

**United States Department of the Interior**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 2

Olympic National Park Historic Trails District  
Clallam County, WA  
Historic Resources of Olympic National Park

---

Summary

The Olympic National Park Historic Trails District is eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion A in the area of politics/government for its association with federal management between 1898 and 1938. Much of the Olympic Peninsula has remained under federal management since 1898, when President Glover Cleveland first set aside two million acres on the peninsula as a forest reserve. The trail system, which included trail shelters, telephone lines, guard stations, and fire lookouts, was established by the Forest Service between 1905 and 1933, and it formed the backbone of the agency's efforts to pursue its multiple use policies. 962 miles of trail, 109 campgrounds and 90 shelters were built during this time in an effort to shape an inaccessible wilderness into a managed forest.

These trails and structures provide important evidence of the history of both the United States Forest Service and the National Park Service on the Olympic Peninsula. The trail system, which was built primarily for fire protection but also for recreation and timber management, reflects the political pressures, financial scarcity and the Forest Service's competition with the National Park Service during this time. In 1933, management of much of the forest shifted to the National Park Service, and five years later, due to pressure from conservationists, Olympic National Park was created from 634,000 acres of Mt. Olympus National Monument and Olympic National Forest. The Forest Service legacy of a working forest would live on in the new park's system of trails, shelters and structures, while new facilities catered to the needs of recreational users.

Statement of Significance

Most national parks began as national forests, and the history of these parks extends back to their years as national forests. The Forest Reserve Act of 1891 empowered the president to establish forest reserves; these reserves were the source of nearly all of today's national forests and thus of nearly all of the national parks established since the turn of the century. The most common story about this shared ancestry is the controversy over the conversion of national forest lands into national parks. The transfer pitted two conservation philosophies against each other—one whose advocates believed in the preservation of the nation's remaining wild lands, and the other whose proponents believed in the use of those lands. It was a battle waged primarily by the two land management agencies responsible for caring for the public domain: the United States Forest Service and the National Park Service.

Olympic National Park became a contested site for these two agencies, and its creation in 1938 serves as one of the best examples of the two bureaus' conflicting management philosophies. The Forest Service adhered to the belief that forests should be used, albeit wisely and efficiently, for a wide variety of uses, such as timber harvests, mining, grazing, and recreation. The Park Service, on the other hand, followed a management philosophy centered on preserving the nation's scenic wonders, the last remnants of original America. The establishment of Olympic brought to a close a hard-fought battle by preservationists to preserve the virgin

**United States Department of the Interior**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 3

Olympic National Park Historic Trails District  
Clallam County, WA  
Historic Resources of Olympic National Park

---

forests and spectacular glacier-clad peaks of the Olympic Range.

Forty years of federal land management preceded the arrival of the national park, and for most of that time, the Forest Service managed the forest. The Park Service inherited what had been a working forest, complete with its infrastructure of ranger and guard stations, campgrounds, roads, fire lookouts, and trails and their related facilities. These developments reflected an administrative focus that was different from that of a national park. The Forest Service was commodity oriented and strove to both regulate and promote the use of forests by eliminating wasteful and destructive practices through scientific management. These tenets of conservation guided the bureau, whose origins lay in the Progressive era. The bureau placed the greatest administrative emphasis on protecting forests from fire and meeting the wide range of demands from local communities, industry, and the nation for timber, water storage, and range for live stock, as well as opportunities for homesteading, mining, and recreation. These concerns shaped the built environment of the forests, and they left a legacy of forest management that remained imprinted on the landscape well after forests such as Olympic became national parks.

As one component of that legacy, the forest's trail system reflected both the administrative aspect of forest development as well as its recreational counterpart. This study will focus on the planning and development of Olympic National Forest's trails within the larger context of forest management through several periods. The first is from 1898 to 1905, the years the Olympic Forest Reserve was established and managed by the Department of the Interior. The second is from 1905 to 1916, the first decade of Forest Service management, years that produced the first trail plan. The third is from 1916 to 1933, years of modest improvements and a comprehensive forest plan for recreation. The fourth is from 1933 to 1938, years of significant advances in forest developments, based on previous plans, with the arrival of the New Deal work programs.

\*\*\*

The Olympic Forest Reserve was created on March 1, 1898. It covered some 2.2 million acres of the "high and broken Olympic Mountains...a region of steep and jagged mountains," clad with permanent snow fields and glaciers. Its forests were equally, if not more, spectacular. Here was "the largest and most valuable body of timber belonging to the nation; and here is the only part of the United States where the forest unmarked by fire or the axe still exists over a great area in its primeval splendor."<sup>1</sup> The creation of forest reserves, like Olympic, ranked high among the most significant conservation achievements in the nation's history because the reserves protected the nation's timber supply from the abuses of private interests. However the reserves themselves were poorly managed. The General Land Office, within the Department of the Interior, was charged with their care and was notoriously corrupt; its field offices were understaffed and funding for managing the reserves was scarce. Reserve rangers contended with settlement claims, among other duties, but their main

---

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in [Guy Finger], Olympic National Park: An Administrative History (Seattle: National Park Service, 1992), 22. According to Finger, the reserve, while recommended in 1897, was not officially created until the following year.

**United States Department of the Interior**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 4

Olympic National Park Historic Trails District  
Clallam County, WA  
Historic Resources of Olympic National Park

---

focus was on protecting the reserves from timber trespass and fire.

This was essentially true of the General Land Office's management of the Olympic Reserve. There were only a handful of rangers to patrol this vast entire area, and most of them were off dealing with agricultural claims in the lightly settled drainages of the Hoh, Quinault, and Elwha rivers, among others. Moreover, one General Land Office (GLO) inspector observed in 1903, the Olympic Reserve "had suffered more than any other in the state from lack of supervision." At that time, there was no supervisor, and the acting supervisor had no time to make field inspections.<sup>2</sup>

The physical environment of the reserve also posed obstacles to administrators. The forest inspector noted that the "peculiar topography and remoteness of the reserve makes proper patrol absolutely impossible at present." This description provides perhaps the first commentary on how federal officials wanted to tame the wilds of the Olympics in order to oversee them in an orderly and efficient manner. "The Olympic Mountains," the inspector continued, "have almost no trails in them and are exceedingly rough and inaccessible." Some roads and the occasional trail skirted the reserve's boundaries. In some places, trails penetrated drainages on the southern and western edges, but not to any great extent. Patrol activities were thus limited to the reserve's perimeter. The situation had a positive side, since the rugged, inaccessible character of the reserve also confined most human-caused fires and trespassing to the periphery as well. The reserve required a better system for transportation.

Federal land managers had inherited an informal network of trails leading through principal areas in the rugged and often jungle-like conditions of the Olympics. These pathways had evolved over long periods of time, the product of countless years of Native American use during their seasonal trips up the valleys and into the high country of the peninsula. The peninsula's wildlife, especially the range's herds of elk, also wore visible trails along the rivers through dense forest cover and up into the alpine zone. Other path breakers appeared in the 1880s and 1890s when the peninsula's first European explorers, settlers and timber speculators blazed trails through the Olympic country, though often these, too, followed established routes.<sup>3</sup> These "routes are often roundabout and consume too much time." They also required rangers to spend valuable time and energy opening trails outside the reserve just to reach it. The inspector concluded that the "necessity of trail work is obvious," but its solution was in doubt, since it required "more assistance from the Department (of the Interior) than has been accorded."<sup>4</sup> Reserve managers did develop some trails and improve existing routes, such as with the construction of the trail along the southern shore of Lake Crescent in 1903, but these projects reflected immediate needs rather than an overall plan for a trail system. In addition to funding shortfalls, the

---

<sup>2</sup> Forest Inspector to the Secretary of the Interior, February 26, 1903, Record Group (RG) 95, Records of the U.S. Forest Service, Regional Office files, box 3, file: Olympic Forest Reserve--Inspection, 1903, National Archives--Pacific Northwest Region (NA-PNR), 2.

<sup>3</sup> Gail Evans, Historic Resource Study: Olympic National Park (Seattle: National Park Service, 1983), 5-50.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 2-3.

**United States Department of the Interior**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 5

Olympic National Park Historic Trails District  
Clallam County, WA  
Historic Resources of Olympic National Park

---

peninsula's seasons foretold of slow progress in this area, since the summer ranger force spent its time entirely on fire patrol and heavy winter snows prevented any trail work from being accomplished. Under the best conditions, one ranger may have time to carry out trail projects, but he was "almost helpless," the forest inspector concluded, building trails "in a region where logs are so large."<sup>5</sup>

A harsh environment and limited financial means were the main reasons why foresters undertook so many improvements to meet immediate needs rather than long-range administrative goals during the forest reserve years. This changed, however, in 1905 when Congress transferred the responsibility for managing the reserves from the General Land Office to the Forest Service. (In 1907, Chief Forester Gifford Pinchot managed to have legislation passed changing the names of the reserves to national forests so that there would be no confusion as to their purpose.) The transfer of the reserves to the Forest Service ushered in an important change in their administration. They would be managed by career professionals rather than political appointees who would oversee the forests using the conservation principles set down by Pinchot himself, one of the key figures in the Progressive conservation movement.<sup>6</sup>

Pinchot believed that the nation's forests should be managed wisely and efficiently for their continued use by the American people. In 1905, he set down this management philosophy, which came to be known as multiple use, for the administration of the forest reserves. In this regard: "it must be clearly borne in mind that all land is to be devoted to its most productive use for the permanent good of the whole people, and not for the temporary benefit of individuals or companies. All the resources of the forest reserves are for use, and this use must be brought about in a thoroughly prompt and businesslike manner, under such restrictions only as will insure the permanence of these resources." Proper management, in other words, could ensure the perpetual supply of forest resources for the nation, a point of view summed up in Pinchot's famous slogan "the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run."<sup>7</sup> Roads, trails, fire lines, telephone lines, and ranger cabins and stations, Pinchot noted, were essential elements for forest use and protection. They would be part of the overall administrative infrastructure in the management of the forests. In this respect, a complete road and trail system would "render for use the resources of the forest reserve," "make them accessible for travel," and "protect them."<sup>8</sup>

Pinchot placed a great emphasis on the value of trails. "There is urgent need of more and better trails on most of the forest reserves. They are of capital importance, because they are not only the best insurance against fire, but the means by which the reserves can be seen and used." The chief forester recommended that foresters first plan out a whole system "or scheme" of trails for the entire forest before they begin with improvements.

---

<sup>5</sup> Forest Inspector to Secretary of the Interior, February 26, 1903. See also [Fringer], Olympic National Park, 32.

<sup>6</sup> Harold K. Steen, The U.S. Forest Service: A History (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1976), 98-99.

<sup>7</sup> Steen, The U.S. Forest Service, 78-79.

<sup>8</sup> U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, The Use of the National Forest Reserves: Regulations and Instructions (hereafter cited as Use Book), July 1, 1905, 105.

**United States Department of the Interior**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 6

Olympic National Park Historic Trails District  
Clallam County, WA  
Historic Resources of Olympic National Park

---

Those trails, he stated, that would provide the most immediate benefits for protection and patrol would be given top priority, but he also recommended that in locating and constructing these trails forest officers take into account that the general public would use them as well. Trails as a means to patrolling and protecting the forests were related to other improvements as well. Telephone lines, for example, bore a direct relation to trails and their primary purpose of fire control; the lines would run along the trails and link supervisors' headquarters with rangers' headquarters and lookouts, "so that fires may be reported and other business of the reserve managed expeditiously."<sup>9</sup> Despite a lack of funding, the chief forester's grand scheme influenced the gradual development of more trails, roads, and other structures in Olympic National Forest.

In the forest's first decade of management, forest officers continued to build trails and other structures in response to need rather than an overall plan. Several projects illustrate this point. First, in 1905 ranger Chris Morgenroth and other forest rangers built a horse trail to Sol Duc Hot Springs to accommodate the rising numbers of visitors heading to this resort. Second, for similar reasons forest crews completed a twenty-eight mile foot trail along the south shore of Lake Crescent, connecting to Sappho, as the popularity of this area grew with the "back to nature movement." Third, as more people were drawn to the Lake Crescent country and resorts like Olympic Hot Springs for scenery, relaxation, and fishing, the Forest Service in turn built a ranger station here, known as the Storm King Ranger Station, in 1906 to better manage this part of the forest. It would prove to be only the beginning of the bureau's interest in improving the lake country for outdoor recreation. Fourth, in 1907 Morgenroth led a Forest Service crew that built a horse trail up the South Fork of the Skokomish River. The idea and funding for this trail came from a timber baron who wanted to take his friends into the high country to fish and hunt. As it was originally conceived, the trail was to connect to the Quinault River and down to Lake Quinault, a section which was not finished until five years later with Forest Service funds. As suggested by this project, trail construction in Olympic National Forest often depended on the direction or influence of private interests. Another example of this was the role the Seattle Mountaineers played in financing trail construction up the Elwha River in 1907. The Elwha offered one of the most direct routes into the Olympic high country and the group's goal was to improve the primitive pathway established by early settlers and others up the river so their climbing expeditions could reach the interior of the Olympics with greater speed and safety.<sup>10</sup> The service also concentrated its efforts on carrying out road and trail projects for settlers in the Quinault and Queets valleys.<sup>11</sup> By 1909, foresters at Olympic had still fallen short of achieving the long-range improvements Pinchot and other bureau leaders thought necessary for forest management, and he underscored the "great need" for "a more complete system of trails."

---

<sup>9</sup> Use Book, 105, 107.

<sup>10</sup> Chris Morgenroth, *Footprints in the Olympics: An Autobiography*, Katherine Morgenroth Flaherty, ed., (Fairfield: Ye Galleon Press, 1991), 83, 93-103, 110-111.

<sup>11</sup> [Olympic Forest Inspection Report], February 1909, RG 95, Regional Forester, Inspections, National Forests, 1904-1916, box 3, file: Olympic, 1909, NA-PNR, 19-20.

**United States Department of the Interior**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 7

Olympic National Park Historic Trails District  
Clallam County, WA  
Historic Resources of Olympic National Park

---

In 1909, Forest Supervisor Raymond E. Benedict proposed (and mapped out) a system of trails that would belt the forest approximately on its boundary lines. His plan seems to have been inspired by the previous forest supervisor, Hanson, who believed the trail system should run along the section lines of the forest's boundaries and began work on the system by making notches in trees along the boundary in the "jungle," an approach long since abandoned. Benedict's plan was never fully implemented. The trail work, though begun, went unsupervised; the design of the trails was, as one forest officer recalled, "fancy in places (hand rail on puncheon for instance) and the costs were very high." Forest workers were building trails for horses, when foot trails would not only provide the necessary access into the backcountry for rangers but could be modified later to accommodate horses.<sup>12</sup> Moreover, it seemed that Benedict had little idea of the country through which the trails would run and never inspected them on the ground once built.<sup>13</sup> Most of these new trails were poorly located and conceived. As in the case of the East Humptulips-Wynooche Trail, its location, grade (too steep), and construction (too wide) reflected a lack of understanding of the natural conditions and the costs of such an undertaking.

In 1910, fires of historic proportions swept through many of the western forests, and as a result, forest improvements, primarily to provide protection from future fires, received top priority. The chief forester reported in 1911, "The purpose of construction of permanent improvements on the National Forests is to facilitate (1) protection from fire, (2) the administration of the business of the Forests, and (3) the development of their resources." In order to achieve this goal, each forest required a complete system of communication for its protection, primarily trails and telephones--to tie the whole forest together. In addition, quarters and other structures to house rangers and aid in their patrols and in regulating forest use were critical to fulfilling the demands of forest management.<sup>14</sup> Each forest was required to produce a plan under which the work would be carried out in a well-coordinated fashion over a "series of years" so that each forest may "eventually be supplied with an adequate, coherent, and unified system of communications, stations, fire lines, stock fences, and other aids to protection and use of all the resources of the Forest." Limited appropriations continued to impede the bureau's progress, and only the most urgent projects were taken up over the next several years, all of which were for fire protection. Despite a budget shortfalls, forest managers went ahead with their planning efforts in the years immediately following the fires of 1910. By 1914, the chief forester could report that "each Forest more or less" had "complete and comprehensive working plans." That same year, the Forest Service finally secured a means of funding forest improvements from the 10 % item, which referred to the percentage of funds taken from forest receipts (from timber sales, primarily) to help finance these important projects. Another important source of funding would come from the 1916 federal highway which provided assistance in

---

<sup>12</sup> W.E. Herring, [Olympic National Forest Inspection Report], November 1910, RG 95, Regional Forester, National Forests, Inspections, 1904-1916, box 3, file: Olympic, 1910, NA-PNR, 1, 6-8.

<sup>13</sup> P.S. Lovejoy to Rudolph Fromme, December 31, 1912, on file Olympic National Park Archives.

<sup>14</sup> Department of Agriculture, Report of the Forester, 1911 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1911), 59.

**United States Department of the Interior**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 8

Olympic National Park Historic Trails District  
Clallam County, WA  
Historic Resources of Olympic National Park

---

improving roads through national forests. “The immediate result of the historical 1910 fire season,” the district forester noted, “was the rapid extension of trunk trails and telephone lines into inaccessible regions” of all the forests in the Pacific Northwest.<sup>15</sup> By 1916, the district boasted at least “4,000 miles of trails,” among other improvements.

As was the case throughout the service, fire suppression determined to a large extent the physical improvements on the district’s forests. There were two main needs: quick detection and rapid response. In forests such as Olympic, which had large quantities of marketable timber, the main forest improvements had been the construction of trails and lookouts and the installation of telephone lines. Trails played a vital role, since rangers used the trail system to carry out continuous fire patrols. Trails were essential to fire suppression as indicated by the other “safeguards” augmenting the system. These, the district forester wrote, were “tool boxes containing axes, mattocks, shovels, crosscut saws, grub hoes, and in many instances, grain and provisions at convenient places over most of the Forests.”<sup>16</sup> By 1916, the district reported success in reducing fire damage, but the district had barely over half of its needed improvements completed. And of these improvements, “trail construction overshadows all other improvements in importance,” concluded the district forester.<sup>17</sup>

It was within this context that forest managers set out to make improvements on Olympic National Forest between 1910 and 1916. Parish Lovejoy, the Olympic Forest Supervisor for a little over a year, and Rudolph Fromm, who occupied that position from 1912-1926, worked to open up the interior of the Olympics for fire prevention as well as public use. Rather than limit trail construction to “foot trails” as previously recommended by one forest inspector, these forest managers supported the construction of horse trails. Lovejoy had been witness to the Montana fires of 1910, and he advised Fromme to develop a fire protection plan for the Olympics with horse trails as its centerpiece. In an often quoted statement, Lovejoy told Fromme in 1912:

My general plan is about so: Trails and trails and trails all looping into one another and into roads so as to allow cross cuts. All main trails and roads parallel, and by and by all trails and roads paralleled with phone lines. Patrol boxes not farther than 5 miles apart on the phone lines. Boxes and lots of tools at or near the patrol...stations. Houses and sheds and shelters along the trails where they will serve to shelter crews and patrolmen and all traveling officers and where the tools in the boxes can be concentrated winters and protected....Then lots of guards....Then lookouts.<sup>18</sup>

Fromme shared Lovejoy’s outlook as well as the general Forest Service belief in the importance of

---

<sup>15</sup> U.S. Department of Agriculture, Report of the Forester, 1914 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1914), 25. See also U.S. Department of Agriculture, Report of the Forester, 1917 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1917), 23-24, which states that the agency combined both the 10% fund and the highway act money for forest road and trail improvements.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

<sup>17</sup> Annual Non-Statistical Report--District 6, 1916, RG 95, Entry 4, box 21, file: D-6, Reports Annual, F, Reports, Non-Statistical, 1916, NA, 4-6.

<sup>18</sup> Lovejoy to Fromme, December 31, 1912.

**United States Department of the Interior**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 9

Olympic National Park Historic Trails District  
Clallam County, WA  
Historic Resources of Olympic National Park

---

improvements. He spent his first years in the Olympics scouting locations for horse trails in the backcountry, primarily up the major river drainages. Many of the existing trails, he discovered, were dangerous for horse use, and travel into the interior still usually meant following game paths or trails improved by explorers, speculators, and settlers.<sup>19</sup>

Soon after, Fromme drafted the first formal plan for Olympic National Forest's trail system. Ironically, the impetus for Fromme's plan, submitted in 1915, stemmed not as much from the Forest Service's drive to complete "working plans" as much as it did from the question of whether part of the forest would be converted to a national park. In 1909, President Theodore Roosevelt had signed a proclamation establishing Mount Olympus National Monument, encompassing more than 610,000 acres in the center of Olympic National Forest and the cluster of peaks surrounding Mount Olympus. The monument's purpose was to protect the region's native elk, named the Roosevelt Elk in 1897 by famed naturalist Clinton Hart Merriam for the president, an avid hunter and conservationist. Concerned citizens acquainted with this species of elk, the largest of four species in North America, welcomed the monument as a significant step towards saving these animals that seemed on the verge of extinction from overhunting. For the Forest Service, on the other hand, it presented a management dilemma. Preservation ran counter to its commercial mission, yet at the same time, if it opposed the monument it stood to lose this large section of forest to a national park.<sup>20</sup>

The monument was the kernel of the national park idea for the Olympics, and it would be the focus of the hotly debated and controversial movement that eventually led to the creation of Olympic National Park in the late 1930s. The presence of the monument introduced an important factor in the bureau's planning efforts. Rather than simply meeting the needs for protection, forest plans now had to take into account recreational uses as well. Interest in outdoor recreation had steadily increased since the turn of the century, and both national forests and national parks were natural attractions for the American public. Moreover, the popularity of recreation led to a competition between the newly formed National Park Service (1916) and the Forest Service over which agency would control this use of the nation's public lands and its most scenic wonders.<sup>21</sup>

Under Gifford Pinchot, the Forest Service had treated recreation as an incidental use of the forests, yet as the numbers of people seeking recreation in natural surroundings, especially as a respite from their lives in urban centers, continued to grow, the agency could no longer ignore their presence. Many national forests lay within reach of cities and were brought all the closer with the widespread popularity of the automobile. The North Pacific District [District 6] had reported 45,000 recreational visits in 1909 alone. By 1913, Chief Forester Henry S. Graves noted that recreation was a "highly important form of use of the Forests by the public, and it is

---

<sup>19</sup> Rudolph Fromme, "Olympic Memoirs, 1912-1916," typescript, Rudolph Fromme Papers, box 1, UW, 23, 48-53.

<sup>20</sup> For an overview of the Olympic National Park battle, see Michael G. Schene, "Only the Squeal is Left: Conflict over the Establishment of Olympic National Park," *The Pacific Historian* 27 (1983): 53-60

<sup>21</sup> Hal K. Rothman, "'A Regular Ding-Dong Fight': Agency Culture and Evolution in the NPS-USFS Dispute, 1916-1937," *Western Historical Quarterly* 20 (May 1989): 141-153.



**United States Department of the Interior**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 10

Olympic National Park Historic Trails District  
Clallam County, WA  
Historic Resources of Olympic National Park

---

recognized and facilitated by adjusting commercial use of the Forests, when necessary.” Graves concluded that it would be important to prevent grazing or timber harvests from marring the beauty of lakes and other areas of natural beauty for the “enjoyment of the public.”<sup>22</sup>

Forest Service recreational development, most of which occurred in areas with sizeable cities nearby, underscored its competition with national parks and the young federal agency that oversaw them, the Park Service. The Park Service had a dynamic leader in Stephen T. Matter who announced that his agency’s management purpose was one devoted to preservation and use. That is, national parks were for the public’s enjoyment, not resource extraction, and thus outdoor recreation formed a central purpose of national parks; recreation would therefore fall under the purview of his agency. The establishment of the Park Service, in fact, grew out of differing views over conservation and preservation. Preservationists, led by John Muir and the Sierra Club, rejected Gifford Pinchot’s bid, and the attempts of his successors, to have the Forest Service manage the national parks. The most symbolic evidence of this rift was the loss of Yosemite’s Hetch Hetchy Valley to a reservoir for San Francisco in 1913, a plan endorsed by Pinchot and vehemently opposed by Muir. Embedded in the Forest Service’s attempts to take over national park management was the bureau’s desire to fend off more proposals to create new national parks from national forests.<sup>23</sup>

The competition with national parks for recreation and the beginning stages of the Forest Service’s planning for recreation provide the context for Olympic National Forest’s trail plan. In order to prepare for recreation and deflect interest in converting the monument into a park, Graves ordered Fromme to identify (on a map) all of the scenic features which might be included within a national park. More importantly, he requested from Fromme a report on all of the existing and proposed trails “which would make all the principal features accessible to tourist travel.” He planned to use the interest in a park to get funding from Congress for trails, roads, and other recreational developments. As Graves instructed, Fromme prepared a comprehensive plan that outlined the principal scenic features and made them accessible through a “comprehensive trail system.” This, Graves believed, would satisfy park proponents like the Mountaineers and others who were demanding more improvements for their adventures into the Olympic backcountry.<sup>24</sup>

Fromme’s plan, dated December 7, 1915, listed many projects that would “open up and develop Mt. Olympus National Monument.” At that time, there were only four trail projects officially credited to the Forest Service that made the scenic features of the Olympics more accessible. These were the Soleduck-Hoh Trail, the Lillian Switchback on the Elwha, and the North Fork Quinault Trail--all completed in 1913—and the Upper Dosewallips Trail, built in 1915. These trails, with few exceptions, were hastily and often poorly constructed,

---

<sup>22</sup> Quoted in William C. Tweed, Recreation Site Planning and Improvements in National Forests, 1891-1942 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, 1980), 2-3.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 5-6. Stephen Fox, John Muir and His Legacy: The American Conservation Movement (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1981), 139-147.

<sup>24</sup> R.L. Fromme to District Forester, July 23, 1915, RG 95, box 99759, file: L, Boundaries, Olympic, Mount Olympus National Monument, 1905-1916, NA-PNR.

**United States Department of the Interior**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 11

Olympic National Park Historic Trails District  
Clallam County, WA  
Historic Resources of Olympic National Park

---

especially difficult for horses to travel.<sup>25</sup> His projects, while ostensibly for “the interests of recreation,” would also satisfy needs for “increased fire protection and administrative efficiency.” In this way, the plan would fit within the framework established by the Forest Service’s management philosophy. Fromme’s plan may have focused on the monument but it took into account the entire forest--the various routes through the forest one could take to reach the monument itself--and thus serves as Olympic’s first plan.<sup>26</sup>

Fromme proposed to have trails leading into the forest up the major river drainages, the spokes that radiated from the hub of the Olympics. He identified routes that led through areas of popular interest as well as areas important to forest management efficiency (usefulness and protection). The forest supervisor recommended twenty-six trail projects, all of which he justified by how they would aid in the broad range of forest management activities. His first recommendation, for example, was a trail along the Hayes River to provide a connection to the forest from east side on Hood Canal. The Hayes River Trail would provide an important link with the Dosewallips Trail and make this the “first main trail highway into the upper Elwha from the Hoods Canal side.” The Mountaineers proposed to follow this route in the club’s 1917 ascent of Mt. Olympus. Besides the recreational aspects of the trail, there would be considerable administrative benefits as well; recent lightning-caused fires in the upper Hayes drainage had been difficult to suppress without a trail.<sup>27</sup>

Fromme tended to focus on those trails or routes which followed river drainages and were already popular with climbing clubs like the Mountaineers. In some instances this required only trail renovations, such as the Kurtz Lake to Quinault Low Divide route. Several more trails were of interest to the Mountaineers or other outdoor enthusiasts, such as the Kurtz Lake to Promise Creek route, the Promise Creek to Queets Basin Trail (for hikers) and the Glacier Creek Trail from the Olympus Ranger Station to Blue Glacier on Mt. Olympus. Other proposed trails or reconstructions would also lead up the major river drainages, connecting popular lowland areas like Cushman, Quinault, and Crescent lakes and population centers like Port Angeles and Hood Canal, among others, with the major peaks and other scenic vistas of the interior Olympics. One of these was a route connecting the North Fork of the Skokomish, Duckabush, and Quinault drainages to take parties into Mt. Anderson. Another was a route connecting the Hoh and Elwha rivers.<sup>28</sup>

In other cases, trails would serve administrative purposes, such as improving travel for fire protection, timber sales and mining.. The Seven Lakes and Canyon Creek to Bogachiel Peak trails would provide access to a future lookout on Bogachiel Peak. They would also supply an important new link in the main trail system for the Solduck, Bogachiel, and Hoh river countries. A proposed trail between Deer Park and Dosewallips would provide a high country patrol route from the Deer Park Lookout to the Dosewallips headwaters. Trails along

---

<sup>25</sup> Fromme to District Forester, December 7, 1915, 2-5.

<sup>26</sup> R.L. Fromme to District Forester, December 7, 1915, RG 95, box 99759, file: L, Boundaries, Olympic, Mount Olympus National Monument, 1905-1916, NA-PNR, 1.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., 11-22.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.

**United States Department of the Interior**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 12

Olympic National Park Historic Trails District  
Clallam County, WA  
Historic Resources of Olympic National Park

---

the Queets and Bogachiel Rivers would open up a large expanse of heavily timbered country. These trails were not chosen for their scenic attributes, though many traversed open ridges or rain forests.<sup>29</sup>

Graves called Fromme's plan "admirable," but he had no clear intention of implementing the proposal. The costs of building the extensive trail system were prohibitive, and Graves was unwilling to spend any of the forest reserve's limited supply of money from its permanent improvement fund. He advised the district forester to make only those improvements that were administrative in nature. Graves did, however, use the plan as a bargaining chip to retain his agency's jurisdiction over Olympic National Forest in the face of national park proposals. If he could show that his bureau was contemplating the same kinds of developments one found in national parks, then he could argue that it should remain under Forest Service control.<sup>30</sup>

The chief forester's tactics temporarily paid off. For a brief period in 1915, the Department of Agriculture and Department of the Interior agreed that a park that encompassed the upper reaches of Mount Olympus National Monument should be created. However, when legislation was introduced into Congress in 1916, it failed to make it out of committee. The Secretary of Agriculture now opposed the park idea since he concluded that forests such as Olympic could be developed for their scenic charms without being converted into parks.<sup>31</sup>

\*\*\*

Between 1916 to 1933, the Forest Service displayed ambiguity about recreational development in Olympic. Fromme's plan served as a blue print for trail improvements, and the impetus for the plan--to deflect interest in a national park--remained strong. The agency ultimately prepared a master plan for recreation covering the entire forest in an attempt to silence its critics and defeat subsequent efforts to convert much of the forest into a park. However, the agency was still cautious and conservative in its recreation site development policy until the early 1930s. As a general rule, the bureau maintained that national forests supplied "space" for recreation, and for this reason, publicly financed recreation facilities in the nation's forests "remained limited in number and usually quite simple in nature." This policy of limited federal involvement in the development of recreation sites on national forests fit well with the Forest Service's own philosophical outlook as well as the those of the Coolidge and Hoover administrations and of Congress.<sup>32</sup>

Fred W. Cleator, who worked for the Northwest Region (District 6) out of Portland, was one of the few agency officials responsible for recreation planning and development. Although his title would change over the years, Cleator was the region's "landscape engineer." He was a forester--not a trained landscape architect--who understood the complexity of forest management and the bureau's mission. Cleator carried out recreational

---

<sup>29</sup> Ibid.

<sup>30</sup> Henry S. Graves to District Forester, January 7, 1916, RG 95, box 99759, file: L, Boundaries, Olympic, Mount Olympus National Monument, 1905-1916, NA-PNR.

<sup>31</sup> Secretary of Agriculture, D.F. Houston, to A.F. Lever, December 20?, 1916, *ibid.*

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 15.

**United States Department of the Interior**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 13

Olympic National Park Historic Trails District  
Clallam County, WA  
Historic Resources of Olympic National Park

---

surveys of, and prepared plans for, the forests in Oregon and Washington. Some of his better known projects were the Oregon Skyline and Cascade Crest trails (forerunners of today's Pacific Crest Trail) and the Mount Hood recreation plan, including the famous Timberline Lodge and related developments like the Timberline Trail. Reviewing the status of recreation in the Northwest in the mid-1920s, Assistant Forester Leon Kneipp gave Cleator high marks, noting that the district excelled above all others in the preparation of its recreation unit or work plans.<sup>33</sup>

In 1921, Cleator completed a recreation plan for the Lake Crescent District. The plan recognized the Lake Crescent region's great popularity and made provisions for summer home tracts, public camps, resorts, and the protection of the lake's scenic qualities. A year later, the regional forester established the Lake Quinault Recreation Area, which embraced the shoreline around the lake and recognized its value for summer homes. In 1924, Cleator played a lead role in preparing the Lake Quinault Recreation Area plan. In order to assess the progress in recreation planning, Assistant Forester L.F. Kneipp asked Frank Waugh to review Cleator's plan for Lake Crescent. Waugh, who was familiar with the Lake Crescent country, called it "a very good and sensible report," but he also noted that plans like this represented "a preliminary stage in recreation development, and one which will likely soon pass away." The plan, in other words, did not address any broad recreational policies, and thus, as Waugh concluded, the "whole recreation problem is one in which we are making some very crude beginnings."<sup>34</sup>

By the late 1920s, Cleator made a significant step towards improving the "recreation problem" by producing a recreation plan for the entire Olympic National Forest. This recreation, or master, plan was only one of three forest-level plans the region had undertaken, since recreation still was considered a low priority in forest management.<sup>35</sup> The plan was part of the Forest Service's continued efforts to stave off National Park status. Peninsula groups like the Olympic Development League actively promoted the region's natural splendors--the many possibilities it held for riding, fishing, hiking, and mountain climbing. The league worked with the Forest Service to construct a number of chalets, supported by a system of shelter camps, throughout the rugged lowland and alpine interior of the Olympics.<sup>36</sup> Cleator consulted with the League while preparing his initial forest survey in 1927.

Completed in 1929, the "Olympic Forest Recreation Plan," or "Cleator Plan" as it was known, addressed

---

<sup>33</sup> Gale Throop, Draft National Register Nomination, Recreation Development in the National Forests in Oregon and Washington--1905-1945. Lawrence Rakestraw, History of the Willamette National Forest (Eugene: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, 1991), 39-79. Leon F. Kneipp to Forester, August 31, 1926, RG 95, Entry 86, box 71, file: U-Recreation, Region 6, 1920-1939, NA.

<sup>34</sup> Fred W. Cleator, "Recreational Facilities of the Olympic National Forest and Forest Service Plan of Development," Forest Club Quarterly 10 (1936/37): 6. L.F. Kneipp to Frank A. Waugh, April 14, 1922; L.F. Kneipp to District Forester, May 1, 1922, RG 95, Entry 86, box 71, file: U-Recreation, Region 6, 1920-1939, NA.

<sup>35</sup> Kneipp to Forester, August 31, 1926.

<sup>36</sup> Cleator, "Recreational Facilities on the Olympic National Forest and Forest Plan of Development," 6.

**United States Department of the Interior**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 14

Olympic National Park Historic Trails District  
Clallam County, WA  
Historic Resources of Olympic National Park

---

a wide range of issues. It provided for roads, trails, camps, and shelters, and it set aside certain areas, mostly on lakes, for summer homes and resorts. It also designated for future protection the Olympic Primitive Area, a 134,000-acre alpine area, and established the Snow Peaks Recreation Area which embraced Mount Olympus National Monument. In addition to these provisions, it incorporated the existing recreation unit plans for areas like Lake Crescent and Lake Quinault as well as proposed plans for other areas, such as the Seven Lakes and Mount Angeles recreation units.<sup>37</sup>

The plan addressed a variety of constituencies and it satisfied many of the Forest Service's critics, especially those clamoring for a national park. The plan fit well into the Forest Service's management philosophy. As Cleator stated, the plan "was a classification of recreation values and a coordinated plan of management of these recreation assets along with the utility values of the entire Olympic National Forest." It established a well balanced system for handling the extremely important and sharply defined multiple uses which were crystallizing in the Peninsula, and becoming the subject of great public interest."<sup>38</sup> The Cleator Plan would enable the Forest Service to accomplish what some thought impossible: to preserve "the beauty of the Mt. Olympus National Monument and the Olympic National Forest...and at the same time permit the proper development of the industrial resources; all for the benefit of 'the greatest number in the long run.'"<sup>39</sup>

The plan dedicated some trails, namely those that traversed alpine country and afforded spectacular views, strictly to recreation. The proposed trail connecting the Elwha basin with the Hoh by way of the Queets Basin provides one example of this. These trails would be for travel by horses and pack trains (and foot if necessary) for extended trips into the Olympic backcountry. Trails designed for recreation differed from those whose purpose was transportation only. Rather than direct and efficient travelways, these trails were designed to traverse the forest landscape at a more leisurely pace with pleasure and scenic vistas in mind. Fred Cleator oversaw the design of numerous recreation trails and their construction in the forests of Oregon and Washington. Nevertheless, administrative concerns still dominated trail planning. As Cleator wrote, "it is intended that the recreation [provisions of the plan] should interfere very little, if any, with the accepted road and trail program, since we have here types of use that will fit quite satisfactorily with whatever transportation system is considered administratively desirable."<sup>40</sup> Visiting Olympic Forest to review its recreation planning in 1928, Assistant Forester Leon Kneipp expanded on this point of view.

It is not intended...that a special trail system or unusually heavy outlay of trail funds is necessary to

---

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., 6-7. Fred W. Cleator, "Report on Olympic Forest Recreation Plan," May 25, 1929 (approved June 10, 1929), in Recreation Atlas, Olympic National Forest, Olympic National Forest Archives, Olympia, Washington.

<sup>38</sup> Cleator, "Recreational Facilities of the Olympic National Forest," 6.

<sup>39</sup> This last quote comes from what appears to be Cleator's draft of his published statement, cited above, on his recreation plan. It can be found in RG 95, box 99759, file: Mount Olympus National Monument, Correspondence 1937, NA-PNR.

<sup>40</sup> Cleator, "Report on Olympic Recreation Plan," 2.

**United States Department of the Interior**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 15

Olympic National Park Historic Trails District  
Clallam County, WA  
Historic Resources of Olympic National Park

---

provide for tourist travel. To the contrary, a system of trails meeting the qualifications prescribed in the Trail Manual for secondary trails and designed to provide what eventually will be the administrative requirements of the Forest will be fully sufficient to meet the recreation needs and nothing further than such a system is suggested or approved. As a matter of fact, the territory referred to is not a difficult one in which to build trails at a reasonable cost if a proper preliminary study is made with a view to securing the best and most economical locations. Few of the slopes are so steep as to preclude trail construction, and much of the rock which would be encountered is of a kind which could readily be picked up or shot out with a minimum of expense. Sooner or later it will be necessary to bring the whole series of watersheds which head up around Mount Olympus into communication with trails which will permit prompt passage from one drainage to another. This system when established will provide the average tourist with all the good trails he will need.<sup>41</sup>

The Cleator Plan served as both a guiding principle for forest recreational developments as well as a statement, one by now familiar, that asserted the place of trails within the overall management of the forest. Trails should serve a variety of purposes, when possible, and above all, they should satisfy the administrative concerns of forest managers. By 1933, Cleator reported that the agency had “constructed or bettered and posted many miles of remote country trail, and along these trails had built about a hundred sturdy camping shelters of rustic material, with fireplaces and rough sanitary conveniences, to accommodate the red blooded fisherman and wilderness seeker.” Once again, Cleator emphasized the Forest Service’s multiple purpose approach to recreational developments. “These [structures], of course, served also as administrative quarters for trail builders, fire patrolmen, and traveling forest officers, and were frankly intended to be a dual-purpose development.”<sup>42</sup> By 1935, the bureau had completed some 962 miles of trail and 109 campgrounds, including 90 overnight shelters in Olympic.<sup>43</sup>

Trail-side improvements such as shelters were among the most character-defining features of these pathways. They reflected that trails were intended to meet the needs of forest protection and administration as well as recreation. The first shelters appeared in National Forests in the 1920s along trails in locations where fire and trail crews as well as packers could stop for the night. Many shelters were located in what became

---

<sup>41</sup> Leon F. Kneipp, Memorandum on Recreation, District 6, September 8, 1928, RG 95, Entry 86, box 71, file: U-Recreation, Region 6, 1920-1939, NA.

<sup>42</sup> Cleator, “Recreational Facilities of the Olympic National Forest,” 7.

<sup>43</sup> Chief, Forest Service, to Percival S. Risdale, c. August 5, 1935, RG 95, box 99759, file #5, NA-PNR. A 1933 forest map identified at least thirty-two trail shelters throughout the forest, that is, that portion within today’s national park. The figure of ninety shelters, cited by forest officials above, more than likely included the number of shelters associated with ranger stations and front country campgrounds. Although many shelters no longer exist today within today’s park and adjacent forest, five trail shelters along the Bogachiel River, spaced roughly four to five miles apart, reflect the design guidelines set down by Fred Cleator. See Evans, Olympic National Park, 215.

**United States Department of the Interior**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 16

Olympic National Park Historic Trails District  
Clallam County, WA  
Historic Resources of Olympic National Park

---

natural base camps for forest workers--near trail junctions and meadows which provided ample forage for pack stock (and later, shelter for backcountry enthusiasts). Shelters were more abundant in the wetter forests, like Olympic. As one bureau official reported, because of the peninsula's heavy rainfall, storms, and fog, "shelter camps were essential."<sup>44</sup> In this respect, trail shelters were an integral component of the Forest Service's fire detection and suppression system put in place prior to World War II. Shelters were also the basic support facilities necessary for building and maintaining the trails and telephone lines which aided in this important work and thus tied the forest together in a transportation and communication network. Many were three-sided log structures, equipped with the basic necessities for overnight stays, but depending on their location and use, their design and associated facilities varied.<sup>45</sup>

Although shelters, like the trails they augmented, had their origins in the administration of forests, they became widely popular for backcountry recreation, especially in the 1920s when the Forest Service began to design trails with recreation in mind. Cleator's plans prominently featured trail-side shelters where hikers could spend the night, break camp the following morning, and then travel about six to seven miles to the next shelter, which they would reach by early afternoon. In this way, they could enjoy not only the hike itself but the opportunities for recreation around the shelter before resuming their trip the next day.

Even though Cleator's plan was never realized to the extent he had envisioned, some shelters were eventually built. Just as important, the shelters and the trail were conceived and built as an interrelated unit. The trail and shelter system spoke to a time in history when hiking with heavy and cumbersome camping equipment was difficult, and thus without the burden of carrying tents (and stoves), and by having the shelters a day hike in distance apart, Cleator believed that the mountains would become more accessible to many more people. While we know little of Cleator's specific plans for recreation trails in Olympic National Forest, we can assume that similar principles applied, for example, in the design and construction of the Skyline Queets Trail.<sup>46</sup>

Further proof of the importance of trail-side shelters in forest recreation appeared in the Forest Service's 1933 Recreation Handbook. The handbook noted that there were three factors that came into play when planning trail-side improvements. These were to meet the needs of trail travelers, to protect the sanitary conditions of camp sites, and to provide better fire protection. The manual allowed for a wide range of improvements, noting that lightly used camping areas would need few enhancements, especially since most backcountry hikers or horseback riders would like the forest conditions to remain as primitive as possible. On the other hand, those popular sites would warrant everything from rustic toilets and garbage collection facilities to tables, benches, fireplaces, and water systems. Finally, simple shelters would provide a valuable element to the outdoor experience along heavily used recreation trails, particularly those forest areas on the wet and cold

---

<sup>44</sup> F.V. Horton to Forest Supervisor, Olympic National Forest, August 12, 1935, *ibid*.

<sup>45</sup> All of this and the following information on trail shelters is drawn from Gale Throop's draft domination.

<sup>46</sup> E.J. Hanzlik and Lee P. Brown, "Report on Proposed Elimination of Certain Units from the Olympic National Forest for Addition to the Mt. Olympus National Monument," April 10, 1935, RG 95, box 99759, file: LP, Boundaries, NA-PNR.

**United States Department of the Interior**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 17

Olympic National Park Historic Trails District  
Clallam County, WA  
Historic Resources of Olympic National Park

---

western Cascades; all of these would include improvements similar to those outlined above. The importance of trail-side shelters, in this context, was readily apparent in Olympic. As Regional Forester C.J. Buck alluded to later, trails for recreation, and their related facilities, were essential in the Olympic region where the “extraordinary density of the undergrowth” was similar to that found in tropical jungles.<sup>47</sup>

\*\*\*

1933 marked an important turning point in the forest’s history. That year, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s New Deal changed the course of the nation in the throes of the Depression by providing numerous federal-aid programs. The New Deal brought funding for the Forest Service’s recreation program that was beyond the “wildest dreams” of earlier forest officials, and a decade of frenzied recreation development began. Work relief programs like the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) provided most of the labor for projects aimed at completing recreational developments in the national forests. Most of these projects met needs identified in earlier forest plans, but they also were following the recreation program outlined in the “A National Plan for American Forestry,” also known as the Copeland Report. Prepared by the Forest Service in 1933 to address the variety of problems affecting the nation’s forests, the report contained a section on recreation written by Robert Marshall. Marshall, arguably the nation’s most famous forester and wilderness advocate of his time, was then working as a private citizen- but would go on to lead the bureau’s Recreation and Lands Division in 1937.<sup>48</sup>

Marshall’s analysis of the importance of recreation of all kinds in the national forests, from wilderness areas to campgrounds and summer homes, and his subsequent leadership of the bureau’s recreation division, placed recreation on solid footing in the Forest Service. As a result, for most of the 1930s the Forest Service built roads and trails, as well as “substantial recreation structures in National Forests from coast to coast,” predominantly in the Rustic style of architecture characterized by its use of native materials such as logs and stone for construction and its nonintrusive presence in the natural scene. Assisting in these designing and overseeing these projects were skilled professionals, architects and landscape architects, whom the Forest Service once again returned to, at least temporarily, for their expertise.<sup>49</sup>

Reviewing the Forest Service’s recreation work in the Pacific Northwest during the New Deal era, Fred Cleator wrote with great enthusiasm about its success. “When the CCC program broke,” he stated, “the Forest Service in the Pacific Northwest, as a result of its previous experience, had thousands of project plans, not only engraved in the minds of its Forest Officers, but graphically on paper and ready to go. The crying need just then was to correct our very primitive transportation and communication systems.” Within a year and a half, Cleator noted, the bureau overcame great physical and logistical odds and set out to accomplish its projects.

---

<sup>47</sup> C.J. Buck to Chief, Forest Service, January 19, 1936, RG 95, box 99759, file: LP, Boundaries, Olympic National Park, Miscellaneous Reports, NA-PNR.

<sup>48</sup> Tweed, Recreation Site Planning and Improvements in National Forests, 1891-1942, 16-25. See also, Fox, John Muir and His Legacy, 206-210.

<sup>49</sup> Tweed, 17-22.



**United States Department of the Interior**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 18

Olympic National Park Historic Trails District  
Clallam County, WA  
Historic Resources of Olympic National Park

---

The service, with aid of CCC laborers, architects, landscape architects and other experts, improved “dingy” ranger stations and other existing facilities. More importantly, the bureau was able to install a long list of new structures for recreation which exceeded in “both quality and quantity” anything “than had been hoped for.” The agency upgraded campgrounds and picnic areas, installing clean toilets, running water, tables, benches, kitchens, bathhouses, and campstoves. In addition, the bureau built and renovated “for special recreation usage” many miles of lakeside and streamside trails, bridle paths and strolls, along with “stub or loop trails to fishing grounds, waterfalls, lookouts, and other scenic or scientific features.”<sup>50</sup>

As suggested by Cleator, the New Deal emergency work programs benefited Olympic National Forest substantially because they allowed forest officers to carry out long-desired and necessary projects for recreation, all of which included extending miles of trails and roads in the forest and expanding the number of shelters and other camping facilities. Some of the structures built during this period also benefited wildlife management. Forest crews built as many as eight shelters on the Hoh, Queets, and Quinault Rivers for the Olympic elk study.<sup>51</sup> But, as Cleator concluded, while recreation may have made serious advances, it still had to fit within the traditional framework of forest management. “After 25 years of experience,” the recreation engineer wrote, “we are more than ever convinced that the multiple use principle of land management is sound, both economically and socially.” As American life becomes more complex, he concluded, and the need for outdoor recreation increases, we hope the Forest Service can “meet the new needs, and at the same time keep a conservation balance of vision for the other legitimate forest uses.”<sup>52</sup>

Ultimately, the Forest Service’s attempts to balance timber harvests and outdoor recreation proved to be a central reason the bureau lost most of Olympic National Forest to a the National Park Service in the late 1930s. Cleator’s recreation plan for the forest bought the bureau some time in its efforts to show its detractors that it could manage the region for its wild and scenic qualities as well as its commercial values. However, conservationists, unconvinced that the agency would adequately protect the mammoth trees and Roosevelt elk, renewed their attacks on the agency’s management of the peninsula. While the Forest Service tried to improve its position with the public, it also had to contend with the National Park Service. As part of Roosevelt’s reorganization of the federal government during the New Deal, the jurisdiction over national monuments, including Mt. Olympus National Monument, was transferred to the Park Service in 1933. Afterwards, conservationists, led by the Emergency Conservation Committee, mounted a campaign to convert the monument into a national park. The Forest Service, as well as entrepreneurial interests in the peninsula, namely those who depended on the timber economy, opposed the proposal. Primarily to protect these interests,

---

<sup>50</sup> Fred W. Cleator, “Recreation Work of the U.S. Forest Service in the Pacific Northwest,” March 14, 1936, RG 95, box G-1, file: L Recreation, 1936, NA-PNR, 2-3.

<sup>51</sup> John E. Schwartz, “A Progress Report of the Olympic Elk Study,” May 5, 1936, RG 95, box 99759, file: LP, Boundaries, Olympic National Park, Miscellaneous Reports, NA-PNR.

<sup>52</sup> Cleator, “Recreation Work of the U.S. Forest Service,” 5.

**United States Department of the Interior**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 19

Olympic National Park Historic Trails District  
Clallam County, WA  
Historic Resources of Olympic National Park

---

Washington State subsequently opposed the park idea, too.<sup>53</sup>

As the controversy escalated, the first of several bills to create a large national park from Olympic Forest lands appeared. Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes summed up the sentiments of many conservationists when he testified against the Forest Service by attacking its multiple use philosophy: "Sustained-yield logging, multiple use, or any of the other smooth-sounding techniques of the Forest Service are no substitute for a national park, and will not save an area of national park quality. Neither will they replace trees that are centuries old after they have been cut down." Ickes criticized the Forest Service's claims to be able to harmonize all forms of forest uses, when it appeared to many that timber management would always take precedence over all other forest uses.<sup>54</sup>

As a result, the Forest Service defended its interest in managing the forest for recreation. Once again, Cleator's plan served as a model for how the Forest Service could manage the region for both commercial and recreational uses. The Olympic Primitive Area, set aside in 1930, served as an important example of the bureau's commitment to preservation, yet primitive area designations were subject to administrative rather than congressional approval and could therefore be reduced or eliminated with little warning. More importantly, timber production was an essential component in determining the primitive area's boundaries as well as all other recreational units on the forest. As Cleator wrote, in order to supply the forest industries of the peninsula, it was imperative that "the largest possible portion of the National Forest area compatible with recreation needs and values be managed primarily for timber production." Even Assistant Forester Leon Kneipp, who had promoted forest recreation, sided with his agency's timber management practices, suggesting that they were fully compatible with its recreation program. A park, he maintained, would destroy the local economy.<sup>55</sup> The Forest Service believed that a rational, economic argument for multiple-use management of the forest, including recreation, would win public support and defeat the park proposal. This strategy failed.

On June 29, 1938, President Roosevelt signed the legislation creating Olympic National Park. The bill created a large wilderness park of some 634,000 acres, with provisions for the president to enlarge it up to nearly 900,000 acres. The new park included the former Mount Olympus National Monument and a substantial portion of Olympic National Forest. The Park Service planned to manage the new park as a wilderness reserve as much as possible, preserving its great forests, as well as its impressive array of peaks, glaciers, rivers, lakes, and wildlife, in their primitive state. Though the agency managed the park differently than its predecessor, it continued many of the Forest Service's plans and projects, and it would engage in its own development projects for visitors and management programs. It also promoted recreation as a valuable use of the Olympics, but it

---

<sup>53</sup> Schene, "Only the Squeal is Left," 57. Donald C. Swain, "The National Park Service and the New Deal," Pacific Historical Review 41 (August 1972): 312-319.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 58. See also Ben W. Twight, Organizational Values and Political Power: The Forest Service Versus the Olympic National Park (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1983).

<sup>55</sup> Fred W. Cleator, "Report on Olympic Primitive Area," April 10, 1936 (approved July 3, 1936), RG 95, box G-1, file: U Classification, Olympic Primitive Area, NA-PNR, 2. Schene, 57.

**United States Department of the Interior**  
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places**  
Continuation Sheet

Section number 8 Page 20

Olympic National Park Historic Trails District  
Clallam County, WA  
Historic Resources of Olympic National Park

---

eliminated all forms of commercial use.

However, the Forest Service legacy, that of a working forest, would live on in the new park's system of trails, shelters, and various structures augmenting the trails. The trail system spoke to an earlier vision of the Olympics, one informed by Progressive era beliefs in efficiency and scientific management of resources--that natural resources should be used in a variety of ways and that properly managed forests should produce timber, among other resources, indefinitely. Recreation fit into this management scheme, and it too would be reflected in the new park's trail system. But recreation was only one use of many that factored into the design, planning, and development of the Olympic Forest's trails. In essence, the Forest Service's development of trails in Olympic for administrative and recreational interests was an important element in the Park Service's management of the region.