

**From Renaissance to Region:
Pittsburgh, the Laurel Highlands and the Remaking of Rural Pennsylvania***

On December 22, 1961, Governor David Lawrence received a letter from Lillian McCahan, a resident of the small southwestern Pennsylvania town of Ohiopyle.¹ In her letter to Lawrence, who as mayor during the 1950s had presided over the celebrated urban renewal of the “Pittsburgh Renaissance,” McCahan denounced the role of urban elites that she believed were “terrorizing us by attempting to take everything we have for either homes or income” in order to make room for a proposed new wilderness park centered around the town’s namesake waterfall on the Youghiogheny River. “The worst blow came to us,” she declared, “when they began threatening our coal, which feeds many people ... and bring money to our village.” “We beg you gentlemen,” she concluded, “to not tie up this industry, nor stop other industry ... where so much unemployment exists.”¹

Given her subsequent disenchantment with the role of urban capital in transforming her community into a recreation destination, it is perhaps surprising that the official history of Ohiopyle State Park lists McCahan as one of the three most important people in its creation.² Indeed, just a decade earlier McCahan had written an equally passionate plea to the directors of the new Western Pennsylvania Conservancy begging the organization to buy and preserve the ecologically distinctive Ferncliff Peninsula, which would be at the heart of the future park. At the time, she declared “I realized now was my chance to save Ferncliff – for the coal strippers and the lumbermen were getting nearer and nearer.” By 1961, however, Conservancy directors had begun to expand their holdings in Ohiopyle in a way that alarmed many local residents

* Do not cite without permission of author. Presented by Allen Dietrich-Ward as part of panel "Beyond Urban History: Suburbs and Small Towns in Postwar America," Organization of American Historians Annual Meeting, March 27, 2009.

¹ I would like to thank Graduate Assistants Patty Hay and Ashton Farell for their invaluable assistance in preparing the research for this paper.

including McCahan. “They have enough for a beautiful small park such as we had envisioned she concluded.” But, now they are “attempting to buy both in the borough and in the township ... offering large prices --- to make our town ... deserted, without income or taxes.”³

McCahan’s rocky relationship with the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy highlights the critical role of urban capital in reshaping the postwar rural landscape even as cities increasingly looked to the metropolitan fringe to provide the quality-of-life amenities necessary to attract and retain middle class residents. Beginning in the mid-1940s, Pittsburgh’s business and political elite reinvented the city, first as a center of corporate administration and later as a ‘post-industrial’ hub of the high-tech and service sectors. With the downtown “Golden Triangle” firmly established as an administrative center by the late 1950s, civic leaders and elected officials expanded the scope of their economic development efforts beyond downtown to the region’s suburban and rural communities. The Laurel Highlands, a nearby mountainous area that included Ohiopyle as well as a growing ski industry, increasingly attracted the attention of groups such as the Conservancy interested in providing recreational opportunities for Pittsburgh residents. “When we brag about our area’s growth,” one booster publication confidently declared in 1972, “we mean white oaks and mountain laurel, too.”⁴

By 1982, attendance at Ohiopyle State Park reached more than 1.5 million, the third highest in the state, with whitewater rafting activities alone producing multi-million dollar revenues and well over 100 jobs.⁵ Ohiopyle’s transformation from a depressed mining and lumbering town to a tourist hotspot thus presents an excellent opportunity to study the role of urban capital in reshaping rural Pennsylvania. While urban historians have not fully expanded their metropolitan framework to include the postwar countryside, the activities of public-private partnerships, such as the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy, dramatizes the important regional

dimensions of the Pittsburgh Renaissance. Just as in the central city, the countryside, too, had its winners and losers as older communities were depopulated and displaced whether by the decline of agriculture and industrial employment, the growth of surface mining after 1950 or, as in the case of Ohio, by the creation of new “wilderness areas.” This process created a region of rural contrasts mirroring those of the metropolitan core.

Mapping the Metropolitan Region

The relationship between Pittsburgh and the Laurel Highlands reflects the larger social and cultural evolution in the relationship between U.S. cities and their metropolitan hinterlands during the latter half of the twentieth century. Addressing the deficiencies of an overly simplified postwar declension narrative and expanding the historical record past the late 1970s requires a new “urban” history framework that can encompass the changing spatial patterns of the contemporary metropolis.⁶ Indeed, over the last twenty-five years, two generations of scholars have used the lens of urban social history to expand studies of the suburbs from an emphasis on the white middle and upper classes to include a more diverse landscape of industrial, working class, and African American communities.⁷ During the past five years, Matthew Lassiter, Robert Self and others in the “new suburban history” school have worked to combine these insights into a synthetic narrative of both city and region.⁸

Despite the considerable strengths of this new urban/suburban focus, the case of the Laurel Highlands suggests that the field remains limited in its ability to account for postwar changes taking place “beyond the metropolis.” Though urban decentralization removed factories and residents from central cities to suburbs, equally powerful centripetal forces drew formerly discrete areas into closer contact with the metropolitan core. Some rural historians have moved away from that field’s traditional emphasis on agriculture, but, in general, postwar scholars have

largely ignored the lessons of William Cronon's *Nature's Metropolis* as well as other recent studies by historical geographers and urban theorists that underscore the interdependence of communities throughout wider regions.⁹ While overshadowed in the postwar literature by suburban decentralization, these longer-term trends of economic centralization and increasing community interdependence suggest the need for a new "metropolitan regional" model that can encompass both aspects of the evolving postwar community.¹⁰

Urban history offers one model for understanding the expansion of the Pittsburgh Renaissance to small towns such as Ohiopyle, but another promising approach comes from the increasing attention to issues of race, class and gender in the work of environmental historians. Karl Jacoby's, *Crimes Against Nature*, for example, highlights the role of urban elites in recreating vast swaths of previously inhabited rural spaces in New York (Adirondack State Park), the Rocky Mountains (Yellowstone), and the desert Southwest (Grand Canyon) into their image of "wilderness."¹¹ Jacoby emphasizes the class bias evident in middle and upper class urban vacationers desire for an "unspoiled" landscape of leisure, particularly as the new legal regimes established to enforce park rules and preserve the "pristine" landscape criminalized those economic activities that had once served as a foundation for small town residents.¹²

Taken together these two approaches suggest a metropolitan regional model that emphasizes the evolving social construction of the multiple bonds linking metropolitan and rural space. Indeed, if the metropolitan region is understood as the geographical area marked by the push-pull of urban consolidation and suburban decentralization, then concepts such as "suburban sprawl" and "exurb" become subjective expressions of viewpoints rooted in the power relations inherent in particular conceptions of community. In the case of rural "vacation sheds," for example, Carl Abbott and his coauthors argued that differing interpretations of what constituted

the “local community” dominated the debate over the creation of the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area.¹³ While it has weaknesses as a fully developed historical narrative, *Planning a New West* remains perhaps the best framework for understanding metropolitan regional changes.

Remaking Region

Despite a reputation as an industrial powerhouse, Pittsburgh reached its peak in the 1920s and quickly began to show the signs of decline associated with both older industrial cities and rural Appalachia, a combination that made it particularly difficult for the region to accommodate itself to the postwar economy. The makeup of the regional economy and sometimes touchy employee-employer relations combined with the geographical obstacles of a hilly, broken terrain to make the region unattractive to the growing industrial sectors of the postwar period. Compounding these issues were patterns of contentious local politics and a populace conditioned to expect corporate paternalism that made effective responses to industrial change difficult. As the authors of the landmark *Economic Study of the Pittsburgh Region* explained in 1963, “it is a long step from a coal miner to an electronics technician: from an obsolete steel mill to a modern industrial park; from a giant corporation to a multitude of innovators and ambitious small entrepreneurs.”¹⁴

In response to these economic problems, the celebrated “Pittsburgh Renaissance” of the 1950s centered on revitalizing the city’s central business district, known as the Golden Triangle, through a program of environmental improvements, such as smoke and flood control, as well as the demolition and replacement of older mixed-use neighborhoods with gleaming skyscrapers and public facilities.¹⁵ A powerful partnership between Republican businessmen associated with the progrowth Allegheny Conference on Community Development (ACCD), particularly

financier Richard King Mellon, and the Democratic administration of Mayor David Lawrence guided the Renaissance. “The city welcomed tomorrow, because yesterday was hard and unlovely,” Lawrence explained. “The town took pleasure in the swing of the headache ball and the crash of the falling brick. Pittsburgh, after all the grim years, was proud and self-confident.”¹⁶

The most visible efforts of the Renaissance primarily focused on downtown Pittsburgh, while its earliest regional agenda was limited to providing transportation links to the metropolitan core.¹⁷ It was “apparent that the pressing problems in Pittsburgh [needed to] be solved if the region as a whole was to remain healthy,” explained Allegheny Conference director Park Martin. Although “the Conference was not unmindful of the region in certain elements of its program,” Martin said, it “was a matter of taking care of first things first.”¹⁸ With the reconstruction of the Golden Triangle in full swing, however, city leaders expanded the scope of their economic development efforts beyond downtown to the region’s rural and suburban communities.

One of the earliest public-private partnerships with an explicitly regional agenda was the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy, an nonprofit group formed in 1951 by officers of the Allegheny Conference in response to concerns about “deficiencies in recreational areas which exist in Allegheny, Beaver and Washington Counties.”¹⁹ The Allegheny County Sportsmen’s League and local garden clubs, for example, had been pressuring state officials since the mid-1940s to develop public recreation areas “where our children can go [but] they don’t have to go many miles away from home.”²⁰ In 1950, members of the Conference’s Recreation, Conservation, and Park Council began discussions with civic and political representatives of Lawrence and Butler Counties to establish “a close working relationship with regard to the

acquisition of strategic land parcels” at McConnell’s Mill, a scenic area thirty miles north of Pittsburgh.²¹

The Conservancy’s formation and organizational structure mirrored the public-private partnerships formed to redevelop the Golden Triangle, and the group combined preservation of scenic areas to improve the region’s quality of life with a vision of rural economic development through tourism. Within two years of its formation the Conservancy had already purchased nearly four thousand acres in Lawrence, Butler and Fayette Counties, including the core of what would become Ohio State Park, using funds donated by individuals, civic clubs, and Pittsburgh foundations, most notably the A.W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust²² The Conservancy entered a new phase of its partnership with public officials in 1954 by conveying its property at McConnell’s Mill to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania at cost for use as a state park, and by 1967 the group had acquired 29,000 acres for five more state parks as well as a handful of recreation areas and nature preserves.²³

During the early 1970s, a regional marketing campaign by the Penn’s Southwest Association, another Allegheny Conference sponsored public-private partnership, merged the diverse economic and urban development strategies adopted by business and political leaders during the 1950s and 1960s into a comprehensive regional vision. The narrative marketers presented was that of a regional “neighborhood,” where children could “watch Slippery Rock Creek roar between snow-capped boulders” while their parents’ employer took advantage of “an unlimited supply of professional, skilled and semiskilled workers” as well as “both private and public financial strength and expertise.”²⁴ Indeed, it is easy to see the vision of rural Pennsylvania as natural wonderland embodied in the efforts of the Conservancy as part of the larger effort to symbolically recreate Pittsburgh that increasingly located the city within a larger

region of easily accessible rural amenities. “Look around,” declared a 1972 ad in the *Wall Street Journal*. “You’ll find parks that were once strip mines. New colleges, lakes, ski slopes and skating rinks [as well as] the big city amenities of ... a rebuilt downtown Pittsburgh with its bustling new nightlife.”²⁵

Issues in a Region of Contrasts

Perhaps the most significant Conservancy sponsored project of the postwar period was the creation of a series of nature preserves and state parks in the Laurel Highlands region southeast of Pittsburgh.²⁶ Since the 1780s travelers had noted the beauty of Ohiopyle Falls along the Youghiogeny River.²⁷ Beginning in the late nineteenth century, the region began to attract a modest population of summer homes and winter skiers as a complement to its main economic engines of lumber and coal mining.²⁸ By the 1950s, however, the same issues of economic stagnation and out-migration affecting the rest of northern Appalachia had taken their toll on the small community of Ohiopyle. “The Ohiopyle region was a classic example of the tragedy which comes from areas which depend upon the extractive industries,” proclaimed a Conservancy report in 1967. “The coal had gone; the forests had been cut; the once popular tourist and vacation hotels had disappeared; the population was scarcely a third of what it had been a half century ago; [and] many buildings along the waterfront were vacant, doors flapping in the wind.”²⁹

As in Pittsburgh, residents of Ohiopyle did not need outside experts to understand the economic problems affecting their community. Throughout her correspondence with Conservancy officials, Lillian McCahan noted that her position as station agent for the Western Maryland Railroad gave her a direct view of the decline of the region’s traditional industries.³⁰ After receiving McCahan’s letter in 1951, the Conservancy enlisted Pittsburgh retail magnate

Edgar J. Kaufmann, who spent weekends at his nearby Fallingwater estate, and secured \$40,000 for the purchase of Ferncliff.³¹ McCahan and an advisory committee of local residents then concerned themselves with suggesting improvements to the property to ensure it was “known, used, and appreciated by the people of Western Pennsylvania.”³² Committee members were so convinced that these modifications, which included hiring a full-time caretaker, making the roads “fit to drive on,” constructing fireplaces and a beach, building a “more presentable entrance,” and launching an advertising campaign, would be successful, that they suggested charging admission. A renovated park, their report concluded, would “draw a great many more people and pay for itself in time.”³³

Between 1951 and 1958, Conservancy involvement in Ohiopyle grew from a focus on preserving Ferncliff as a natural area, to protecting the Youghiogheny gorges above and below Ohiopyle, to providing a large recreational park to be incorporated into the state park system. In 1959, Conservancy officer Adolph W. Schmidt, administrator of the Pittsburgh-based A. W. Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust accompanied an inspection team to the community. Dismayed at the “decrepit and abandoned houses along the riverfront,” Schmidt provided funds for purchase of the properties to be converted of half-mile long riverfront park along the Youghiogheny.³⁴ Over the next decade Conservancy funds and lobbying efforts resulted in the razing of much of the original downtown, the renovation of a hotel and restaurant, the development of plans for a new sewer system, and the relocation of a state highway away from the waterfront.³⁵

As the Conservancy’s influence increased, however, some early supporters, such as McCahan grew concerned that the group’s vision was not in synch with the needs of the local community. In 1962, McCahan wrote to Pennsylvania Secretary of Forests and Waters Maurice

Goddard complaining about Conservancy officers with “large foundation money and ... their own plans how to spend it.”³⁶ Rules imposed by the Conservancy on its holdings were increasingly limiting traditional local uses of the landscape. “The Conservancy imposed such drastic rules the park became just a big woods the public no longer cared to enter,” McCahan continued. “People won’t hike these days. And there could be no driving roads in Ferncliff or even camping.” More ominously from the local perspective, the Conservancy had begun buying and razing homes in the village itself, an issue that received national attention through a series of letters to the editor in the *Wall Street Journal*.³⁷

The issue of community control came to a head in the early 1960s over the problem of acid mine drainage from nearby coal mining operations. The Conservancy favored restriction of mining near “areas of such imposing beauty, history, significance, or recreational potential, that they should not be stripped” and supported efforts to stop mining near “those parks which have been created through Conservancy initiative.”³⁸ Many Ohiopyle residents, on the other hand, saw coal mining and the resulting water pollution through acid drainage as a nuisance overshadowed by the clear benefits of mine employment. “I don’t know how many mines are getting acid into the [river],” McCahan wrote as early as 1952, “but ... we don’t want our business closed down for the sake of fish.”³⁹

While concerned about the effects of water pollution at Ohiopyle, Conservancy leaders initially sought a middle position, stating that while “anxious to contribute to the eventual establishment of a system of regular and administrative enforcement,” they were “not opposed to all stripping of minerals.”⁴⁰ Indeed, while the early 1960s witnessed a major effort to enact regulations culminating in the strict Pennsylvania Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1963, the Conservancy resisted efforts by more militant members to “participate in protests against

these stripping operations and [various] instances of coal stripping in other counties,” explaining that the group had “neither the staff, nor the funds, nor the privilege, as a nonprofit organization to engage widely in public controversy.”⁴¹

A series of pollution problems beginning in the summer of 1961, however, forced the Conservancy into more active opposition to surface mining near Ohiopyle. In one incident, the local Smithfield Mining Company accidentally released a highly acidic discharge that had a dramatic impact on Cucumber Falls, a scenic area near Ohiopyle that had just been acquired by the Conservancy. “The bed of the run was stained and much of the beauty of Cucumber Falls, one of Western Pennsylvania's outstanding scenic attractions, was largely destroyed,” reported one observer. This incident and a resulting “flood of telegrams” as well as active lobbying by Conservancy officials led state officials to block the company’s request to continue mining at Cucumber Falls as well as the nearby Jonathan Run a tributary of the Youghiogheny.⁴² “The board's action adds up to a complete victory for the proponents of clear streams,” a delighted Conservancy official noted. “It would appear that as far as Jonathan Run and Cumber Run are concerned [mining companies are] out of business.”⁴³ McCahan, on the other hand, was outraged at the actions of Conservancy officials. “It is an insolent, over-bearing attitude ... that has created most of the trouble,” she declared. “Plus their deliberate propaganda to the *Pittsburgh Press* about Cucumber Falls when the “Press” was putting on a campaign against big stripping. This is probably the smallest strip in the state! And I fear this propaganda is deliberately ruining a man who invested ... much in equipment.”⁴⁴

Conclusion

On a late November evening in 1973, the crème of Pittsburgh’s civic elite streamed into the beautiful surroundings of Oakland’s Carnegie Music Hall for the annual meeting of the

Allegheny Conference on Community Development, the progrowth coalition that had spearheaded the city's economic "Renaissance" following World War II.⁴⁵ As they walked through the grand foyer with its crystal chandeliers and elaborately carved pillars, the university presidents, industrialists, financiers, labor leaders, and politicians gathered there had reason to be proud of their accomplishments in the downtown Golden Triangle, new urban and suburban industrial districts, and the handful of state parks dotting the rural periphery.⁴⁶ That night's speaker, former Appalachian Regional Commission executive director Ralph Widner, congratulated the audience on the many gains of the Pittsburgh Renaissance, but counseled that that "[t]he future of the region rests as much with what can be initiated in the outlying areas as with what can be done downtown."⁴⁷

Widner's remarks highlight the need for an expanded approach to "urban" history that pushes scholars to move "beyond the metropolis" in search of a more comprehensive picture of community growth and change. The story of Pittsburgh and the Laurel Highlands raises several points that may serve as an outline for this expanded "metropolitan regional" model. First, hinterland communities and their residents are important actors on the metropolitan stage. While urban elites through the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy certainly shaped rural development in Ohio, local residents actively engaged with the process from Lillian McCahan's first letter to officials through the fight over park expansion and surface mining in the 1960s.

Second, hinterland actors have exerted their limited agency to shape their communities even as metropolitan development reworked the physical and social landscape. The Conservancy's vision of public land ownership for recreation came to fruition with the dedication of Ohio State Park in 1971, but a backlash among local residents led first to arson in the 1968 burning of the newly renovated Ohio House Hotel, and later the failure to

designate the Youghiogheny as a National Wild and Scenic River in the face of concerns that such a designation would harm the local coal industry.⁴⁸

Reframing the story of postwar metropolitan growth to include rural as well as urban and suburban communities thus raises a number of avenues for future scholarship. While urban historians have not fully expanded their metropolitan framework to include the postwar countryside, they must do so in order to better account for the complex and interconnected relationships between cities, suburbs, and rural spaces. Similar to downtown, the countryside, too, had its winners and losers as older communities were depopulated and displaced whether by the decline of agriculture and industrial employment, the growth of surface mining after 1950, or, as in the case of Ohio, by the creation of new “wilderness areas. This process created a region of rural contrasts mirroring those of the metropolitan core, and thus provides a fertile ground for new research focusing “beyond the metropolis.”

¹ Lillian McCahan to David L. Lawrence, Maurice K. Goddard, Lewis E. Evans, “Letter,” Dec. 22, 1961. Box 23, folder 3, Records of the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy, Archives of Industrial Society, 99:13, University of Pittsburgh Archives Service Center, Pittsburgh, PA. Hereafter cited as WPC Records.

² On the origins and development of Ohio State Park, Fallingwater, Ferncliff Park, Bear Run, Laurel Ridge State Park and other developments in the Laurel Highlands, see M. Graham Netting, *50 Years of the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy: The Early Years* (Pittsburgh: The Western Pennsylvania Conservancy, 1982). The portion of this work relating to Ohio is reprinted as “A Preservation Success Story OHIO AND FERNCLIFF PARK.” Available at <http://www.depweb.state.pa.us/heritage/cwp/view.asp?A=3&Q=443635>

³ McCahan to Lawrence, et al., “Letter,” Dec. 22, 1961.

⁴ “When We Brag About Our Area’s Growth, We Mean White Oaks and Mountain Laurel, Too,” Advertisement, *Wall Street Journal*, March 22, 1972.

⁵ Arthur A. Davis, “The Impact of Land Acquisition on Local Economies: Benefit or Burden?” 1983. Box 377, Folder 1, Records of the Allegheny Conference on Community Development, MSS #285, Western Pennsylvania Historical Society, Pittsburgh, PA. On the development of the whitewater rafting industry in the Steel Valley, see Ralph Gray, “Spanking the Wild Water with Canoes,” *Water Land and Life* 4, no. 3 (Autumn 1962), 7; “White Waters of Yough Draw Many,” *Water Land and Life* 7, no.2 (December 1965), 23; “White Water Brings Thrill In ‘Yough’,” *Water Land and Life*, 9, no. 4 (Winter 1967), 17.

⁶ In their recent edited volume, Jefferson Cowie and Joseph Heathcott provide persuasive evidence that the narrative trope of deindustrialization (and its geographical auxiliary, the “Rust Belt”) dominating scholarly discourse in the 1980s and 1990s is no longer adequate for describing the multitude of economic and social changes taking place “beyond the ruins.” Jefferson R. Cowie and Joseph Heathcott, *Beyond the Ruins: The Meanings of Deindustrialization* (Ithaca: ILR Press, 2003).

⁷ For an overview of recent trends in suburban historiography, see “Introduction – The New Suburban History,” in Kevin M. Kruse and Thomas J. Sugrue, eds., *The New Suburban History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006).

^{8 8} Robert Self, *American Babylon: Race and the Struggle for Postwar Oakland* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003); Matthew Lassiter, *Silent Majority: Suburban Politics in the Sunbelt South* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007). In focusing on the metropolis as a whole, these new studies have highlighted the breadth of metropolitan spatial inequality, while connecting previously isolated movements – in Self’s case, Black power politics and suburban tax revolts in Oakland – and revealing unexpected political alliances, such as the cross-race working class alliance in favor of broad-based busing in Charlotte illustrated in Lassiter’s work.

⁹ In his research on nineteenth century Chicago, Cronon demonstrated that urban growth manifested itself not merely as changes within the city or in the expansion of residential landscapes, but in far ranging linkages between metropolitan centers, satellite communities, and rural hinterlands. Further, Edward K. Muller’s work on the Pittsburgh region, for example, convincingly links developments in the Steel City to changes in the mining communities and mill towns of the Pennsylvania countryside. William Cronon, *Nature’s Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1991); Edward K. Muller, “Industrial Suburbs and the Growth of Metropolitan Pittsburgh, 1870-1920” in Robert D. Lewis, *Manufacturing Suburbs: Building Work and Home on the Metropolitan Fringe* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2004). On the turn away from agriculture as the defining feature of rural America, see Anne B.W. Effland, “When Rural Does Not Equal Agricultural,” *Agricultural History* 74, no. 2 (Spring 2000); William H. Friedland, “Agriculture and Rurality: Beginning the “Final Separation,”” *Rural Sociology* 67, no. 3 (Sep. 2002).

¹⁰ For an expanding version of this call for a “metropolitan regional” history, see Allen Dieterich-Ward and Andrew Needham, “Beyond the Metropolis: Metropolitan Growth and Regional Transformation in Postwar America,” *Journal of Urban History* (Forthcoming, 2009).

¹¹ Karl Jacoby, *Crimes Against Nature: Squatters, Poachers, Thieves and the Hidden History of American Conservation* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2001).

¹² A recent example of this approach is David Stradling, *Making Mountains: New York City and the Catskills* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2008).

¹³ Carl Abbott, Sy Adler and Margery Post Abbott, *Planning a New West: the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area* (Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 1997).

¹⁴ Max Nurnberg, *Economic Study of the Pittsburgh Region, Vol. III: Region with a Future* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1963), 267.

¹⁵ For the best existing scholarly overview of Pittsburgh and the Pittsburgh Renaissance, see Roy Lubove, *Twentieth Century Pittsburgh, Volume One: Government, Business, and Environmental Change* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1996).

¹⁶ Stefan Lorant, *Pittsburgh: The Story of an American City* (Pittsburgh: Esselmont Books, 1964, revised and expanded editions in 1975, 1980, 1988 and 1999), 373. Quotation is from the 1999 edition.

¹⁷ For the most comprehensive account of the role of the Allegheny Conference in creating the Pittsburgh Renaissance, see Sherie R. Mershon, “Corporate Social Responsibility and Urban Revitalization: The Allegheny Conference on Community Development, 1943-1968” (Ph.D. diss., Carnegie Mellon University, 2004).

¹⁸ AIS Park H. Martin Papers. Park Martin, “Narrative of the Allegheny Conference on Community Development and the Pittsburgh Renaissance, 1943-1958,” 1964, 4.

¹⁹ Michael Baker Jr. Inc, “A Report on the Recreational Survey of Allegheny, Beaver and Washington Counties,” (Harrisburg, PA: PWPC, 1945).

²⁰ Bob Prince, “A Network of Lakes for Pittsburgh and Vicinity,” An Address Delivered on Radio Station WJAS on Friday, December 17, 1943, Printed through the courtesy of the Allegheny County Sportsmen’s League, Inc.; Samuel E. Phillips to Mark James, “Letter,” May 22, 1944, PWPC, Box 4 “General Correspondence.”

²¹ Adolph W. Schmidt to Park H. Martin, “Letter,” December 29, 1950, ACCD Records, Box 376, Folder 5. The vehicle for this cooperation was the Greater Pittsburgh Parks Association, an elite conservation-minded group whose directors included ACCD members Charles F. Chubb, B.F. Jones III, and retail magnate Edger Kaufmann, which agreed to add four new board members from Lawrence and Butler and change its name to reflect its expanded regional mission.

²² Adolph W. Schmidt to Charles F. Chubb, “Letter,” July 5, 1951, “Re: Prospectus for the Development of the Slippery Rock-Muddy Creek Drainage Area,” in Box 2, Folder 2, M. Graham Netting Papers, MSS #122, Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, PA; M. Graham Netting, *50 Years of the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy: The Early Years* (Pittsburgh: The Western Pennsylvania Conservancy, 1982). Overseen by R.K. Mellon associate and Allegheny Conference Executive Committee member Adolph Schmidt, the Mellon Trusts provided funding at strategic moments in the Conservancy’s evolution, including at its founding in 1950 and its re-

organization as a dues paying organization in 1958.

²³ Charles F. Lewis and John R. Schell, "Impressive Growth and Achievements Recorded by Conservancy in Past Year (Annual Report)," *Water Land and Life* 9, no. 1 (April 1967).

²⁴ See advertisements in the *Wall Street Journal* from December 15, 1971 and April 24, 1973.

²⁵ "When We Brag About Our Area's Growth, We Mean White Oaks and Mountain Laurel, Too," *Wall Street Journal*, March 22, 1972.

²⁶ On tourism development in southwestern Pennsylvania through the mid-1960s, see Pennsylvania State Planning Board, "Regional Development Reconnaissance: Region 12," 1966, 37-43. On the origins and development of Ohiopyle State Park, Fallingwater, Ferncliff Park, Bear Run, Laurel Ridge State Park and other Conservancy sponsored developments in the vicinity of Ohiopyle, see Netting, *50 Years of the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy*.

²⁷ D. Rittenhouse, "Description of OHIOPYLE FALLS, with a view of the same, done from a Sketch taken on the spot, by D. Rittenhouse, Esquire," *The Columbian Magazine*, Feb. 1, 1787.

²⁸ Richard J. Hoch, *Uneven Development of Nature: An Historical Geography of Ohiopyle State Park* (Master's thesis, West Virginia University, 1999).

²⁹ "Major Construction Work is Underway on Ohiopyle Sewer and Water System," *Water Land and Life* 9, no. 2 (July 1967), 6. On opposition to the transfer of rural land from private to public ownership in Ohiopyle, see Nina J. Webb, "'Green' Legacy," letter to the editor, *Wall Street Journal*, March 3, 1965, 14. In response, see Howard M. Swartz, "Citizens and Conservation," letter to the editor, *Wall Street Journal*, March 24, 1965, 16.

³⁰ Lillian McCahan to Charles Chubb, "Letter," August 6, 1952. See also, Lillian McCahan, February 25, 1960. Both in WPC Records, box 23, folder 3.

³¹ Netting, *50 Years of the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy*, 137.

³² Lillian McCahan to Charles F. Chubb, 17 June 1953. WPC Records, box 23, folder 3.

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ Netting, *50 Years of the Western Pennsylvania Conservancy*. See also "Major Construction Work is Underway on Ohiopyle Sewer and Water System," *Water Land and Life* 9, no. 2 (July 1967), 6.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ Lillian McCahan to Maurice Goddard, "Letter," July 3, 1962. WPC Records, box 23, folder 3.

³⁷ On opposition to the transfer of rural land from private to public ownership in Ohiopyle, see Nina J. Webb, "'Green' Legacy," letter to the editor, *Wall Street Journal*, March 3, 1965, 14. In response, see Howard M. Swartz, "Citizens and Conservation," letter to the editor, *Wall Street Journal*, March 24, 1965, 16.

³⁸ "Hit-and-Run Strip Miners Hit," *Water Land and Life* 3, no. 2 (Autumn 1961), 13; "Cucumber-Jonathan Strip Fight Won," *Water Land and Life* 4, no. 2 (Summer 1962), 10.

³⁹ Lillian McCahan to Charles Chubb, August 6, 1952. WPC Records, box 23, folder 3.

⁴⁰ Indeed, the organization awarded an honorary life membership to surface mine owner James F. Hillman for his conservation work and, in 1962, the Conservancy's largest corporate donor was the Consolidation Coal Company. See Charles F. Lewis, "Drive to Save Penn's Woods West Scores New Highs on All Fronts in Stirring Year," Report of the President to the Annual Meeting, March 21, 1962. Reprinted in *Water Land and Life* 4, no. 1 (Spring 1962). "Hillman Cited as Honorary Life Member," *Water, Land and Life* 11, no. 1 (Spring 1969).

⁴¹ "Stripping Near McConnell's Mill Alerts State," *Water Land and Life* 4, no. 2 (Summer 1962), 19. On the grassroots mobilization to enact surface mining regulation in Pennsylvania, see Chad Montrie, *To Save the Land and People: A History of Opposition to Surface Coal Mining in Appalachia* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003).

⁴² "Stripper Denied Pit At Ohio Pyle Stream," *Evening Standard (Uniontown, Pa.)*, Oct. 26, 1961, 1. See also "Strip Mine Mars Cucumber Falls," *The Pittsburgh Press*, Oct. 8, 1961, 1, 6, 6.

⁴³ "Hearing on Strip Mine in Ohiopyle," *Evening Standard (Uniontown, Pa.)*, Dec. 14, 1961, 1.

⁴⁴ Lillian McCahan to Walter Storey, "Letter," Oct. 27, 1961. WPC Records, box 23, folder 3.

⁴⁵ Mershon, "Corporate Social Responsibility and Urban Revitalization."

⁴⁶ Oakland, home to Carnegie-Mellon University and the University of Pittsburgh, was also a good setting for the evening's keynote speech, which touched upon the city's growing status as post-industrial mecca. On Pittsburgh's growing reputation as a research center, see David K. Willis, "Pittsburgh Quickens Economic Stride," *Christian Science Monitor*, December 15, 1964, 9; Neal Stanford, "Industrial Fallout" Garnered from U.S. Space Program, June 22, 1965; "Pittsburgh Area a Research Center," *New York Times*, October 27, 1968, F17; Marilyn Bender, "An Elite Brain Factory," *New York Times*, October 17, 1971, F3; Bill Zlatos, "Posvar Pushed Economic Rebirth at Pitt,

Growing Pains and All,” *Pittsburgh Press*, May 13, 1990.

⁴⁷ *Ibid*, 23.

⁴⁸ Tim Palmer, *Youghiogeny, Appalachian River* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1984).