

*Opening the Mountains*  
*The Civilian Conservation Corps and*  
*the U.S. Forest Service at Lamoille Canyon*  
*and Mount Charleston, Nevada*

JONATHAN FOSTER

In the decades since the Great Depression, the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) has been portrayed in the American historical narrative as one of the most successful and popular of all New Deal relief programs.<sup>1</sup> From 1939 to 1942, millions of down-on-their-luck young men and World War I veterans spent time in thousands of CCC camps located across the nation and in territorial holdings of the United States. These young men earned a small salary, found purpose in their work, and even broadened their own horizons through participation in CCC-supported educational opportunities. In the process, they transformed the nation's landscape by planting billions of trees, fighting fires, and opening millions of acres to both recreational and conservationist activities.<sup>2</sup> The CCC's influence proved particularly strong in the national forests. CCC enrollees provided much needed labor for a United States Forest Service (USFS) that, by the 1930s, increasingly addressed the people's outdoor recreational needs in addition to managing the forests.<sup>3</sup> This process was certainly evident in Nevada. A local-level comparison of similar CCC camps in Nevada's national forest brings into focus the historically

Jonathan Foster teaches history (U.S., environmental, and Western U.S.) at Great Basin College in Elko. He presented an earlier version of this article at the American Historical Association's Pacific Coast Branch's annual conference in 2013. He is currently working on a study of the CCC's relationship to urban areas in the intermountain West.

significant and varied role played by the CCC in opening Nevada's mountain retreats to post-Depression-era recreational activity. Such a study also identifies structural and contextual causes for the distinct variety in enrollee experiences and long-term camp legacies. Examining the histories of CCC Camps F-1 and F-4, located at Nevada's Lamoille Canyon and Mount Charleston, thus contributes to a richer understanding of the CCC's roles in the national forests, both in operation and outcomes.

That the work of CCC enrollees transformed the landscape and usage patterns of American national forests is beyond doubt. President Franklin Roosevelt's "Tree Army," as it was commonly called, planted some 2.3 billion trees, devoted 6.3 million man-days to fire fighting, 6.2 million man-days to fire pre-suppression projects, and treated 21 million acres of woodlands in pest and disease control operations. Further, the CCC built infrastructure within national forests that allowed for exponentially increased public usage in the decades that followed. These projects included 122,000 miles of roadways, the development of 23,700 new water sources and systems, improvements to more than 100,000 miles of hiking trails, the blazing of 28,000 miles of new hiking trails, and the construction of 50,000 new campgrounds and thousands of recreational parks, structures, and ranger stations.<sup>4</sup> The CCC certainly contributed to opening the way for many Americans to experience the outdoor recreational opportunities of the national forests.

At first glimpse, the state of Nevada seems an unlikely setting for an examination of the significance of the CCC in the national forests. The state is, after all, better known for sage brush, aridity, and vast open spaces than the forests. Similarly, the state does not seem a particularly promising location for an historical study of the CCC and the USFS's influence on recreational behavior. Of approximately four thousand CCC camps in existence, only fifty-four were located in Nevada. Of the fifty-four, only seven were supervised by the USFS. This is in contrast to the national trend, where in the early years of the CCC's existence, the forest service claimed more CCC camps than did any other single federal agency. In Nevada, that honor went to the Division of Grazing, which had twenty-seven camps devoted to its projects.<sup>5</sup>

Although Division of Grazing projects took center stage with the CCC in Nevada, the USFS projects and the importance of the CCC to the state's forest lands should not be discounted. Nevada, after all, is home to the largest national forest in the United States outside of Alaska. Known today as the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, it encompasses 6.3 million discontinuous, high-elevation acres across the state.<sup>6</sup>

It is fitting that the national forest derived its name from the Humboldt Mountain Range and the Shoshone word for mountains, as large forests typically exist only in the state's higher elevations. Nevada certainly does not suffer from a shortage of higher elevations, as indicated by the existence of more than two-hundred-thirty named mountain ranges within the state's

boundaries. This makes Nevada the country's most mountainous state in terms of number of mountain ranges. Twenty-three of these ranges contain peaks reaching elevations higher than ten thousand feet. These mountains receive considerable snowfall each year, and offer prime winter and summer recreational activities.<sup>7</sup>

The forested mountains' recreational potential did not escape the attention of the USFS and CCC planners. As the historian William Rowley has shown, the forest service was forced to address recreational issues as early as 1906. At that time, and for some decades thereafter, the USFS had to deal with tensions between urban sportsmen and rural ranchers over the regulation of game on forest lands. Sportsmen typically sought more game regulation to increase game herds, while ranching interests viewed the existing herds as a threat to grazing land. The USFS, at least at the local level and in practice, tended to align more with grazing interests at this time.<sup>8</sup> By the 1930s, however, creating public access to outdoor recreational opportunities seemed to take on more importance. Building amenities for the public's enjoyment of the national forest lands assumed a place "foremost in foresters' minds," and "central" to the cooperative projects of the USFS and CCC throughout the Great Depression.<sup>9</sup>

With such prospective development in the state's abundant public lands and a small population, Nevada benefitted disproportionately from New Deal relief agencies like the CCC. With a population of 91,058 in 1930, Nevada ranked last among all states. Yet despite the facts that Nevada had fewer New Deal projects and less over-all New Deal investment within its borders than did other states, the activity that it received had a greater per-capita impact. For example, over-all New Deal investment in Nevada amounted to approximately \$1,200 for each man, woman, and child in the state, with the overwhelming majority of federal expenditures coming through the Bureau of Reclamation (Hoover Dam), the Bureau of Public Roads, and the CCC. Nevada subsequently ranked first in the nation in terms of per-capita investment of New Deal funds. In other states, the over-all per-capita federal expenditure could be as little as \$5 per person.<sup>10</sup>

In terms of CCC presence relative to population, Nevada eclipsed all other states. By 1937 Nevada had sixteen operational camps. This amounted to one camp per 5,591 inhabitants. Ultimately, 30,791 men worked for the CCC in Nevada. Of these 30,791 enrollees, 7,079 were native Nevadans. Thus, approximately 8 percent of Nevada's population actively worked for the CCC during the term of its existence.<sup>11</sup> This statistic is particularly impressive when one takes into account that enrollment in the CCC was limited for the most part to the 18-to-25 year old demographic and World War I veterans.<sup>12</sup>

The CCC affected an even greater number of Nevadans than those living in its camps and working on its projects. The placement of a CCC camp often resulted in a boom of commerce and income for nearby urban areas. Thus, town officials and politicians on all levels often lobbied tirelessly in hopes of

obtaining camps and keeping active those already in existence.<sup>13</sup> Additional economic contributions to the state included increased education of Nevada enrollees obtained through CCC education programs, and the influx of cash to families of enrollees. CCC educational programs, sometimes with participation rates of more than 90 percent at the camp level, increased enrollees' likelihood of obtaining post-CCC employment and their long-term earning potential.<sup>14</sup> That each enrollee was required to send home \$25 of their monthly \$30 CCC earnings, both helped many struggling Nevadan families survive the Great Depression. The practice also infused much needed cash into faltering local economies.<sup>15</sup>

Yet the existence of such positive influences of the CCC on Nevadans depended upon more than simply the existence of the camps. Successful operation rested upon close cooperation among multiple government agencies. Nevada's CCC camps in national forest lands illustrate that smooth and productive camp operation required an almost unprecedented degree of interagency cooperation among the CCC, the USFS, and the U.S. Army. Oftentimes, breakdowns in cooperation at the local or national level could have damaging consequences at the camp level. These included poor morale, discipline problems, loss of work productivity, and deteriorating relations with nearby communities.

While typical strife and disagreements between the CCC and USFS (or its parent, the Department of Agriculture) certainly occurred, interagency cooperation seems to have been better between them than with the army. A large flare-up between the CCC and army occurred in 1937 for example, when the War Department decided on a rotation scheme that would remove and replace all CCC camp commanders who had been on duty at their camps for more than eighteen months. Even though the army had, at first, participated in the CCC experiment reluctantly, its leaders had realized the value of experience gained by reserve officers in commanding CCC camps. Therefore, a rotation schedule was approved that would give more officers the opportunity to serve as camp commanders. CCC Director Fechner bitterly opposed this decision and interceded directly with President Roosevelt to have it overturned. This opened up great antagonism with the War Department, which viewed Fechner's actions as an attempt to dictate policy. Eventually, a compromise was reached that allowed for the army to rotate out 50 percent of its commanding officers each year.<sup>16</sup> As will be made evident in the examination of Camp Charleston Mountain, this decision reverberated through Nevada's CCC camps in terms of enrollee morale, opportunity, and camp productivity.

It was within this context of increasing emphasis on recreation access and amenities and strained inter-agency cooperation that Nevada's CCC camps operated from 1933 to 1942. Two of these camps, Lamoille Canyon's F-1 and Mount Charleston's F-4, shared such similarities that historians of the CCC in Nevada have labeled them "counterparts" to each other.<sup>17</sup> Both were summer-only camps devoted to USFS projects for most of their existence. Both



Camp Lamoille Barracks under Construction, 1933. (*Northeastern Nevada Museum Archives, Elko, Nevada*)

were located in spectacular mountain settings that offered huge potential for recreational development. Each camp was also located approximately the same distance from its county's largest urban area. Both date to the earliest period of CCC history, having been formed in May 1933, and they remained in existence for the duration of CCC's existence.<sup>18</sup> Yet closer inspection of each camp's history and accomplishments suggests striking variation between the two counterpart camps. Specifically, there were apparent differences between the camps regarding scope of work, leadership quality, and camp legacies.

Lamoille Canyon is located in the Ruby Mountain range of northeastern Nevada, approximately thirty miles southeast of the city of Elko. The mountain range and canyon are widely recognized as harboring some of the most spectacular scenery in the state.<sup>19</sup> Local, regional, and national publications have often commented on the area's world-class beauty, going so far as to apply the nickname "Nevada's Alps."<sup>20</sup>

This spectacular scenery was not readily accessible to tourists prior to the 1930s. Though locals knew of the area's alpine lakes, sublime landscapes, and



Tents at Camp Lamoille, ca. 1933. (*Northeastern Nevada Museum Archives, Elko, Nevada*)

recreational potential, no roadway extended into the length of the canyon.<sup>21</sup> Thus, as road building and recreational accessibility stood as a central concern of the USFS, Lamoille Canyon offered a prime site for large-scale forest-service projects. The CCC offered the USFS the means and manpower to accomplish such projects. Subsequently, Lamoille Canyon's Camp F-1 became the state's first camp devoted to forest-service projects. The enrollees' primary job was to open the canyon via the construction of a twelve-mile road into its far reaches. Additional projects included the construction of a USFS ranger station, new campgrounds, water systems, and a network of hiking trails throughout the canyon and surrounding mountains.<sup>22</sup>

This ambitious slate of projects coincided with prevalent forest-service agendas in the 1930s. New and improved roadways and amenities were intended to serve multiple purposes that the forest service emphasized during this period. For example, the roadway would provide access to the forests for multiple tasks: the harvesting of trees, fire suppression, and recreational activities. A forest-service manual on forestry for CCC enrollees from this period stressed that the role of forestry and, by association, the USFS was to manage the forests to ensure their continued "protection of watersheds .... erosion protection .... timber production .... and game." The manual goes on

to stress another primary concern of the forest service that has emerged in recent years due to increased leisure time and the widespread acceptance of the automobile. This final concern, "which in some areas exceeds all others in importance," was outdoor recreation.<sup>23</sup>

The CCC's work projects in Lamoille Canyon certainly reflected this emphasis on recreational accessibility. According to the enrollee Ivan Dunlap, the main purpose of the camp's existence was to "open up this marvelous region by building a road into the heart of the mountains."<sup>24</sup> CCC enrollees began working on the road "opening" Lamoille Canyon in 1933, and completed it in 1940. As the seven-year-span indicates, the road's construction was no easy task. Enrollees used dynamite to blast the roadway's bed into precarious high-altitude granite cliffs, and graded its surface by horse-drawn equipment. As the enrollee Edmund Rosowski recalled some years later, at Lamoille "it was either firefighting or road construction." His job, in regard to road construction, was to deliver the explosives used to blast out the Lamoille Canyon roadway. Each day, he would drive into town, pick up a truckload of dynamite at the Elko rail depot, and then drive the dynamite back out to the Lamoille camp.<sup>25</sup>

The efforts of Rosowski and those working alongside him paid off. When completed, the dirt-and-gravel road provided scenic access for tourists who wanted to sightsee, camp at CCC-built campgrounds, explore the miles of CCC-constructed hiking trails, or pursue trout in the many alpine lakes and streams in the vicinity.<sup>26</sup> In the decades that followed, and particularly after the designation of the canyon as a scenic area in 1965, the original road was greatly improved. The Lamoille Canyon Scenic Byway (officially designated NF-660) is now a modern two-lane asphalt road with numerous scenic overlooks; it allows tens of thousands of visitors to enter and enjoy the canyon each year.<sup>27</sup>

Projects such as the Lamoille Canyon road were the result of increased focus on recreation by forest-service officials. The basis for this increased awareness is evident from even the most cursory glance at federal land usage statistics into the 1930s. Between 1917 and 1931, the public's visitation of national forests increased from 3,132,000 per year to 32,288,613 per year. Further, the rate of increase of national-forest visitation was itself increasing rapidly in the 1930s. By 1935, the number of visitors had jumped more than 9 million from 1931's total, to a staggering 41,725,000 per year. This rate of visitation surpassed that of national parks, national monuments, and other federal recreational lands combined in 1935.<sup>28</sup> It is not surprising that forest-service projects carried out by the CCC were often aimed at "improving recreation and scenic values, as well as increasing the utility of the forest as a producer of wood."<sup>29</sup>

Recreation-oriented work projects at Camp Lamoille were, by no means, the only projects on which enrollees toiled. For example, the fighting of forest fires consumed much energy and time, as did activities aimed at the pre-suppression of fire. The enrollees at Lamoille and other CCC camps performed admirably in the execution of such duties. Often, this required the enrollees to

risk their lives in attempts to contain wildfires across Nevada and the West. This could end in tragic results, as was the case when five enrollees from the Camp Paradise Valley (Lamoille's wintering camp), lost their lives battling a fire on June 28, 1939.<sup>30</sup> As one might guess, this tragedy greatly affected the camp. As Edna Timmons, the wife of Camp Paradise supervisor Tim Timmons, later recalled, "that was real bad .... that was the most terrible thing."<sup>31</sup> Yet, such occurrences, though tragic, were the exception. Firefighting was one of the CCC's most successful endeavors in the national forests. Thanks to the work of the CCC, national forest acreage destroyed by fire decreased to its lowest levels on record between 1933 and 1942.<sup>32</sup>

Beyond fire suppression, CCC enrollees also devoted much time to cattle-guard construction, fence building and mending, reservoir impounding, and fighting the hordes of "Mormon Crickets" that invaded the surrounding area each summer.<sup>33</sup> The cricket populations were so heavy in summer that enrollees used metal sheets to build diversion funnels to concentrate the insects into a pile. Once the cricket piles reached heights of approximately three feet, the enrollees would douse the piles with gasoline and light them on fire.<sup>34</sup> Still, beyond burning crickets, the camp's main objective remained the opening of the area to greater access. According to the CCC camp inspector M. J. Bowen, the enrollees at Lamoille Canyon performed "some really fine work" in this regard.<sup>35</sup>

As in Lamoille Canyon, the enrollees who inhabited Camp Charleston Mountain in southern Nevada's Kyle Canyon also worked on forest-service projects primarily aimed at improving recreational access and amenities. Like Lamoille Canyon, Kyle Canyon's natural beauty often led to comparisons with famous spectacular environments. In this case, the area around Mount Charleston was at times referred to as a "Yosemite in the Sagebrush."<sup>36</sup> Unlike Lamoille Canyon, Kyle Canyon and the Mount Charleston area were heavily used for recreational purposes well before the CCC's arrival. In 1915, the early Las Vegas entrepreneur and politician E. W. Griffith purchased some eighty acres around Kyle Springs in an area historically used as a source for lumber and as a hideout for horse thieves. Griffith, attuned to the recreational needs of nearby Las Vegas, immediately began the construction of what was known as Charleston Park on Mount Charleston, as well as improving the rudimentary road connecting his new resort with the main Tonopah Highway. Although the road was difficult to travel, and the thirty-five-mile trip from Las Vegas took three or four hours to complete, many Las Vegasans made use of it each year. The cool high-elevation forests of Mount Charleston (typically thirty degrees or so cooler than the Las Vegas Valley) was a tempting respite for those needing relief from the desert heat.<sup>37</sup>

By the late 1920s, the recreational value that locals placed upon the Mount Charleston area was made apparent by heavy visitation of the site. Summer weekends in 1927 often found every available room and cabin at Griffith's resort occupied, with applications being accepted for waiting lists.<sup>38</sup> The following year, a keen public interest in Mount Charleston recreation was





Camp Mount Charleston, June 1940. (Gerald W. Williams Collection, Oregon State University Libraries Special Collections & Archives Research Center)

shown by vocal public outcry and legal proceedings against Griffith in relation to mountain access. Griffith, it seems, had installed a gate across what by then had become known as Charleston Road in an attempt to control entrance into the area. Despite Griffith's claims that he had built the road across his private property, the Las Vegas district attorney soon ordered him to remove the gate and reopen access to county road workers and visitors to Mount Charleston.<sup>39</sup>

Thus, by the late May and early June 1933 arrival of the CCC enrollees at Camp Charleston Mountain, the area was already widely known, heavily used, and vehemently claimed by the public as a recreational outlet for neighboring Las Vegas. Yet the area sorely lacked adequate amenities for the growing urban population nearby.<sup>40</sup> The forest service's projects for the CCC in Kyle Canyon reflected this context, by focusing on improving existing access and facilities, and constructing new recreational amenities. These included an impressive winter park with ice skating, ski slopes, and ski jumps, an amphitheater, numerous trails, road construction and improvements, and water pipeline systems for inhabitants.<sup>41</sup>

As with Lamoille Canyon, work projects advanced at a steady rate on Mount Charleston. From 1933 onward, crews of enrollees were busy developing new skiing sites, picnic areas, trails, parking lots; stringing telephone cables; installing water pipes, and improving public campgrounds. The crews also devoted time to fire suppression and pre-suppression projects. Beyond the construction of the winter park, which was to contain two ski jumps, ski slides, ice-skating pond, and a toboggan slide, the main project appears to have been the construction of a three-mile-long roadway to the mountain summit. In contrast to Lamoille, the CCC enrollees on Mount Charleston were also tasked with the unenviable duty of patrolling and cleaning campgrounds and also maintaining signage for the thousands of recreationalists who visited the area each weekend. At times, this placed a significant strain on the CCC enrollees, who already suffered from low morale at Camp Charleston Mountain.<sup>42</sup>

Enrollee morale became an issue at both Camp Lamoille and Camp Charleston Mountain. In both instances, camp morale started strong but wavered as time drew on. While the fluctuations in morale were significant in each instance, enrollees at Mount Charleston exhibited the greatest drop in morale over the course of their camp's existence.

Morale at Mount Charleston seems to have declined rapidly following 1938. Prior to 1939, existing records indicate no evidence of significant discontent. Camp inspection and educational reports for 1936 describe an active, orderly camp inhabited by enrollees of "high spirits and morale." The camp offered ample recreational and educational activities for the young men, and seemingly benefited from strong leadership and good cooperation among the army, forest service, and CCC officials.<sup>43</sup> Similarly, inspection reports from 1937 and 1938 praised camp leadership, conditions, and agency cooperation, and ranked morale as "excellent" and "splendid." In a supplemental narrative to 1938's report, camp inspector Bowen went so far as to characterize Camp Mount Charleston as "the best summer camp I recall visiting in some time."<sup>44</sup>

By the summer of 1939, however, the camp's morale had plummeted. That year, CCC camp inspector A. W. Stockman wrote of a setting unrecognizable when compared with the inspections of the previous year. Stockman's scathing reports described a disorganized camp that ranked poorly in everything from sanitation to recreational equipment. Predictably, Stockman also rated the camp's morale as poor. A telling statistic regarding enrollees' attitudes could be found in the nine discharges for desertion that year as compared to zero for the previous year. Stockman concluded by opining that the camp, "as a whole" was "most unsatisfactory" and in need of "drastic and concentrated attention."<sup>45</sup>

The source of the morale collapse at Camp Charleston Mountain resides in the camp's lack of stable leadership from winter 1938 through summer 1939. As Stockman reported, the company stationed at the camp had, after a long period of commendable army leadership, operated under five different commanders during this period. Four of these changes had taken place since April 1939.

Further, a new company of enrollees were combined with the existing company in May 1939.<sup>46</sup> This, along with instability and dereliction in leadership, likely served to fracture company cohesion and morale. It is of interest that the turnover in the camp's army leadership coincides with the previously discussed decision by the War Department to rotate camp commanders.

In the wake of Stockman's report CCC Director Robert Fechner's office took action. In a tersely worded memorandum to the adjutant general of the War Department, Assistant to the Director Charles Kenlan conveyed Fechner's wish that the War Department investigate and take immediate action regarding the "extraordinary" and "far from satisfactory" conditions at the camp.<sup>47</sup> Army investigations found failures in "adequacy of command, administration, and camp facilities." These issues, the report went on to explain, were being addressed by new officers who had been placed in charge of camp administration.<sup>48</sup>

However addressed, the army's actions failed to rectify the problems at Mount Charleston. The slide in both camp morale and conditions continued through 1942. That year, CCC inspector M. J. Bowen issued what surely must have been the most critical inspection report of his career. Bowen found few things in the camp that met CCC standards. His report described trashed facilities, mess halls and kitchens swarming with flies, lack of refrigeration, lack of educational materials, missing or worn out recreational equipment, broken windows, and very poor administration. As for the enrollees, Bowen reported that they suffered from poor morale and appeared generally "untidy, slack, and unkempt." These enrollees and their work, Bowen concluded, "were not up to the general average."<sup>49</sup>

Again, further investigation found that the source of the camp's terrible morale and conditions resided with substandard army leadership at the camp level. In this instance, a Captain William J. Irwin had been placed in charge of CCC company 1530 stationed at Logandale, Nevada, in late 1941. In the spring of 1942, the company relocated to Mount Charleston, where it would spend the summer working on USFS projects. Irwin turned out to be completely incompetent as camp commander. Soon, camp conditions and morale sank to even greater depths than observed in 1939. Work on forest-service projects also suffered, as evidenced by numerous complaints from USFS supervisors throughout the spring and summer of 1942.<sup>50</sup>

Investigations into camp conditions suggested a shocking dereliction of duty on the part of Captain Irwin. Those interviewed, including subordinate officers, related alarming levels of "inefficiency and various forms of misconduct" on Irwin's part. For example, Captain Irwin seems to have seldom slept in camp, having chosen instead to live primarily in Las Vegas. Even when in camp during the day, he often appeared to be intoxicated. On the rare occasions that he stayed in camp overnight, he preferred to be accompanied by female companions. Reports indicated that Captain Irwin provided transportation for his female companions, who were also characterized as frequently intoxicated, with CCC and USFS trucks.<sup>51</sup>

Beyond Irwin's substandard leadership, the decline of Camp Mount Charleston resembles a national trend of dwindling morale and camp deterioration that occurred during the CCC's final two years. At this time, several contextual events worked against the CCC's ability to live up to its previous standards. International events had helped shift government emphasis away from economic relief and recovery to war preparation, the CCC had been denied the status of permanent agency by Congress, and the longtime CCC director Robert Fechner, passed away.<sup>52</sup> As a result, CCC camps and enrollee morale declined.

Though this wider context undoubtedly contributed to the problems on Mount Charleston, Bowen's reports indicate that this camp had deteriorated at a much faster rate and to a greater degree than others he inspected. His strong emphasis on Irwin suggests that instability of command and poor leadership served as the greatest contributor to the unsatisfactory state of affairs at the camp. This too could be related to the wider context of the crisis of war, which required the skills of more capable officers in more pressing duties. Even Irwin was called up from the reserves and commissioned in the regular army in 1942.<sup>53</sup>

Regarding Camp Lamoille, indications are also present of strong morale early on, and then periods of declining morale beginning in the late 1930s. In contrast with Mount Charleston, this seems to be indicative of the changing characteristics of enrollees rather than turnover in leadership. While local Nevadans were among the initial enrollees at Camp Lamoille, their numbers were not sufficient to fill requirements initially, and even less so over time. Ultimately, the majority of enrollees at Lamoille Canyon were from other parts of the United States. Whereas, in the early years many enrollees at Camp Lamoille came from rural areas of Ohio, Kentucky, and West Virginia, in later years New York City and New Jersey supplied more of the enrollees in the camps.<sup>54</sup>

Early on, Lamoille Canyon's remote location and stunning scenery served as a source of pride for many enrollees. Enrollees tended to enjoy the setting tremendously as evidenced by a submission to the CCC's newspaper *Happy Days* in 1934. Titled "Ruby Hunters Cut Way in 'Alps,'" a submission to *Happy Days* by enrollee Ivan Dunlap, it praised the location as "not unlike that of the Alps."<sup>55</sup> Others indicated their comfort and a sense of mischief through their interactions with the wild setting. On one such occasion, enrollee Frenchie La Vitte was surprised to find an unwelcome visitor under his bunk on a spring morning in 1934. Much to everyone's surprise, a rattlesnake had taken refuge there during the night. This did not faze La Vitte, who, to the cheering of his bunkmates, proceeded to pick the snake up and display it for the others to see, and even placed the venomous reptile's head in his own mouth at one point.<sup>56</sup> Although extraordinarily foolhardy, it shows that even this unwelcome event was turned into a raucous display of fun and camaraderie by the enrollees, indicating a degree of happiness and comfort with the wild on their part.



Recreational Activity at Camp Lamoille, 1933. (*Northeastern Nevada Museum Archives, Elko, Nevada*)

During this period, from 1934 through 1936, no evidence indicates poor discipline or morale in the Lamoille Canyon camp. In contrast, surviving inspection reports can be characterized as glowing. CCC Camp Inspector Bowen, for example, described the camp's over-all morale in 1935 as "splendid."<sup>57</sup> Paul Murdoch, the camp's educational advisor, characterized the enrollees as a "very choice group of boys to work with." Murdoch went on to describe the Lamoille enrollees as motivated and interested in learning as evidenced by an approximately 90 percent participation rate in educational offerings.<sup>58</sup>

Yet this level of happiness was not to be permanent. By the late 1930s, problems with camp morale began to appear. This coincided with a shift in the origins of enrollees serving in Lamoille Canyon in 1937. For that year, the Division of Grazing took over supervision of the Lamoille Camp and replaced the previous company with a group of enrollees hailing primarily from New York City and New Jersey.<sup>59</sup> It is likely that the previous groups of enrollees, having arrived primarily from rural areas, were more comfortable with the isolated setting and had experienced some previous introduction to outdoor labor. Camp inspection reports from this period suggest that did not seem to be the case with the more urbanized New Yorkers who arrived in 1937. These reports clearly reveal a greater degree of dissatisfaction on the part both of the newly arrived enrollees and their camp commander.<sup>60</sup>

In 1937, camp commanding officer John De Long reported to CCC special investigator M. J. Bowen that this group was “the poorest lot of boys he had handled” in his three years in the CCC. In his opinion, about half of the enrollees were unfit for service. He asserted that many of the enrollees refused to work, complained frequently, and suffered from exceedingly low morale. In fact, nineteen of the company’s approximately one-hundred-fifty enrollees received dishonorable discharges for refusal to work in the three months preceding inspector Bowen’s visit.<sup>61</sup>

Those associated with the camp also seem to have held a somewhat low opinion of the New York enrollees and their fit with the surroundings early on. Camp supervisor Tim Timmons’s wife, Edna, later recalled that the New Yorkers “didn’t have anything .... when they left, they talked like human beings. When they arrived it was just a lot of gibberish. It was just like letting out a herd of monkeys.”<sup>62</sup>

Inspector Bowen acknowledged that the life experiences of many of the boys had not adequately prepared them for the rural, rugged surroundings. At the same time, he also outlined contributing issues stemming from the commanding officer’s actions. De Long, for example, had discontinued weekly Sunday trips into Elko for enrollees to attend worship services. His reasoning for this was that enrollees sometimes did not actually attend the services. This reduction in town visitation increased the enrollees’ sense of isolation and severely dampened company morale. It needed, according to Bowen, to be immediately rectified. Poor food also seems to have contributed to low morale. The company, as Bowen states, had frequent turnover in mess officers, which contributed to substandard food quality. Most enrollees interviewed by Bowen stressed isolation, the lack of Sunday trips to town, and poor food quality as the sources of their disgruntlement.<sup>63</sup>

When confronted with the rural, isolated setting and strict discipline of the CCC camp, these young men experienced a degree of shock and tended to be less willing to cooperate. For the first time at Camp Lamoille, discipline problems and refusals to work ensued. On one such occasion, several enrollees engaged in a disturbance in the camp’s mess hall that resulted in a “riot call” to the Elko Police Department. Three enrollees, Anthony Ambrosio, John Cotton, and Pat Guazzo were subsequently arrested for causing the disturbance. Eventually, Guazzo confessed to having created the disturbance in hopes of gaining a discharge from the CCC and being allowed to return to New York City.<sup>64</sup>

In spite of these periods of substandard leadership and declining morale, the CCC camps at Mount Charleston and Lamoille Canyon accomplished their objectives. CCC work on USFS projects in both camps made each area more accessible for recreational use. At present, hundreds of thousands of recreationalists visit the two mountain canyons each year. Whether hiking, camping, skiing, or sightseeing, their recreational activities are possible because of the CCC enrollees who worked on USFS projects three quarters of a century ago.

This legacy certainly fits within the wider national legacy of the CCC concerning tourism and recreation. The CCC and forest service proved to be tremendously cooperative in their emphasis on increasing accessibility and recreation on public lands. The resultant process that one historian has labeled as the “packaging the natural world as recreational resource” contributed to a pattern of road building and construction in national parks and national forests that only intensified in the ensuing years. Road mileage in national forests, for example, doubled from 80,000 miles in 1940 to 160,000 miles in 1960.<sup>65</sup>

The legacy of such accessibility-centered policies has been controversial. Even during the CCC’s active years, many influential environmentalists and conservationists spoke out against the trend of opening wild areas to recreational development and activity. By the mid 1930s, wilderness activists such as Bob Marshall argued that CCC projects destroyed primitive wild areas in national forests and thus reduced the over-all worth of the forests. Similarly, the voice of Benton MacKaye, who had at one time worked for the CCC, criticized the corps’ road-building projects as destroying wilderness and the all-important solitude that it creates. Others, Aldo Leopold among them, vocally challenged CCC and forest-service projects in the 1930s for not placing adequate emphasis on forest ecology. Concerns such as those of Marshall, Leopold, and MacKaye directly contributed to an increased awareness of the need to preserve wilderness.<sup>66</sup> Thus, on a broad level, the CCC contributed both to the opening of wilderness and the increased awareness of the need to preserve wilderness. The historian Neil Maher has argued that, in this regard, the CCC played a central role in the transformation of specialist-based Progressive Era conservation into post-World War II grass roots environmentalism.<sup>67</sup>

As intellectuals and academics continue to debate the propriety of increased public access to wild areas, recreationalists go on enjoying the physical legacies of CCC work in record numbers. In both Lamoille Canyon and Mount Charleston, the CCC and USFS certainly helped this process along by packaging nature as an available “recreational resource” for Nevadans. Yet, the extent of increased recreational pressure has varied greatly between the two locations. Even though Lamoille Canyon remains a popular escape for locals, its development and visitation rates pale in comparison to those at Mount Charleston.<sup>68</sup>

At Mount Charleston today, in many ways, one can find the worst dreams of wilderness proponents recognized. Each year approximately 1.2 million people visit the Spring Mountain National Recreation area, of which Mount Charleston is the main attraction. An additional 1,200 people reside in permanent homes built on and around the mountain in the 1960s. Along with CCC’s ski slopes, campgrounds, trails, and roads, one finds houses, schools, and lodges.<sup>69</sup> Surrounded by forest growth in an arid region, this built environment has placed both property and lives at risk. In the summer of 2013, for example, residents of this mountain getaway faced the destructive

force of wildfire. The largest local fire in recent history resulted in the forced evacuation of the Kyle Canyon area and the exertion of tremendous amounts of manpower and money to save the dwellings and recreational infrastructure from incineration.<sup>70</sup>

In Lamoille Canyon permanent houses number in the tens rather than hundreds. Today, the road first blazed by the CCC provides access for thousands instead of millions of visitors in automobiles each year. During their visits they might overnight at the Thomas Canyon Campground, or park at the end of the twelve-mile-long Lamoille Canyon Road and spend an hour or a week exploring the numerous hiking trails that radiate through the spectacular mountain setting, all of which were developed by CCC enrollees. They will not, however, find ski slopes, mountain lodges, restaurants, or other modern development. In this regard, the locations of the twin camps no longer resemble each other.<sup>71</sup>

The reasons for the divergent paths of Lamoille Canyon and Mount Charleston are numerous. Most obviously, one can look to the post-World War II population growth of southern Nevada relative to that in northern Nevada. In 1930, three years before the creation of the CCC, both Elko and Clark counties (the counties in which the camps were located) were similar in population. That year, Elko County's population stood at 9,960, and 8,532 people resided in Clark County. As for the counties' primary cities, which includes also the urban areas closest to the respective canyons, populations stood at 5,165 for Las Vegas and 3,217 for Elko. In the decade of the 1930s, Clark County and Las Vegas began to experience rapid population growth as the result of the Boulder Dam project and increased local emphasis on gaming and tourism in Las Vegas. By 1940, the population of Clark County had doubled to 16,414, while the geographically larger Elko County saw its population increase by fewer than 1,000 to only 10,912 residents. This pattern continued throughout the ensuing decades, and grew even more pronounced in the second half of the twentieth century. Today, just over 2 million of Nevada's total 2.7 million people live in Clark County, compared to approximately 52,000 in Elko County.<sup>72</sup> Further, it is somewhat likely that a few of the approximately 40 million yearly visitors to the Las Vegas area also visit the Mount Charleston area.<sup>73</sup>

Still, the areas' widely divergent demographic patterns do not fully explain the varying legacies of the two CCC projects. Historical context beyond urban growth has also influenced post-CCC usage of the areas. For example, the two CCC camps' work projects differed significantly, even if both fell under the guidance of the USFS and were aimed at increasing accessibility and recreational amenities. The CCC and USFS developed far greater recreational infrastructure at Camp Charleston Mountain than at Camp Lamoille. Whereas CCC enrollees at Camp Lamoille spent the majority of their time blazing a dangerous and time-consuming twelve-mile mountain road, such access to Mount Charleston already existed. This made it possible for the forest service to devote enrollee time to other, more varied and recreationally attractive



projects. Further, a more established pattern of recreational activity existed at Mount Charleston prior to the CCC's arrival. Although this tasked CCC enrollees with the additional burden of catering to and cleaning up after thousands of recreationalists each weekend, the established pattern of day-use recreation combined with growing populations to ensure heavy usage in the post-CCC period. This was not the case in Lamoille, where the development of significant pre-CCC recreational use was limited by lack of access into the canyon. Even when completed, that access took the form of a one-lane, treacherous gravel roadway. It was not until the 1960s and 1970s, according to the local resident and historian Edna Patterson, that the completion of a widening and surfacing project truly "opened" the "scenic grandeur" of Lamoille Canyon "to the masses."<sup>74</sup>

Finally, even the context of climate contributed to the extreme popularity of Mount Charleston relative to Lamoille Canyon. Las Vegas is much hotter than Elko in the summer, and lacks the long and severely cold winters found in the higher elevation of Elko County. In addition to recreation, Las Vegans have long utilized Mount Charleston as an escape from the oppressive heat of summer. In contrast, northern Nevada summers are brief and viewed by many as a welcome respite from winter's extremes.<sup>75</sup>

Since World War II, attempts have been made to significantly expand recreational amenities in Lamoille Canyon. For example, in 1977 Joe Royer, a ski-patroller, opened one of the West's few helicopter-based skiing services. Catering to wealthy adventure seekers, Royer's business remains profitable. A "heli-skiing" trip, as it is popularly known, presently costs \$4,400 per person for a three-day excursion. For that sum, skiers receive room and board at Royer's Red's Ranch, and six heli-skiing runs. On these runs, skiers experience the rush of being dropped off on otherwise inaccessible mountain peaks and the extreme skiing that follows.<sup>76</sup> Because it is such a dangerous and prohibitively expensive sport, Ruby Mountain heli-skiing remains far less common than skiing the slopes of Mount Charleston.

As indicated by the experiences and legacies of the camps at Lamoille Canyon and Mount Charleston during the 1930s, the CCC's presence in Nevada's national forests was historically significant and varied. In both locations, the CCC made great strides in opening national forest lands to public recreational use. This was possible because the USFS emphasized recreational development alongside conservation on Nevada's national forest lands. Yet variation also defined the CCC experience and its legacy in Nevada's national forests. From this comparison of the histories of two seemingly similar camps, the importance of variations in the camps' local context, enrollee origin, and quality of leadership becomes apparent. Also, the camps' differing legacies indicate the influence of local historical context on the long-term impact of CCC projects. Comparative examinations of such camps thus illustrate the limitations of simple generalizations concerning the CCC's rich history and influence in Nevada.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>The popularity of the CCC is an oft repeated mantra in discussions of the New Deal. Textbooks for United States history survey courses as well as monographs typically recite the popularity and success of the CCC. James Roark's popular textbook, *The American Promise: A History of the United States*, Vol. 2., ed. 5 (Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2012), 725, refers to the CCC as "the most popular relief program." Similarly, monographic treatments of the CCC such as John A. Salmund, *The Civilian Conservation Corps, 1933-1942: A New Deal Case Study* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1967) characterizes the CCC as a "successful experiment" with "immediate" and "obvious" benefits that made the CCC "one of the most popular" and "most successful .... of all New Deal measures."

<sup>2</sup>Edwin G. Hill, *In the Shadow of the Mountain: The Spirit of the CCC* (Pullman: Washington State University Press, 1990), 138-39.

<sup>3</sup>The USFS officially adopted the motto "Caring for the Land and Serving the People" in 1985. See Lou Romero, "'Caring for the Land and Serving the People': The Origins of the U.S. Forest Service Motto," *Forest History Today*, 18 (Fall 2012), 35-39. Its actions, however, as evidenced by the emphasis placed on developing access, recreational infrastructure, and managing forests during the 1930s with CCC labor, have long reflected such a philosophy.

<sup>4</sup>U.S. Census Bureau, "Resident Population of Nevada," <http://www.census.gov/dmd/www/resaport/states/nevada.pdf>; Hill, *In the Shadow of the Mountain*, 138-39; Neil M. Maher, *Nature's New Deal* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 72.

<sup>5</sup>Bureau of Land Management and U.S. Forest Service, "Civilian Conservation Corps in Northeastern Nevada," Report no. BLM-WN-GI-92-014-8100. Folder: CCC, Northeastern Nevada Museum Archives, Elko; Richa Wilson, "Privies, Pastures, and Portables: Administrative Facilities of the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest, 1891-1950," Forest Service Report no. TY-01-1370 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture, 2001), 56.

<sup>6</sup>"About the Forest," <http://www.fs.usda.gov/main/htnf/about-forest>.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*; James Hulse, *The Silver State: Nevada's Heritage Reinterpreted* (Reno and Las Vegas: University of Nevada Press, 2004), 3.

<sup>8</sup>William Rowley, *U.S. Forest Service Grazing and Rangelands: A History* (College Station: Texas A&M University, 1985), 77-78, 165-66.

<sup>9</sup>Renée Corona Kolvet and Victoria Ford, *The Civilian Conservation Corps in Nevada: From Boys to Men* (Reno: University of Nevada Press, 2006), 120.

<sup>10</sup>*Ibid.*, 18.

<sup>11</sup>*Ibid.*, 2-3, 150.

<sup>12</sup>Salmund, *Civilian Conservation Corps*, 30.

<sup>13</sup>Kolvet and Ford, *Civilian Conservation Corps in Nevada*, 39; A few examples of local concern over the continuation of camps can be found in "Pep Rally Speakers Predict Best Fair Ever; Resolution Favors Keeping CCC Camp," *Elko Daily Free Press* (15 August 1935); "All CCC Camps in Clark County to be Maintained," *Elko Daily Free Press* (3 October 1933); "The Future of the Forest Army," *Elko Daily Free Press* (16 September 1933); "Lamoille Camp Is to be Moved South for Winter," *Elko Daily Free Press* (6 October 1933).

<sup>14</sup>Paul B. Murdoch to M.J. Bowen, "Educational and Recreational Activities in Our Camp" (27 August 1936), Records of the Civilian Conservation Corps, RG-35-3-4, Records of the Division of Investigations, Camp Inspection Reports, Folder: Nevada, F-1 (Lamoille), National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, D.C. (Hereafter: NARA, CCC Camp Inspection Records, RG-35-3-4).

<sup>15</sup>Salmund, *Civilian Conservation Corps*, 30; "Army Ready to Pick Forest Service Jobs," *New York Times* (8 April 1933). This article mentions the requirement that enrollees must send \$22 to \$25 of their monthly pay home to support their families.

<sup>16</sup>Salmund, *Civilian Conservation Corps*, 172.

<sup>17</sup>Kolvet and Ford, *Civilian Conservation Corps in Nevada*, 126.

<sup>18</sup>Wilson, "Privies, Pastures, and Portables," 55; Salmund, *Civilian Conservation Corps*, 26; Kolvet and Ford, *Civilian Conservation Corps in Nevada*, 155-62.

<sup>19</sup>Edna B. Patterson, "Lamoille," *Northeastern Nevada Historical Society Quarterly*, no. 3 (2001): 101-103.

<sup>20</sup>Ivan Dunlap, "Ruby Hunters Cut Way in 'Alps,'" *Happy Days* (22 September 1934).

<sup>21</sup>"Lamoille Road to be Constructed to Plateau this Year," *Elko Daily Free Press* (31 May 1933); "Road Work in Canyon by Lamoille Workers," *Elko Daily Free Press* (19 June 1933); "Lamoille Roadwork Is Speeded," *Elko Daily Free Press* (3 August 1933).

<sup>22</sup>M.J. Bowen. "Camp Inspection Report," 26 August 1936, NARA, Records of the Civilian Conservation Corps, RG-35-3-4; NARA, CCC Camp Inspection Records, RG-35-3-4, Folder: Nevada, F-1 (Lamoille).

<sup>23</sup>H. R. Kylie, G. H. Hieronymus, and A. G. Hall, *CCC Forestry* (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1937), 2-3.

<sup>24</sup>Dunlap, "Ruby Hunters."

<sup>25</sup>Edmund Rosowski, interview by Dan Bennett, Victoria Ford, and Renée Kovet, "The Civilian Conservation Corps in Nevada," University of Nevada Oral History Program, University of Nevada Special Collections and University Archives, Reno, 30 September 2000.

<sup>26</sup>Works Progress Administration, *Nevada: A Guide to the Silver State* (Portland: Binforde and Mort, 1940), 160-61.

<sup>27</sup>Edna B. Patterson, *Nevada's Northeast Frontier* (Reno and Las Vegas: University of Nevada Press, 1991), 470.

<sup>28</sup>Kylie, Hieronymus, and Hall, *CCC Forestry*, 279.

<sup>29</sup>*Ibid.*, 280.

<sup>30</sup>"4 Youths Die in Flaming Woods," *New York Times* (30 July 1939); "Vitale's Body Found in Nevada," *New York Times* (31 July 1939).

<sup>31</sup>Edna Timmons, interview by Dan Bennett, Victoria Ford, and Renee Kovet, "The Civilian Conservation Corps in Nevada," University of Nevada Oral History Program, University of Nevada Special Collections and University Archives, Reno, 2000.

<sup>32</sup>Kolvet and Ford, *Civilian Conservation Corps in Nevada*, 147-51.

<sup>33</sup>"War Continues Against Crickets; Millions Take Place of Dead," *Elko Daily Free Press* (22 July 1935); "CCC Holds Nevada Front Against Army of Mormon Crickets," *Happy Days* (20 June 1936).

<sup>34</sup>Rosowski, interview.

<sup>35</sup>M. J. Bowen to Robert Fechner, "Cover Letter for Camp Report," 27 August 1936, NARA, CCC Camp Inspection Records, RG-35-3-4, Folder: Nevada, F-1 (Lamoille).

<sup>36</sup>Philip Johnston, "Called a Yosemite in the Sagebrush," *Touring Topics Magazine* (2 May 1919).

<sup>37</sup>Delphine Squires, "Early Vegans Find Summer Relief Amid Charleston's Pines," (publication information unknown), Richard "Dick" Taylor Papers, MS 94-30, Box 6, Folder: "History," Special Collections, UNLV Libraries, Las Vegas, Nevada (Hereafter: Taylor Papers, UNLV Spec. Col.); "Lumber Camp: Building Mill in Charleston Mountains," *Las Vegas Age* (23 June 1906); "Charleston Park Resort Opens Saturday, June 3," *Las Vegas Age* (2 March 1922).

<sup>38</sup>Untitled newspaper article beginning "Senator E.W. Griffith, Owner of the Resort at Charleston Park," publication information unknown, (Taylor Papers, UNLV Spec. Col., Box 6, Folder: "History").

<sup>39</sup>"Kyle Canyon Road Argument Renewed: Griffith Makes Another Attack," *Las Vegas Age* (30 August 1928); "Board Orders Fence Removed," *Las Vegas Age* (21 June 1928); "Screed Is Own Best Evidence," *Las Vegas Age* (date unknown), (Taylor Papers, UNLV Spec. Col., Box 6, Folder: "History").

<sup>40</sup>Squires, "Early Vegans" Taylor Papers, UNLV Spec. Col., Box 6, Folder: "History").

<sup>41</sup>M.J. Bowen to Robert Fechner, "Cover Letter for Camp Inspection Report," 30 July 1937, NARA, CCC Camp Inspection Records, RG-35-3-4, Folder: Nevada, F-4 (Las Vegas).

<sup>42</sup>*Ibid.*; M. J. Bowen, "Camp Inspection Report for Camp Mt. Charleston," 30 July 1937, NARA, CCC Camp Inspection Records, RG-35-3-4, Folder: Nevada, F-4 (Las Vegas); Joe Griswold, "Active Work Projects: Camp F-4," 26 September 1938, NARA, CCC Camp Inspection Records, RG-35-3-4, Folder: Nevada, F-4 (Las Vegas).

<sup>43</sup>M. J. Bowen, "Camp Inspection Report for Camp F-4, Mt. Charleston, Nevada," 17 September 1936, NARA, CCC Camp Inspection Records, RG-35-3-4, Folder: Nevada, F-1 (Las Vegas); Education Assistant Advisor to M. J. Bowen, 29 July 1937, NARA, CCC Camp Inspection Records, RG-35-3-4, Folder: Nevada, F-4 (Las Vegas).

<sup>44</sup>M. J. Bowen to Robert Fechner, "Cover Letter for Camp Inspection Report," 30 July 1937, NARA, CCC Camp Inspection Records, RG-35-3-4, Folder: Nevada, F-4 (Las Vegas); M. J. Bowen, "Camp Inspection Report for Camp Mt. Charleston," 30 July 1937, NARA, CCC Camp Inspection Records, RG-35-3-4, Folder: Nevada, F-4 (Las Vegas); M. J. Bowen, "Camp Inspection Report for Camp Mt. Charleston," 26 September 1938, NARA, CCC Camp Inspection Records, RG-35-3-4,

Folder: Nevada, F-4 (Las Vegas); M. J. Bowen, "Supplemental Report on Camp Mt. Charleston," 26 September 1938, NARA, CCC Camp Inspection Records, RG-35-3-4, Folder: Nevada, F-4 (Las Vegas).

<sup>45</sup>A.W. Stockman, "Camp Inspection Report for Camp Mt. Charleston," 14 August 1939, NARA, CCC Camp Inspection Records, RG-35-3-4, Folder: Nevada, F-4 (Las Vegas).

<sup>46</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>47</sup>Charles H. Kenlan to Adjutant General, War Department, 21 September 1939, NARA, CCC Camp Inspection Records, RG-35-3-4, Folder: Nevada, F-4 (Las Vegas); "Report-War Department-Los Angeles District CCC to Commanding General, 9<sup>th</sup> Corps Area," 11 October 1939, NARA, CCC Camp Inspection Records, RG-35-3-4, Folder: Nevada, F-4 (Las Vegas).

<sup>48</sup>"Report-War Department-Los Angeles District CCC to Commanding General, 9<sup>th</sup> Corps Area," 11 October 1939, NARA, CCC Camp Inspection Records, RG-35-3-4, Folder: Nevada, F-4 (Las Vegas).

<sup>49</sup>M. J. Bowen, "Camp Inspection Report for Camp Mt. Charleston," 10 August 1942, NARA, CCC Camp Inspection Records, RG-35-3-4, Folder: Nevada, F-4 (Las Vegas).

<sup>50</sup>M. J. Bowen, "Memorandum to Director, Civilian Conservation Corps," 1942, NARA, CCC Camp Inspection Records, RG-35-3-4, Folder: Nevada, F-4 (Las Vegas).

<sup>51</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>52</sup>Salmond, *Civilian Conservation Corps*, 181-99.

<sup>53</sup>Bowen, "Memorandum to Director," 1942, NARA.

<sup>54</sup>M. J. Bowen. "Camp Inspection Report," 26 August 1936; M. J. Bowen to Robert Fechner, "Cover Letter for Camp Inspection Report," NARA, CCC Camp Inspection Records, RG-35-3-4, Folder: Nevada, F-4 (Las Vegas).

<sup>55</sup>Dunlap, "Ruby Hunters."

<sup>56</sup>"In-and-Around the Forest Camp at Lamoille," *Elko Daily Free Press* (27 June 1933).

<sup>57</sup>M. J. Bowen to Robert Fechner, "Cover Letter for Camp Report, 27 August 1936, NARA, CCC Camp Inspection Records, RG-35-3-4, Folder: Nevada, F-1 (Lamoille).

<sup>58</sup>Paul B. Murdoch, Educational Advisor to M. J. Bowen, Special Investigator, "Educational and Recreational Activities in Our Camp," 27 August 1936, NARA, CCC Camp Inspection Records, RG-35-3-4, Folder: Nevada, F-1 (Lamoille).

<sup>59</sup>M. J. Bowen to Robert Fechner, "Cover Letter," 27 August 1936, NARA, CCC Camp Inspection Records, RG-35-3-4, Folder: Nevada, F-1 (Lamoille).

<sup>60</sup>M. J. Bowen. "Camp Inspection Report," 26 August 1936, NARA, CCC Camp Inspection Records, RG-35-3-4, Folder: Nevada, F-1 (Lamoille).

<sup>61</sup>M. J. Bowen to Robert Fechner, "Cover Letter for Camp Inspection Report," NARA, CCC Camp Inspection Records, RG-35-3-4, Folder: Nevada, DG-64.

<sup>62</sup>Timmons, interview.

<sup>63</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>64</sup>"Police Called to CCC Camp," *Elko Daily Free Press* (28 June 1937).

<sup>65</sup>Ted Steinberg, *Down to Earth: Nature's Role in American History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 242-43.

<sup>66</sup>Neil M. Maher, *Nature's New Deal: The Civilian Conservation Corps and the Roots of the American Environmental Movement* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 8-9.

<sup>67</sup>*Ibid.*, 10-12.

<sup>68</sup>"USDA Forest Service: Spring Mountain National Recreation Area, by the Numbers," <http://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/htnf/about-forest/offices/?cid=stelprdb5420936>.

<sup>69</sup>Tovin Lapan, "45 Minutes and a World Away: Mount Charleston Residents Relish Life in a High-Altitude Oasis," *Las Vegas Review Journal* (7 April 2012).

<sup>70</sup>Colton Lochhead, Rochel Goldblatt, and Steven Slivka, "25,000 Acre Fire in Backyard of Resort on Mount Charleston," *Las Vegas Review Journal* (11 July 2013); Laura Carroll, "Lodge, Resort at Mount Charleston Prepare to Reopen," *Las Vegas Review Journal* (18 July 2013).

<sup>71</sup>Description based on author's visits to site.

<sup>72</sup>U.S. Bureau of Census, "State and County Quickfacts: Clark County, Nevada," <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/32/32003.html>; U.S. Bureau of Census, "State and County Quickfacts: Elko County," <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/32/32007.html>; Richard L. Forstall, "Population of Counties by Decennial Census: 1900 to 1990," Population Division, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C., 1995 (available at <http://www.census.gov/population/cencounts/nv190090.txt>).

<sup>73</sup>Velotta, Richard N. "Tourism Agency Not Concerned About Dip in 2013, Optimistic About 2014," *Las Vegas Sun* (11 February 2014); Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority, "2013 Las Vegas Year-to-Date Executive Summary" (available at <http://www.lvcva.com/includes/content/images/media/docs/ES-YTD-2013.pdf>). Some 39.7 million people visited Las Vegas in 2013.

<sup>74</sup>Edna B. Patterson, "Lamoille," *Northeastern Nevada Historical Society Quarterly*, 121.

<sup>75</sup>Observations based on author's experiences living in Elko and Las Vegas over the past ten years.

<sup>76</sup>"Ruby Mountains Heli-Experience: Our Story," <https://www.helicopterskiing.com/about/our-story> (accessed 5 November 2015); Scott Willoughby, "Nevada's Ruby Mountains a Heli-Skiing Paradise," *The Denver Post* (5 January 2010); "The Untracked Line: Ruby Mtn. Heli, NV," *Skiing* (December 2004), 64.