wood frame extension was added to the north, the window in the east wall was blocked up, and a new hollow metal door was installed in the existing door opening. A new gas-fired, hot-air furnace and duct work were also installed. The present interior finishes date from the 1963-64 renovation, although they duplicate the original appearance. The most important change made was the removal of several built-in shelf units located around the periphery of the room.

FIRST FLOOR
Floor
Laminated oak parquet, 9" x 9" (ca. 1963-64).

Ceiling
Metal lath and rough troweled plaster.
Six false ceiling beams, 8" x 6", rough finish (original fabric).

Walls
Metal lath and plaster, white sand paint (ca. 1963-64).

Cornice
Same as false beams (original fabric).

Baseboard
Plain varnished oak 7 1/2" base with applied 1" oak molding (ca. 1963-64).

Doors
#1011. Exterior double oak door, fourteen panels, varnished. Three brass butt hinges on each leaf (ca. 1963-64—duplicate original). The wrought-iron pintles, massive iron ring knocker, and iron door nails are all from original door. Molded wood trim 3 1/2" wide (original fabric).
#1012-3. Two oak doors with louvered panels, plain oak trim, 4 1/2" wide, brass butt hinges, brass latches (ca. 1963-64).
#1014. Double doors, eight lights each leaf, plain oak trim, brass butt hinges and latch (ca. 1963-64—Duplicate original).

Windows
South wall, four eight-light, pine-frame casements, brass butt hinges and latches, plain oak trim (ca. 1963-64—duplicates original). North wall, projecting bay with two twelve-light, pine casement sash, one double sixteen-light casement flanked by two eight-light single casements, all with plain oak trim (ca. 1963-64—duplicates original). The brass closing hardware is reused from the original windows.

Heating
Five baseboard-mounted hot-air registers, one small floor register. "Honeywell" thermostat on the north wall (ca. 1963-64).

Lighting
Six-light incandescent chandelier (ca. 1963-64). Two pressed tin hanging lanterns and brackets (old) made for candles but now electrified.

Equipment
Fireplace on west wall. Sunken hearth pit of 2" thick bluestone slabs. Firebrick lining, 4 1/2" bluestone surround, 6" stone mantel shelf resting on projecting stone brackets (rebuilt ca. 1963-64).
**PROBLEMS OF REPAIR**

As the previous sections of this report demonstrate, Grey Towers is a total environment—buildings, landscape, and collections—of great cultural significance. There is no question that it is one of the principal monuments relating to the history of American conservation. The entire estate merits careful preservation and restoration because of its historical association with Gifford Pinchot, the intrinsic architectural quality of the house and outbuildings and their connection with Richard Morris Hunt, and the environmental quality of the grounds.

**MAIN HOUSE**

The general physical condition of the main house is good. It has enjoyed a high level of maintenance during both the Pinchot residency and the period of Forest Service stewardship. During the 1960s many of the elements which normally cause problems for old buildings received considerable attention. The electrical, plumbing, water distribution, and heating systems were completely renewed. The roof was repaired and a new fire detection system installed. Extensive structural rehabilitation occurred, especially to the deteriorated first floor framing system.

However, the remodeling of the house in 1963-64 seriously affected the historical integrity of the building. Although most rooms were altered to some extent, the first floor dining room (Room 107) and the second floor service wing (Rooms 218-230) experienced the most complete alteration. These changes were made in an effort to institutionalize the character of the house for its new use as a conference and study center.

Although the house has been extensively remodeled, the entire building is worthy of careful restoration. While restoration cannot bring back the historic building fabric that was removed, it could return much of the house’s lost architectural quality and ambience, by the use of reproduction or compatible modern elements. All of the pre-1963 building fabric left in the house is significant and should be preserved, whether it is original or part of the early twentieth century remodelings.

**BASEMENT**

During the 1963-64 renovation, the floors of Rooms B-1 and B-2 were excavated to provide additional headroom. However, in excavating the floors, the bottoms of the foundation walls, and in some cases the footings, were exposed. This condition in conjunction with the improper sloping of the ground has resulted in water penetrating the south wall of Room B-1 and the west wall of B-2. Recent foundation plantings, which are historically inaccurate, may be compounding this problem in other sections of the basement by trapping moisture against the exterior walls.

Another moisture problem exists in the crawlspace to the west of Room B-1. There a water source of indeterminate origin is leaking onto the floor of Room B-1.

**EXTERIOR WALLS**

In some sections, such as the east wall, the original masonry pointing has failed and the joints are now open to the weather. In other areas, such as the west wall turret, the original pointing has been replaced with modern portland cement mortar, which is different in composition, appearance and physical characteristics. Incompatible portland cement can cause damage to old masonry because of its extensive rigidity, lack of plasticity, and great density compared with historic lime or lime and cement mortar.
The exterior woodwork needs to be repainted to protect the wood. The caulking between wood window and door trim and masonry wall openings has failed in places and needs to be renewed. The molded wood trim of the south cornice of the main house is missing and needs to be replaced.

ROOFS
The dormer, chimney, and turret flashings have failed in places causing damage to interior finishes. The original iron turret caps and vents require treatment to prevent corrosion and then repainting. The pointing of all the brick chimneys has deteriorated, and many joints are completely open to the weather. In some chimneys as much as 70% of the joints must be repointed with compatible, modern, lime-base mortar. The breakdown of the mortar joints has been accompanied by the spalling of the brick faces in some locations.

OUTBUILDINGS
The general condition of the outbuildings is not as good as that of the house because of the lack of adequate maintenance beginning apparently in the 1930s. Partly as a result, the interiors of the Bait Box and the Letter Box were heavily remodeled, during 1963-64. The entire interior of the Bait Box was removed, and major alterations occurred to the Letter Box, such as the removal of the original fireplace.

Both buildings are currently suffering damage to their exterior masonry walls caused by leaking roof gutters and flashings. Water is penetrating the walls and is saturating the stonework causing the mortar to break down. Salts from the mortar are being dissolved by the moisture and precipitated out on the surface of the stone walls causing efflorescence and staining.

In addition to the gutters and flashings, the sheet metal roof coverings of both buildings have deteriorated and have been coated with asphalt roofing cement, which have compounded the problems and contributed to additional deterioration. A further complication in the roofing systems is the use of dissimilar metals (copper and iron) in the gutters and leaders of the Letter Box which has resulted in electrolysis and the corrosion of the iron rainwater heads connecting the gutters and leaders.

As with the main house, recent repointing of the masonry walls with incompatible portland cement mortar has caused additional problems for the outbuildings. The caulking between wood door and window trim and masonry wall openings needs to be renewed and the exterior woodwork requires repainting.

The Icehouse also has been remodeled since 1963 and requires repairs to the stucco wall covering and asphalt shingle roof. The original doors have been replaced and the cupolas rebuilt.
ANALYSIS OF SITE

As a cultural and recreational resource the landscape at Grey Towers is as important as the house. In its evolution, it parallels the development of the house and is very evocative of Gifford Pinchot's role in the history of American conservation. The maintenance and interpretation of the landscape demands curatorial attention as careful as that which the buildings it supports requires. Neglect began during the last years of Pinchot family ownership, and the introduction of a variety of incompatible features such as a large parking lot and some unnecessary shrubbery since 1963 have done much to diminish the historical integrity of the site. However, much of the landscape created by the Pinchots has survived, although in modified form.

The preservation and interpretation of the historic landscape at Grey Towers will present some complex problems. Unlike buildings, a landscape forms a constantly evolving ecosystem which never reaches a cut-off point. A stylized period landscape requires extremely careful maintenance; the grounds at Grey Towers were designed with the expectation that they would be maintained intensively. If the maintenance is not carried out in the manner intended, then the landscape evolves into something different from the original design.

It is essential that the grounds of Grey Towers be the subject of a detailed historical and physical investigation—a historic landscape report—to determine how much they vary from their historic condition. Full public appreciation of the man-made landscape at Grey Towers will come only with a complete understanding of its creation, which transformed a bleak hillside into a beautiful estate.
ANALYSIS OF EXISTING COLLECTIONS AND FURNISHINGS

This section is a room-by-room summary of the collections material and furnishings of Grey Towers as they were in the fall of 1977. Wherever possible, materials which date from the Pinchot ownership of the property are surveyed and identified. The existing interpretive uses of each room are also included in the room-by-room survey.

Although many of the furnishings are modern in origin, having been installed since 1963, nevertheless there still remain many collection items from the period of Pinchot family ownership. These items range from some that are of importance only because of their Pinchot association to rare art items of great value. However, many of the pre-1963 materials are in a serious state of repair caused by improper conservation treatment, visitor abuse, or general neglect. Many of these items require immediate attention if they are to be saved.

Virtually all of the office and conference furniture that has been installed since 1963 is institutional in character and incompatible with the ambiance of Grey Towers. These furnishings do much to diminish the visual quality of the building.

FIRST FLOOR

Room 101

Pinchot family material includes a large trestle table of 19th-century manufacture. French marbletop tables, highback chairs with dragon arms, four court cupboards (late 19th century), statuary, urns, and a radio (ca. 1920-30) are all a part of this large area. A covered couch may also be of Pinchot family ownership.

A couch with vinyl cushions may have been part of the furnishings of the Yale School of Forestry. Lighting fixtures of modern manufacture are totally inappropriate for the setting. The Hall will have complex lighting requirements in order to accommodate large group visitation and historical interpretation. The furniture is highly diversified in style ranging from Renaissance Revival to contemporary styles which enjoyed widespread popularity during the 1960s.

Room 104

This room contains office furniture (post 1963) and shelves for the storage of printed materials (early 20th century). The location of the room provides good access but poor visibility of the Hall.
Room 105

An extensive library dealing with natural history and conservation forms a nucleus for study and public visitation. The room is well equipped and lighted for study and interpretation. However, exterior doors and natural light offer a potential for visitor traffic problems, as well as a need for special security and conservation measures.

The Library, like all the rooms in Grey Towers, reflects the various periods of family and institutional use of the building and grounds. Pinchot family furnishings include statuary, a veneer screen, vases, a leather screen, and two easy chairs—one of possibly 18th-century New England origin, and the other a reproduction of the first. Many of the Pinchot family books originally in the Library are now in storage on the third floor.

Since 1963 the Library and many other rooms have been furnished with reproduction “Early American” furniture. Pieces in this category include two library tables, each with six side chairs of Chippendale form. A library ladder, two transitional reproduction arm chairs, and a pier table are also a part of the room’s decor. A trophy case of modern construction (post 1950) was installed after 1963.

Indirect lighting was installed after 1963. Much of the furniture has suffered from extensive refinishing. A rotating bookcase, probably of Pinchot ownership, is located near the Gifford Pinchot Office door. Its location is in a high visitor traffic area. The fireback in the fireplace is probably 17th or early 18th-century French manufacture, and may definitely be attributed to Pinchot ownership. Another Pinchot Family piece is a bench of South Pacific origin.

Room 106

Many small objects and memorabilia are located in this important office area. The desk and office equipment were probably installed during Gifford Pinchot’s tenure. The confined space suggests a problem in access and egress for visiting groups. Formal framed printed material is suffering from poor matting and acid migration, which is causing acute deterioration. The office includes a wide variety of small objects owned by the Pinchot family such as a Chinese chest of drawers, an American 18th-century Windsor continuous armchair, 19th-century table, photographs, prints, radio, screen and a late 19th century Windsor chair. Additional 20th-century material such as office equipment, an early telephone, and dictating equipment all have excellent possibilities for high visitor appeal.

The large desk includes many small objects belonging to Gifford Pinchot: A fishing jacket, paintings, maps, and store...
documents are also located in this room. Because of the limited space, there will be a real challenge in interpreting the office to visiting groups.

Room 107

This room is of tremendous proportions, even in contrast with the rest of the house. It is “decorated” in a manner indicating high institutional use.

The post-1963 conference furniture is overwhelming in its size and form. A large conference table with twenty chairs commands most of the room’s space. The room is equipped with audio-visual facilities, including a retractable movie screen and small projection booth (Room 112).

A large wall mural has suffered from excessive exposure to natural light, heavy refinishing and surface abrasion from visitors who are forced to walk the length of the mural in a narrow passageway between the wall and conference table.

The Pinchot family furnishings in the room have been placed in a grouping around the fireplace as a contrast to the room’s obvious conference function. All of the Pinchot family objects in the room suffer from improper use and treatment. A pier table has been damaged by water. Reproduction 19th-century French armchairs are placed in direct sunlight, which has contributed to their fabric deterioration.

The tilt-top American 18th-century table may very well be one of the finest pieces of furniture in Grey Towers. It has been excessively refinished with some heavy varnish causing extensive damage to its patination. Some statuary and two classical pillars are also attributed to Pinchot family ownership.

An important oil painting on panel (Italian 17th century?) is in need of immediate treatment for warpage and panel separation. A pine board stretcher has been nailed to its reverse to accommodate hanging.

Room 109

Primary use of this room is as a storage room for furniture used in Room 107.

Room 112

Projection equipment servicing Room 107. Access is gained through a hall so that the conference area is not disturbed by service personnel. Equipment is intact and operable and could be used in other areas of the building.

Room 114

No collections noted. Wall treatment and floor surface indicate institutional changes.

Room 115

The kitchen has high visitor interpretation potential because of its original use and because so much of the historic building fabric remains. The furniture is nonderependent and may date from after 1963. The room is now used as a staff kitchen and is not included in public tours.

Room 117

Now used as a maintenance workshop, this room contains tools and equipment dating from after 1963.

Room 118

No Pinchot furniture or decorative arts material is currently located in this room; the limited Pinchot material formerly there is now on the second floor. Room 118 is being converted to a first aid station.

Figure 89. Room 107, 1978. The large painting on canvas, attached to the plaster wall, is one of the only decorative finishes that survive in the room from the Pinchot period.

SECOND FLOOR

Room 201

Lighting fixtures of modern manufacture are totally inappropriate for the character of the room. The room contains a large reception table of 20th-century construction and folding chairs, settee, sofa, drop-leaf pedestal table, two wood bookcases and a steel filing cabinet (all post 1963).

Room 203

Pinchot material in this room includes a small settee, one painting and some small statuary. Institutional furnishings include three tables, chairs and a filing cabinet (all post 1963).

Room 204

Although historically Gifford Pinchot’s bedroom, Room 204 is now used as a staff lounge and is not exhibited to the public, it contains tables, chairs and a filing cabinet (all post 1963).

Room 207

Paintings, statuary, clocks, rug and oriental lacquered screen are all from Pinchot Family holdings. A reproduction Empire settee, modern block front desk, filing cabinets and a slab-top table were installed since 1963.

Room 208

This room contains a circle table with four reproduction chairs and steel shelving (all post 1963).

Room 210

This room contains office equipment, communications transmitter, filing cabinets, desks and chairs (all post 1963). The prints are from the Pinchot collections.

Room 213

Xerox machine, filing cabinets, steel shelving, chalkboards, water cooler and side table (all post 1963) are included in this room.
Room 214

This room is now used by seasonal guides. It contains important 19th-century paintings in need of restoration and drawings, work table, desk and chairs (all formerly Pinchot). It also contains five bookcases, a desk and a chair (post 1963).

Room 215

This room contains 19th-century paintings (formerly Pinchot) as well as a desk, chairs, filing cabinets, a table and general office equipment (all post 1963).

Room 218

Used as a conference room, this room contains statuary on the fireplace mantel (Pinchot in origin) along with a large oval table with claw-ball pedestal legs, leather armchairs, a side table and photographs (all post 1963).

Rooms 222-230

Now used for storage, these rooms are furnished with U.S. Forest Service equipment including storage cabinets with dust seals, photographic equipment, drawing files, matte and paper-cutting boards, desks and tables (all post 1963).

THIRD FLOOR

Room 301

Room used by community groups for lectures and meetings. Modern folding chairs arranged for approximately 80 people.

Room 302

Used for the storage of chairs for Room 301.

Room 303

Modern table, chairs and filing cabinets arranged in a manner indicating storage rather than office use.

Room 304

An elaborate conference facility with substantial seating capacity, this room contains 5 conference tables, with seating for 30, a side table, chalk board and bookcases, all installed since 1963.

Room 305

Sparsely furnished room not in active use containing modern bookcases, table and 6 chairs.

Room 306

A reading and conference area containing desks, chairs and 7 tiers of book cases, all installed after 1963.

Room 307

A little used space containing a modern desk and table as well as printed and photographic material relating to the Pinchot family and the Forest Service.

Room 308

Women's rest room containing a modern couch.

Note

Since this section of the report was prepared in late 1977, a number of changes have occurred. Most important, all artifacts and other materials have been removed from the Letter Box and Bait Box to a stable climate and greater security in rooms 222-230. The conference furniture intrusion upon the first floor rooms viewed by the public has been removed, and to the extent possible, an attempt has been made to place as many as possible of the Pinchot artifacts, including artwork and furniture, in believable settings observable by the public during tours. All of this work is preparatory to the more permanent curatorial, exhibition, and interpretive work in the future.
Figure 90. Grey Towers from the northeast (rear elevation), circa 1963. The triple windows and chimney were added by Gifford and Cornelia Pinchot when Room 107 was remodeled.
RECOMMENDATIONS

RESTORATION OBJECTIVES

Because of the significance of Grey Towers, the entire property—buildings, grounds, and collections—merits restoration to the conditions that existed when it was owned by the Pinchot family. That is, as much as possible, the property should be returned to its pre-1963 appearance. As many as possible of the inappropriate post-1963 changes to the property, which detract from its character, should be reversed. A long-range construction program needs to be prepared and adopted in which routine maintenance is used to help accomplish these restoration objectives. For example, as various parts of the buildings, such as roofs or walls, require repair or replacement, the work should be carried out in a way that conforms with the overall goals of the restoration of the property to its appearance under Pinchot ownership.

The degree of restoration treatment required for the various parts of the estate vary according to their significance and the intended uses they are to accommodate. In the main house, rooms such as the entrance hall, library, living/dining room, and Gifford Pinchot’s tower office merit careful restoration because of their intrinsic importance and potential interpretive value. Because these rooms will be open to the public, they are to be restored as accurately as possible to their condition during Pinchot ownership using careful historical and architectural research.

Those rooms, such as the second floor bedroom, that will continue to be used for offices and meeting spaces, should be treated in a manner that preserves all of their historic building fabric intact. Where modifications are required to accommodate new functional requirements, they should be carried out in a modern, straightforward manner that complements the existing historic building fabric and maintains the integrity of the spaces. In rooms given over to modern, adaptive uses, the reproduction of historic appearances is less of a consideration than for those spaces that are to be exhibited to the public. The selection of esthetically compatible finishes and fixtures is a major concern, not only out of respect for the integrity of the property, but also to create comfortable and attractive work spaces.

Many of the elements installed during the 1963-64 remodeling, such as the textured ceilings and lighting fixtures, simply are not compatible in style, texture, color, or form with the existing character of the building. Their fault is not in being modern, but in esthetic incongruity that makes the spaces less pleasant than they might be. Further, many of them represent the institutional styles of their period. However, fashions have changed and the 1960s renovations at Grey Towers now look dated, as well as incoherent in their setting.

Because Grey Towers is owned by the Federal government and has been designated a National Historic Landmark, all proposed modifications to the estate, buildings and grounds must be subject to Section 106 reviews under the provisions of Public Law 89-665, commonly called the National Historic Preservation Act. These reviews are carried out by representatives of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the Forest Service and the State of Pennsylvania’s Historic Preservation Officer. The purpose of the review process is to determine whether the expenditure of funds or the taking of action by a Federal agency will have an adverse effect on a property listed in the National Register of Historic Places. If a review determines that a poten-

tial adverse effect will result, then steps must be taken to mitigate the adverse effect.

PROPOSED USES

Grey Towers is well suited for a unique combination of uses that will preserve and enhance the historical integrity of the structures and their setting while accommodating the needs of the Pinchot Institute for Conservation Studies and its programs. At the same time, the property can remain available for public appreciation as an important monument significant in the history of conservation.

Because of the enduring, overriding importance of a nationally significant cultural resource like Grey Towers, its preservation and esthetic integrity must remain a principle concern throughout the planning, development, and operation of the property. The modern adaptive use inherent in the Pinchot Institute programs should be planned and conducted in a manner that will not adversely affect the qualities of significance and integrity that merited the designation of Grey Towers as a National Historic Landmark. The same should be said for public visitation. Pinchot Institute activities and public visitation should not unduly intrude upon each other. It is very important that all of these interests and needs be accommodated through careful planning, design, and management consistent with modern historic preservation principles.

HISTORIC SITE

As one of the major monuments associated with the history of American conservation and the development of the U.S. Forest Service, it is very appropriate that Grey Towers remain open to the public as a historic site. In developing other uses for the property, the significance and integrity of Grey Towers must be kept in mind and only those uses that reinforce these qualities should be developed. The entire property should be preserved and restored and the new uses fitted to the building rather than the other way around.

MEETING AND CONFERENCE CENTER

Grey Towers has the potential to become a major conservation study center because of its historical associations and unique character. The main house is currently used as a meeting and conference center on a limited basis. There are several drawbacks for using the building in this manner, including the lack of overnight accommodations and adequate dining facilities for people attending meetings. Another drawback is the present institutional character of the meeting spaces in the main house. It is recommended that Grey Towers be used for short meetings and conferences, especially those related to the conservation and preservation of the natural and man-made environment. Limited meal service can be provided but off site facilities must be utilized for overnight accommodations. Because the house will be restored and furnished with historic furniture and other collections items, Grey Towers will be an attractive meeting and conference center with a special character that would provide participants with a unique experience. The facility could be used for Forest Service in-service training programs and meetings as well as for conferences involving other governmental agencies and private interests.

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION CENTER

Through the use of interpretive programs drawing upon indoor exhibits and outdoor walks, the estate can be used as a teaching tool for environmental education, focusing on forest management and utilization. The conference facilities in the house can also be used as teaching spaces for short courses.
CONSERVATION HALL OF FAME

A national conservation hall of fame in the form of a forest trail can be established on the estate grounds away from the historic landscaped areas. The hall of fame would consist of metal plaques spaced along the trail. Such a program should avoid any intrusion upon the cultural resources of Grey Towers, since that would be inconsistent with the kind of conservation principles the program should promote.

GREY TOWERS

As the principal building on the estate, the house requires the most preservation attention and offers the greatest potential to accommodate future uses. As is the case with all of the buildings at Grey Towers, a final historic structure report needs to be prepared to guide future restoration work. A program of scientific paint analysis is required to provide additional information for the restoration and historic paint colors for repainting the house. Carefully prepared contract documents consisting of drawings and specifications based on the historic structure report are needed to direct the restoration work. These drawings and specifications should reflect modern historic preservation practice and technology. The immediate repairs can be carried out now without the completion of the final historic structure report. However, these repairs should be guided by contract documents determined by modern preservation practice and technology.

IMMEDIATE REPAIRS

Remove or replace all deteriorated roof flashings and chimney crickets.

Repaint deteriorated chimney joints with appropriate and compatible mortar mix.

Repaint sheet metal turret caps and ventilators using compatible modern paint system.

Repaint exterior woodwork using compatible modern paint system after scientific paint analysis is completed.

Recaulk open joints between wood window and door frames and masonry openings using compatible modern caulking system.

Correct moisture problem in crawlspace west of Room B-1 which results in leaks through door opening B13.

FUTURE RESTORATION

First Floor

Remove all textured plaster ceilings installed in 1963-64 and install new ceilings to match original.

Remove all lighting fixtures installed in 1963-64. Install historic lighting fixtures or reproductions in all rooms after appropriate research is completed.

Remove all 1963-64 building fabric in Room 107 and completely restore room to its pre-1963 appearance.

Restore pre-1963 floor conditions in rooms 113, 114, 115, 116, 117 and 118.

Replace fireplace and mantel in Room 109 removed in 1963-64.

Second Floor

Remove all textured plaster ceilings installed in 1963-64 and install new ceilings to match original.

Remove all lighting fixtures installed in 1963-64. Install historic lighting fixtures, reproductions, or appropriate modern fixtures in all rooms after appropriate research is completed.

Remove 1963-64 finishes and trim in Rooms 219 to 230 and replace with new finishes compatible with historic portions of the house.

Remove 1963-64 plumbing fixtures and building fabric in Rooms 205 and 206 and restore rooms to pre-1963 conditions.

Third Floor

Remove all textured plaster ceilings installed in 1963-64 and install new ceilings to match original.

Remove all lighting fixtures installed in 1963-64. Install historic lighting fixtures, reproductions, or appropriate modern fixtures in all rooms after appropriate research is completed.

Replace fireplaces and mantels in rooms 302, 303, 305, 306 and 307 removed in 1963-64.

Restore pre-1963 floor conditions in rooms 301 to 307.

Remove all 1963-64 building fabric in rooms 308, 309, 310, and 311 and restore pre-1963 room arrangement and conditions.

Exterior

Remove recent portland cement pointing and replace with compatible lime-cement mortar.

Remove recent aluminum storm sash and replace with wood storm sash of appropriate character.

Install replicas of original window shutters on all windows that had shutters originally.

Remove recent slate patches that do not match original slates in color. Install new slate that exactly matches original roofing.

Refinish and restore main doorway on south facade.

Security Systems

Design and install new intrusion detection and fire detection systems in main house and outbuildings. The systems should be designed using historic preservation standards and the fire detection system should utilize sophisticated modern technology.

Code Analysis

The house should be analyzed to ascertain its conformance with the National Building Code and other prevailing codes, especially the use of the second and third floors as meeting and conference facilities.

OUTBUILDINGS

All of the outbuildings require final historic structure reports so that long-range restoration programs can be developed for each building. As is the case with the main house, scientific paint analysis is needed to provide information on historically accurate paint colors. Drawings and specifications prepared in accordance with modern historic preservation standards are also required to guide the immediate repair, as well as the long-range restoration work.

Letter Box

The Letter Box should be restored to its pre-1963 condition as Gifford Pinchot's study with its historic furnishings and collections material and exhibited to the public.
IMMEDIATE REPAIRS

- Repair deteriorated parapet walls.
- Repair or replace deteriorated flashings.
- Repair or replace deteriorated roof covering.
- Remove efflorescence stains from masonry walls.
- Repair damaged gutter and leader system isolating iron rainwater heads and copper leaders to prevent electrolysis.
- Remove recent Portland cement mortar and repoint with appropriate cement-lime mortar.
- Recaulk joints between wood window and door frames and masonry openings.
- Reputty window sash.
- Repaint exterior woodwork with historically accurate paint colors.

FUTURE RESTORATION

- Remove all building fabric installed during 1963-64 remodeling and restore interior to pre-1963 condition including floor and ceiling finishes, door hardware, baseboard, and lighting fixtures. Restore fireplace on south wall removed in 1963-64.
- Remove existing 1963-64 exterior doors to public toilet facilities and replace with historically appropriate doors.
- Remove existing 1963-64 exterior lighting fixtures and replace with appropriate modern fixtures.
- Remove existing 1963-64 concrete walk and steps and install stone walk and steps.

*Bait Box*

The exterior of the Bait Box should be restored to its pre-1963 appearance and the building used as an office and study for site staff or visiting scholars.

IMMEDIATE REPAIRS

- Replace deteriorated flashings and crickets.
- Repair or replace deteriorated roof covering.
- Replace deteriorated gutters.
- Remove efflorescence stains from masonry walls.
- Remove recent Portland cement mortar and repoint with appropriate cement-lime mortar.
- Recaulk joints between wood window and door frames and masonry openings.
- Reputty window sash.
- Repaint exterior woodwork with historically accurate paint colors.
- Repair deteriorated interior plaster.

*Old Ice House*

The exterior of the Old Ice House should be restored to its historic appearance and the building continued to be used for maintenance purposes.

IMMEDIATE REPAIRS

- Repair deteriorated stucco wall covering.
- Recaulk joints between wood door frames and masonry openings.
- Remove recent Portland cement mortar in connecting walls and repoint with appropriate cement-lime mortar.

FUTURE RESTORATION

- Remove all building fabric installed during the 1970s remodeling and restore to pre-1963 condition, including cupolas and doors.
- Remove existing asphalt shingle roofing and replace with historically appropriate roof covering.

*Stable*

The Stable should be restored to its pre-1963 condition and exhibited to the public as a barn and stable.

IMMEDIATE REPAIRS

- Repair deteriorated clapboards.
- Repair or replace deteriorated wood shingle roofing.
- Reputty window sash.

FUTURE RESTORATION

- Repaint exterior with historically accurate paint colors.
- Remove two sets of double doors installed in 1963-64 and replace with duplicates of original doors.
- Remove macadam paving and replace with historically accurate paving.
- Remove rustic wood fencing.

*Gate House*

The exterior of the Gate House should be restored to its pre-1963 appearance and the building continued in use as staff housing.

*Farm Complex*

The exteriors of all of the buildings in the Farm Complex should be restored to their pre-1963 appearances and the buildings continued in use as staff housing. The vinyl siding is to be removed and wood clapboards restored.

*Grounds*

Research on the grounds of the Grey Towers landscape has been woefully insufficient. Due to the large amount of available information concerning the Pinchots, it was deemed by the compilers of this report that research energies were most profitably concentrated in the limited time available on unraveling the complicated history of the main house. The following are simply initial recommendations and procedures which are designed to help realize the recreational, scenic and cultural potential of the Grey Towers landscape. A vast amount of work remains to be accomplished towards a comprehensive understanding of the Grey Towers landscape. These recommendations are essential steps towards that end.

SITE SURVEY

The necessary first step in the site restoration process is the completion of a highly detailed large-scale site survey which accurately depicts existing site conditions including land contours, all trees of significant size, groupings of plant material, building, foundations, ruins, walks, roads, and utility lines. The site survey is the critical document for any activity on the site.

VEGETATIVE MATERIAL

An overlay on the site survey should identify plant material including shrubbery, ground covers, garden material, as well as hard areas such as paths, mosaics, and terraces. On a site as significant as Grey Towers, the survey of existing plant material
PHOTOGRAPHY

A complete photo-documentation of the site should be prepared consisting of ground photographs and aerial photography. The photo-documentation would provide a complete record of the site which could be compared with historic photographs. Stereoscopic pairs (aerial photogrammetry) should be prepared to help detect human disturbances of topography and vegetation which may not be visible from the ground. Infrared photography is useful in identifying plant materials and plant health.

HISTORIC LANDSCAPE REPORT

A historic landscape report should be prepared for the grounds to serve as the basic tool for their preservation and restoration. The landscape equivalent of a historic structure report, the historic landscape report is the essential tool for making decisions regarding the grounds. As part of the report, detailed special studies should be made of the grounds for the period of original construction of the buildings in 1885-86 and the period when major modifications were made by Gifford and Cornelia Pinchot in the early twentieth century. No new plantings should be made or no existing plant materials removed until the historic landscape report has been completed.

MANAGEMENT PLAN AND SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS

A sound management plan for the specimen trees and wooded areas of the Grey Towers estate must be established. The management plan should begin with a survey and inventory of the site's trees with special emphasis placed on those in the vicinity of the house. Tree condition should be evaluated and an ongoing plan of tree maintenance prepared. This program will reduce safety hazards, improve the aesthetic quality of the site, and enhance the historic environment.

ACCESS AND PARKING

The existing access road should be retained and a new parking area for visitors developed on a short range basis adjacent to the original carriage house, south of the main house. The existing parking area should be reduced in size and used only for staff parking and parking for conference participants. It should be screened with new plantings. Ultimately, the remainder of the original estate grounds should be acquired by the Forest Service. This would permit the construction of a new parking area behind the Garden Cottage, which could be used as a visitor center in the future. Both the short and long range parking proposals provide a separation of vehicular and pedestrian traffic while permitting visitors to approach the house from the south where the main doorway is located.

LIGHTING

All of the existing 1963 colonial-style lighting fixtures should be removed from the site and replaced with appropriate new fixtures which do not intrude visually on the landscape. Security lighting should be provided for the house and major buildings.

GARDEN STRUCTURES

All of the modern Portland cement mortar should be removed from the garden structures. They should be repointed using appropriate cement-lime mortar. The history and uses of the structures should be studied as part of the historic landscape report.

SWIMMING POOL

The swimming pool, which was filled in for safety reasons, should be partially dug out so that it can be used as a shallow reflecting pool.

SIGNAGE

A comprehensive signage system for the entire site should be designed which respects the unique historical and environmental qualities of the site. This system should include both interpretive and safety signage.

FOUNDATIONS

The foundations of buildings demolished since 1963 should be marked and interpreted to the public.

CEMETERY

The family cemetery at the north edge of the estate should continue to be maintained and should be interpreted to the public.

MAINTENANCE FACILITY

The existing modern maintenance garage should be demolished and a functional new maintenance structure constructed near the farm complex.

LAND ACQUISITION

It is desirable for the Forest Service to eventually acquire the remaining portion of the Grey Towers estate out to an appropriate, manageable boundary, but including the garden, structures, and cleared areas out at least to the wooded areas that form the visual "wall" of the property. Such property acquisition would insure the protection and management of the entire estate in its historic form. Further, the present division of the property makes it difficult to properly interpret the career and significance of Amos Pinchot, whose presence at Grey Towers is represented by property not now owned by the Forest Service. A much better job of interpreting Amos' part of the Pinchot history could be accomplished if it were possible to utilize the property most intimately associated with him.

However, these are considerations for the future. In the meantime, open space and building facade easements could guarantee the visual and physical integrity of the entire estate. The implementation of a use easement might help to resolve problems associated with uncontrolled public access to Sawkill Falls. The Tax Reform Act of 1976, which provides private owners with a variety of new economic benefits for the donation of protective easements of historic property to a government agency or non-profit historic preservation organization, should be investigated for its application to the Grey Towers estate.
COLLECTIONS

SURVEY OF PINCHOT FAMILY HISTORY, INTERESTS AND OBJECT ACQUISITIONS

A thorough investigation of the Pinchot family's history and their collections is necessary. This preliminary investigation indicates a wealth of available primary and secondary sources and materials including the following:
1. Collections at Grey Towers.
2. Collections of Dr. Gifford B. Pinchot
   a. Family material at his home in Guilford, Connecticut.
   b. Photograph of interior and exterior of Grey Towers buildings.
   c. Drawings, movies and personal accounts of the house and contents.
   d. Catalog file of family correspondence.
3. Collections of Pike County Historical Society. The Society has many objects from Grey Towers in its holdings which could be returned on a gift or long-term loan basis.
4. Forest Hall. Dr. and Mrs. Gifford B. Pinchot have objects from Grey Towers in storage at Forest Hall. The objects relate to early Pinchot history, as well as the childhood of Dr. Pinchot.
5. Community Sources. Many area residents were in the employ of the Pinchots and are available for interviewing.

SURVEY OF COLLECTIONS AND CONTENTS

A complete physical inventory of all objects on the property needs to be made as soon as possible by a professional curator with assistance from specialists in late-19th and early 20th-century decorative arts and painting. The inventory is necessary to determine exactly what now exists at Grey Towers and which objects require attention.

As part of the inventory process, a full cataloging system needs to be established to include all of the collections at Grey Towers.

The antiquities in the collections should be surveyed noting:
1. Designation of period and type.
2. Condition analysis.
3. Interpretive value.
4. Photographic record.
5. Recommendations for conservation and/or restoration.

The works of fine art in the collection should be surveyed noting:
1. Identification of artist, school, and type.
2. Condition analysis.
3. Interpretive value.
4. Photographic record.
5. Recommendations for conservation and/or restoration.

The modern furnishings and equipment in the buildings should also be inventoried.

CONSERVATION/RESTORATION PROGRAM

An ongoing program for conserving and/or restoring the collections material should be established. Priority should be given to those objects identified in the survey as being of high value and great significance to the Pinchots and the estate which are in need of immediate attention.

SECURITY AND PRESERVATION

The second floor of the service wing should be used as a temporary storage facility for collection items and selected high risk equipment while the planning and renovation of the buildings occurs.

Those rooms that are used temporarily for collections storage should be shielded from natural sunlight and artificial lighting reduced to a minimum. A temporary intrusion detection system should be installed to protect the collections storage area.

ACQUISITION

A survey should be made of all known objects used by the Pinchot family at Grey Towers. Every effort should be made to acquire family objects from Grey Towers that are available for purchase or loan using the following considerations:
1. Family use.
2. Historical significance.
3. Condition.
5. Interpretive program.

The need for these objects and the priority for acquisition will be determined by the Historic Furnishings Plan.

Many of the original Grey Towers furnishings and collections items are still in Pinchot ownership. Some family items are in storage at Forest Hall in Milford. The Pike County Historical Society has additional material from Grey Towers that might be reacquired.

Where it is not possible to acquire the original family objects, items that are similar to those used by the Pinchots should be obtained.

HISTORIC FURNISHINGS PLAN

After the existing collections have been surveyed and possible acquisitions identified, a historic furnishings report should be prepared on a room-by-room basis indicating the disposition of furniture in each space. This will enable the accurate restoration of those rooms which are opened to the public. The report will incorporate the information collected in the survey of the existing collections and will establish priorities for new acquisition.

THE LETTERBOX

The Letterbox was used as an office by Gifford Pinchot while he held public office. At the present time it contains a wealth of material relating to his life, political affairs and travels. The objects are very diversified in type; paper, metal, leather and textiles are all on exhibit. A complete inventory of the materials is not available and extensive research is necessary to determine the historical significance of each item.

Serious conservation problems exist for the items because of damage caused by natural light and extensive humidity. Although the building is now exhibited to the public, the layout of exhibit cases, objects and interpretive material is exceedingly poor. Visitors tend to congregate at the cases near the entrance, thereby inhibiting traffic flow through the building. The stairway to the second floor balcony is inadequate for large groups.

The collections are not arranged in chronological or logical order. The exhibit cases, which all date from after 1963, serve as a catch-all for a variety of unrelated materials.

THE BAIT BOX

This building was built as a children's playhouse and was named for Gifford Pinchot, II, who was called "fish bait" by his father because of his interest in trout fly fishing. The room contains a number of free standing bulletin boards, which were installed after 1963 to interpret Pinchot political memorabilia. Framed political posters, photographs and documents are on display in this area. While the humidity factor is better than in the neighboring Letterbox, it is still inadequate for the preservation of historic documents. Framed archival material is also fading from ultra-violet light damage.
The historical interpretation program should be woven into all of the uses of Grey Towers. The site provides a unique opportunity to interpret the beginning of conservation in the United States and the development of modern forestry, as well as the history of the Pinchots.

**INTERPRETIVE PROSPECTUS**

An interpretive prospectus should be prepared to guide the development of the site's interpretive program. The prospectus will be based on a comprehensive research program and might include the following elements:

1. The Pinchot family genealogy and their settlement and background in America.
2. The settlement of the Pinchots in Milford.
3. The design and construction of Grey Towers and the involvement of the Pinchots.
4. The design and construction of related outbuildings and site development.
5. The education and early career of Gifford Pinchot.
7. The political career of Gifford Pinchot.
8. The lives and careers of James, Amos and Cornelia Pinchot.
9. The changes, uses and character of the estate.
10. Grey Towers and the Yale School of Forestry.
11. The development and meaning of modern forest management.

**SURVEY OF OTHER HISTORIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL SITES**

A survey of allied and related sites in the area should be conducted so that a coordinated program can be developed to foster cooperation. Special emphasis should be placed on the development of a cooperative program with the National Park Service at the Charles S. Peirce House in Milford. One of the yet unexplored stories is the extent of the relationship between the Pinchots and Peirce, who settled at Milford about the time Grey Towers was built. Peirce—whose title of “Father of Pragmatism” fails to do justice to his seminal importance in philosophy, mathematics, geodesy, symbology, and other disciplines—was the subject of a fund-raising campaign led by William James, who sought to provide him a living so that he could complete his work. It is known that Gifford Pinchot contributed to the “Charles S. Peirce Fund.”

**PUBLICATIONS**

A comprehensive publications program should be developed including the following:

1. Site brochure for wide public distribution.
3. Historic structure report.
4. Historic landscape report.
5. Monographs on Gifford Pinchot, other members of the Pinchot family, and the development of American conservation.
6. Selected portions of the Pinchot papers.
7. Newsletters.

**VISITOR CENTER**

Because of the existing facilities and proposed interpretive program for Grey Towers, it appears that a new visitor center building is not needed. Instead sections of the existing buildings should be used for exhibits.

**PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

The development of a membership program, such as “Friends of Grey Towers,” should be explored to foster publicity, fund raising, and community involvement. Every effort should be made to develop local involvement with the site to increase good will.

**SECURITY**

**DETECTION SYSTEMS**

Intrusion detection and fire detection systems should be designed and installed in the main house and outbuildings. These systems are to utilize sophisticated modern technology and should not damage the historic fabric of the buildings within which they are installed. The intrusion detection systems should include a variety of components such as magnetic door and window contacts, ultra-sonic motion detectors, pressure sensitive mats and exterior security lighting, so that it will be as effective and tamperproof as possible.

The fire detection system should utilize ionization detectors and smoke sensors to provide comprehensive protection for all of the buildings. The detection system should be directly connected to the local fire station to minimize the response time in the event of fire. Training sessions for members of the local fire department should be held at Grey Towers to familiarize them with the special problems in fighting a fire in a historic building with significant collections.

**FIREPLACES**

No fires should be lit in any of the fireplaces of Grey Towers because of the potential danger to the building. The masonry and mortar of old chimneys deteriorate as they age making them less resistant to the heat, flames, and gases of a fire. Further, the burning of wood results in deposits of flammable creosotes and other volatile carbons precipitants in chimney flues. These materials can be ignited by fireplace fires resulting in flue fires which coupled with structural deterioration of the chimney may erupt into the rooms of the house causing major damage.

If it is desired to have fireplace fires at Grey Towers in the future, the chimney flues must be thoroughly cleaned and inspected. In order to insure the safety of the building, it may be necessary to rebuild the chimneys with modern flue-liners. However, even with sound chimneys, open fires still pose a threat to historic buildings and their contents. The use of fireplace fires also requires the reduction in the sensitivity of the fire detection system, thus reducing its effectiveness and quick response in the event of an emergency. It is therefore recommended that a permanent policy of no fires in the fireplaces of Grey Towers established.

**RESEARCH**

Although the research undertaken in conjunction with the preliminary historic structure report has provided a great deal of new information about Grey Towers, there are many further avenues that remain to be explored. Before any major decisions are made that would greatly affect the preservation or interpretation of this important cultural resource, a more comprehensive study should be made. Grey Towers’ status as a National Historic Landmark indicates that the building merits a more thorough investigation, ideally in the form of an in-depth historic structure report. The constraints of time, rather than the lack of potential sources of information, have been the chief factor in limiting our present knowledge of Grey Towers’ history.
The footnotes that accompany each historical section of this report provide an overview of the sources used in the preparation of the preliminary historic structure report. In addition, all reseach notes have been organized into folders with subject and/or source headings, and these will be submitted to the Forest Service to facilitate future research efforts. Included in these folders are the materials furnished the historian at the outset of the project, as well as the new materials discovered in the course of the research. The notes provide much information not included within the body of the text, either because it was too detailed for the present, generalized level of the history, or because it did not provide sufficient data to enable conclusions to be drawn. In either case, the notes furnish many clues for the continuation of further research.

Of the potential sources of new information, the Pinchot family collections in the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress are the most important. Gifford’s papers encompass one of the largest single collections in the entire library, with over twelve hundred feet of shelf space devoted to its storage. Because of the immense amount of twentieth-century material, only the surface has been scratched in the investigation of these papers. The largest percentage of the papers are those retrieved from the mass of paperwork of Pinchot’s two terms as governor; however, even his personal papers, which would bear most directly on Grey Towers, are staggering in their amount. There are eight containers of Gifford’s complete diaries from 1882 to 1936, and this single source would provide a wealth of information on Grey Towers’ role in his life. Although it would be a time-consuming task to review all of the diaries, the rewards would be invaluable. Since all the diaries have been microfilmed, they could be obtained from the Library of Congress on interlibrary loan, thereby eliminating the necessity of reading them in Washington.

The research undertaken for this report focused on finding materials that would shed light on the earliest period of Grey Towers’ history, especially its construction. The family papers of Series III, including all correspondence from January 1884 to December 1887 and Mrs. J.W. Pinchot’s diaries for 1884-1886, were reviewed thoroughly. Notes made on the three-hundred-page draft register of Gifford’s papers will serve as a checklist for all other containers checked in the course of this research. Detailed notes on historical contents, plus chronologically arranged xeroxes of the most important documents, can be found in the folder submitted on this collection. Because of reproduction costs, only highlights of the photographs to be found in these papers have been selected for inclusion in this report; many more should be copied as part of the Grey Towers archives.

Cornelia Bryce Pinchot’s papers probably contain a great amount of information on the twentieth-century changes to Grey Towers, since she not only conceived the alterations but also personally financed most of them. At present, these Library of Congress holdings are warehoused in Alexandria, Virginia, and require advance notice for their retrieval. Because of this problem (which should be solved by June 1978, when the collection will be transferred), only twelve containers were reviewed. This research revealed that the existing index to these papers is all but useless. Besides being very sketchy, it is also incorrect as to the contents of many containers. Therefore, it is very difficult to ascertain what potential information a container holds without actually reviewing all of it. To compound this problem, Mrs. Pinchot was a prodigious “saver,” thus making the effort of finding pertinent information a formidable chore. Nonetheless, this collection probably contains important documents such as architectural drawings of the many alterations and photographs of the estate.

Gifford’s brother Amos also donated his papers to the Library of Congress. They total 272 boxes, and because of this comparatively small number, they are well indexed. Of the six containers of family correspondence, the one containing thirty years of James W. Pinchot’s correspondence (1863-1896) was reviewed thoroughly. This collection merits further investigation, especially for the years around 1920 when the estate was being divided between the two brothers.

Much additional research could be carried out in Milford. The records of the county courthouse have not been fully explored, and the complete chain of title for the Grey Towers estate has not been compiled. Undoubtedly this would provide more information on the occupancy of the site before the construction of the house. The building contract between James Pinchot and Andrew Armstrong may possibly be recorded at the courthouse. Often these documents contain detailed specifications for construction, which would be of great value in the analysis of building materials and methods. Another important source, the Milford Dispatch for the years 1878 to 1925, resides in the local newspaper office. Since the Pinchot family was newsworthy to the village, the newspaper probably printed many items of interest concerning them. These might include such things as progress reports on Grey Towers’ construction during the 1880s, perhaps with descriptions of the interior. When Gifford and Cornelia were in town or when they held special events at the estate, there would have been notice made in the papers. The bound volumes have not been microfilmed and therefore are not available outside Milford. While a thorough review of the Dispatch would encompass several weeks’ research, it would yield much historical information that is otherwise unavailable.

There are many people still alive in the Milford area who worked for the Pinchot family or who are familiar with the estate. In the recent past, a number of interviews have been conducted with these people, but much remains to be done in tapping this source of information. Successful interviewing requires much advance work in establishing good public relations, finding reliable contacts, and developing a standard set of questions. This must then be followed by a systematic scheme for corroborating the resulting information. A number of important people already have been interviewed on various occasions, yet they should be approached once again under a more thorough program based on the best techniques of oral history. Included in this category would be Mrs. Amos E. Pinchot and Dr. and Mrs. Gifford B. Pinchot. In the eleventh hour of the research of this report, it was discovered that Dr. Pinchot retains a remarkable collection of family photographs of Grey Towers, as well as various other materials, from home movies to architectural drawings. Surely the family members are the best source of information on many diverse aspects of the estate’s history. They have a genuine interest in fostering Grey Towers’ success as a historic site, and a concerted effort should be made to solicit their cooperation in this endeavor.
APPENDIX:

PINCHOT INSTITUTE FOR CONSERVATION STUDIES

Mission

The Pinchot Institute for Conservation Studies is located at the former home of Gifford Pinchot in Milford, Pa. Its purpose is to further conservation programs of the Forest Service and other conservation agencies through research, training, and conferences.

Current Program

The Pinchot Institute for Conservation Studies was dedicated by President John F. Kennedy in 1963. In 1977 the program was expanded to include a Visitor Information Service program, a Human Resource program (YCC, YACC), historic restoration, and National program elements. The Institute will contribute to the long range management of the environmental education, urban forestry, and policy formulation, and by developing and implementing programs to improve public understanding of conservation principles; programs that will lead to greater public appreciation and more effective participation in resource management and the decision-making process.

It will also provide an opportunity for people to visit the historic Pinchot family estate. The estate, Grey Towers—a registered National Historic Landmark—was the home of a family whose forebears had left France and migrated to America. The family was wealthy, influential, and dedicated to the promise of the future. They knew science and politics. They were achievers with empathy for the public and a deep understanding of the need for wise stewardship of the land and the environment.

Grey Towers will include a place for honoring those who have achieved greatness in developing the fundamental American concept of resource conservation to enhance the quality of life.

Grey Towers symbolizes those qualities of intellectual freedom and responsibility to humankind that characterize all the great leaders in the conservation movement. Their strategies, political liaisons, and techniques were different, but their unanimity of purpose and dedication marked these greats of conservation as citizens to whom every American, every citizen of the world, owes a debt of respect—and gratitude. It is appropriate that they be honored here where the conservation principles they pioneered still live and grow.

Institute programs will focus on the following areas:

Management of the Grey Towers Property

Grey Towers is a National Historic Landmark and will be managed to preserve and enhance its historic value. There will be continuing programs to restore and rehabilitate the building, and recover and preserve artifacts. Grey Towers will be used for meetings until other facilities are available.

Establish a Conservation Hall of Fame

Criteria will be developed by a broadly representative foundation to identify outstanding conservationists in our nation’s history. Using these criteria, people will be nominated, selected, and installed in a Conservation Hall of Fame at Grey Towers. Appropriate material will be displayed to describe their accomplishments.

Provide a Visitor’s Information Service program at the Pinchot Institute, Grey Towers

The Visitor Information Service program will present and interpret Gifford Pinchot’s philosophy and his contribution to conservation, and relate them to past, present, and future natural resource management. The program will also include information about Grey Towers and its restoration. Other parts of the national interpretation program will discuss such topics as multiple-use forest management, urban forestry, human resources, and the role of forest resources in our daily lives. It will also test advanced techniques of interpretation and will provide an opportunity for training interpreters.

Provide new and innovative methods for the evaluation of public conservation knowledge.

The Institute will evaluate public understanding of renewable natural resource conservation, and of the contributions of these resources to the nation. It will evaluate the effectiveness of present conservation education efforts in providing an objective understanding of environmental issues. It will identify areas of conservation knowledge that need emphasis. It will provide a setting where the scholar, industrialist, conservationist, student, and scientist can exchange ideas in a “think tank” atmosphere, free of day-to-day interruptions, pressures, and demands.

Identify and discuss critical conservation issues

The Institute will identify emerging controversial issues and provide a neutral ground for discussing them and resolving conflicts. It will produce “white papers” that present objective assessments of issues and provide bases for discussion. It will organize and conduct symposia and other meetings to allow all viewpoints to be presented on an issue, and it will provide for the public dissemination of the information gathered. Where appropriate, it will issue reports and summaries for use in policy formulation. The emphasis will be on objectivity.

Develop new and innovative environmental education techniques

In support of a national program, the Institute will develop new and innovative approaches to increase the scope and effectiveness of environmental education, in both formal and informal education settings to reach all levels of education, age, and socioeconomic background. Educators and resource managers will be involved in identifying barriers to effective environmental education. Means will be provided for rapid dissemination of new techniques throughout the educational community.

Improve technology transfer in renewable natural resource field

The Institute will develop techniques to identify useable technology for resource managers to shorten the time between the development of technology and its implementation. The Institute will provide methods to insure the prompt recognition and use of adaptable technology from related fields. The Institute will be the catalyst for interdisciplinary interaction between diverse segments of the scientific community and users of information.

Conduct human resources program at Grey Towers

Available manpower programs such as Youth Conservation Corps (YCC), Young Adult Conservation Corps (YACC), older Americans, volunteers in the national forest, and others will be used in the operation, restoration, and maintenance of the Pinchot Estate. Wherever possible these programs will provide a conservation learning experience for participants. Through the Institute, model human resource programs will be designed and tested for national use.
The Forest Service is required by law to identify and assess historic sites under its jurisdiction. Its holdings are such that it is one of the major historic preservation agencies in the Federal Government. This report on Grey towers—the home of Gifford Pinchot, first Chief of the Forest Service—illustrates the kind of investigation, thinking, and decisionmaking that should be applied to such sites managed by the Forest Service. The instructions this report presents are of the kind urgently needed not only by historic preservation specialists, but by nearly all of our personnel whose activities in one way or another affect these resources. For this reason it will be distributed in large numbers to all offices and levels of the Forest Service.

This report will serve as a model for other reports of its kind. Its major sections—a historical analysis, an analysis of existing conditions, and recommendations for restoration, development, and use (and their subdivisions)—can serve as guidelines for both the work and reporting needed in any major historic preservation effort.

Making this report available to other interested parties is also part of our obligation. The general public is unaware of the full range and nature of the Forest Service’s responsibilities in historic preservation, which we believe include sharing the results of our work with the taxpayers. The Grey Towers report can serve as a guide and an inspiration in this effort. As the home of the first Chief of the Forest Service and one of America’s great conservationists, Grey Towers has a wide appeal both within and outside the Forest Service. This report will provide a highly needed impetus to the nationwide historic sites preservation program and illustrate the part the Forest Service is playing in this program.
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