

# MANAGING HISTORIC MILITARY BUILDINGS

**Russell H. Sackett**

Historical Architect, Directorate of Environment-Conservation, Bldg 764 Pleasonton Road, Ft. Bliss, TX 79912;  
russell.sackett@us.army.mil

## ABSTRACT

Military installations established to secure the nation's interior were temporary in nature, constantly changing with the changing frontier. The development of a national rail system brought about the consolidation of installations and use of generic building stock designed by the Quartermaster Corps. During periods of conflict, installations relied on temporary facilities to meet their immediate needs. The temporary nature of installations reached its peak during World War II. The military recognized the long-term nature of the Cold War and the need to change installation designs, so it turned to generic architectural designs for buildings constructed of more permanent materials, dominated by concrete. Changes made to installations in Alaska during the Cold War virtually erased the World War II landscapes on active bases and posts. Now that the Cold War is over and the military is transforming to meet new global politics, it is once again transforming its landscape. To streamline the Section 106 process, the U.S. Army is developing aggressive policies to evaluate Cold-War era properties and remove them from further actions under the National Historic Preservation Act. This paper looks at these policies in light of the built environment.

**KEYWORDS:** cold war architecture, historic resource evaluations

## MILITARY FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT

Initially there were two types of facilities that formed military installations: coastal fortifications and early frontier posts. The purpose of the coastal fortifications was to secure the nation's coastal borders. The frontier post's mission was to secure the nation's interior and land borders. Throughout the history of the U.S. Army, noncoastal facilities have tended to be temporary in nature. Coastal fortifications were permanent, although ever-changing to reflect technological changes in weaponry. As our nation expanded west, forts sprang up along the frontier. As the frontier was pushed further west, forts were abandoned and new ones established on the new frontier, to thrive until it was

time to move on to the next frontier (Cannan et al. 1995; White 1994). There were exceptions to the temporariness when there was a need for the army to have a permanent garrison stationed or a manufacturing need. Facilities of this type tended to be associated with arms and munitions manufacturing, educational facilities, and forts that served as command and supply points for outlying forts. As the frontier moved west and forts were abandoned, buildings either saw adaptive reuse in the local community or became a source of building materials (Hoagland 1994). The fort often remained only in the name of the community, if the community survived the loss of the fort. As the fron-

tier was settled, the Indian wars ended, and technology changed (beginning with the development of the railroad system), the army began to consolidate facilities. The original frontier forts were designed to house small units in areas where needed to secure the interior. With the end of the Indian wars and the establishment of railroads linking all parts of the nation, the army began to consolidate into larger regional installations near the railroads. The recent and ongoing Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) actions are a continuation of this consolidation movement, reflecting ever-changing technologies that no longer require dispersal of installations (Cannan et al. 1995).

Construction of the installations drew from standardized building designs developed by the Quartermaster Corps (Grashof 1986). Some modifications were made to match construction materials readily available, the skills of available workers, and the site's natural features. These standardized designs reflected the period's architectural styles. Often the military introduced the styles to the frontier communities. Local vernacular treatments also influenced the final interpretation of these designs (Hoagland 1994). Standardization of installation construction has been a recurring theme throughout the military's history.

In times of conflict and the need for rapid build-up, temporary facilities satisfied the installation's needs. World War II is a prime example. During this period, a great build-up of personnel and material took place over a short period. New installations sprang up overnight. Existing installations grew in size by using temporary facilities. As soon as the conflict ended, military budgets plummeted and the standing army returned to preconflict levels. Forts no longer needed were closed and temporary facilities on retained installations were removed.

Alaska's military history is no exception to this ever-changing military landscape. At the height of the Gold Rush, a string of army forts followed the transportation routes. After World War I, the need for an army presence decreased. Alaska forts were abandoned as the military presence declined until only Fort Seward in Haines remained at the outbreak of World War II. Although Alaska communities did not assume the names of the abandoned forts, they did benefit by adaptively reusing buildings and by deconstructing them for a source of building materials.

The military began returning to Alaska towards the end of the 1930s with our nation's looming involvement in World War II. The United States had seen the potential for conflict with Japan since the end of World War I. In the 1930s, considering the possibility of war even stronger, the

War Department developed Plan Orange. This plan recognized Alaska, Hawaii, and Panama as a strategic triangle in defense of the United States. In 1937, the navy established a facility in Sitka and in 1939, Congress appropriated funds to construct naval air stations at Sitka, Kodiak, and Dutch Harbor (Johnson and Cook 1992; Sackett and Clemens 1999; Thompson 1984). The army began developing Ladd Field in Fairbanks as a cold-weather test facility in 1939 (Buzzell 1991). Construction of Fort Richardson near Anchorage also began in that same year (Cook and Bretz 1999). Since these were viewed as permanent facilities, the military approached designs slowly and cautiously.

For both Fort Richardson and Ladd Field, the army selected standardized quartermaster designs for both buildings and fort layouts. The installations achieved a very strong, cohesive site layout and building design, providing a strong sense of place and time. Of interest is the application of a Beaux Arts site plan for Ladd Field. Beaux Arts was one of the most important planning philosophies to emerge in the 1890s. This design included symmetry of plan, strong visual axes, and classically inspired monumental architecture. It made its way into the design of military installations shortly after its introduction in the United States in 1893 but had waned by the 1920s. Ladd Field's site layout is focused on the parade ground, which was a traditional practice until the 1920s. In the 1920s the army began to replace World War I temporary buildings and instituted the City Beautiful and Garden City movements in installation designs. These movements, as applied on military installations, focused on creating healthful conditions to promote the scientific training of troops and to promote social interaction. Parade grounds were no longer used as focal points. Georgian Colonial Revival, Spanish Colonial Revival, French Provincial, and English Tudor Revival were the prominent architectural styles (Cannan et al. 1995). The parade ground was broken into small open areas throughout the installation's core to create open green spaces and outdoor activity areas.

Although Ladd Field's site plan reflects a design philosophy more reflective of military installations at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, its architecture (Colonial Revival) reflects the City Beautiful and Garden City movements that were popular at the time of the installation's construction. Fort Richardson's site plan and architecture (French Provincial) reflects the City Beautiful and Garden City movements as applied by the military in the 1930s.

With Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor and the subsequent taking of the Aleutian Islands of Attu and Kiska,

the characteristics of these military posts changed rapidly. Other military posts sprang up virtually overnight throughout Alaska as the nation's attention turned to winning the war. The armed forces outgrew facilities to house, train, and supply the rapidly increasing number of personnel brought into service. The military turned to temporary buildings to meet its needs.

Temporary facilities have always played a role in meeting military crises. Through the Spanish American War in 1898, tents were the primary means of temporary housing, with simple frame buildings constructed for warehouse, mess hall, and other administrative functions. Because these camps were not meant to last beyond the immediate need, the building stock was quickly erected and substandard. Typhoid fever broke out in all the camps. Once the Spanish-American War ended, these camps were removed.

The army learned from its experience in providing temporary facilities during the Spanish-American War, and the Quartermaster Corps turned to temporary wood designs with the U.S. entry into World War I. World War I was the largest military undertaking in the nation's history, and temporary facilities sprang up across the country to meet the demand. These installations relied on the 600 Series temporary buildings. The 600 Series buildings were developed by the Quartermaster Corps in 1914. These were modular buildings of wooden-plank construction sheathed in board-and-batten siding. By 1917, these were revised to be stud construction sheathed in horizontal siding (Cannan et al. 1995). With the end of World War I, temporary installations were abandoned and temporary buildings on permanent installations were removed.

In the 1930s, the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) designed and used prefabricated buildings. The 600 Series buildings no longer met army needs, and the Quartermaster Corps considered adapting the CCC prefabricated designs. The ease of construction and the relatively cheap square footage cost per occupant was the main attraction of the CCC prefabs. However, the designs did not lend themselves to housing large numbers of men. The Quartermaster Corps discarded consideration of the CCC prefabs and focused on updating the World War I 600 Series buildings (Cannan et al. 1995; Wasch et al. n.d.).

The 700 Series and shortly later 800 Series buildings evolved out of the 600 Series buildings (Wasch et al. n.d.). Other temporary buildings and structures followed, such as Quonset huts, Stout huts, Jamesways, Pacific huts, etc. Although the 700 and 800 Series buildings were designed

as temporary buildings, the manner of construction developed had a great impact on post-war home construction (Albrecht 1995).

The intent of these designs was to provide temporary facilities with no life expectancy once the war was over. The 700 and 800 Series buildings were based on standardized modular designs that could be added onto in increments for various functions, from personnel housing to warehousing to recreational facilities. These were designed as packages that required little skill or time to erect. As with the 1917 revised 600 Series buildings, the 700 and 800 Series were wood stud construction with horizontal siding and gable roofs. The primary differences between the 700 and 800 buildings are (1) 800 building ceiling heights are slightly higher than in the 700 series, (2) center of studs, joists, and rafters of the 800 buildings increased to 24 inches from the 16 inches found in the 700s, and (3) architectural detailing in the 800 Series was simplified. The revisions were aimed at conserving material and simplifying construction. The focus of the designs of temporary buildings was on winning the war and not on post-war needs (Wasch et al. n.d.).

The Alaska Territory's military presence swelled rapidly, using these temporary structures to meet immediate World War II needs. Planned site designs that prevailed before the war were discarded and an organic approach was taken, often dictated by availability and suitability of landforms for development. Functional clusters scattered in organic layouts dominated temporary facilities. At first view of the site plans, it is often difficult to make out a pattern or logic to it. The resulting organic layout was in part for defensive reasons: It was believed that the organic design did not provide a logical map for aerial targeting purposes, unlike the standardized site plans before the war. Thousands of the temporary buildings and structures dotted the landscape. Ladd Field grew in a short three years from 50 buildings to more than 600 buildings of various temporary designs (Sackett 2002). Even greater growth took place at Fort Richardson and newly established bases in the Aleutian Chain.

As in past conflicts, the military experienced budget and personnel cuts following WWII. Personnel levels greatly decreased, along with need for the military installations that had been required to support the war effort. In Alaska, these cuts led to the abandonment of military facilities across the state with only Fort Richardson (Army Air Corps), Ladd Field (Army Air Corps) and Adak Naval Base (originally Adak Army and Naval Operating Base)

retained as major active military facilities. Many of the World War II bases would be designated National Historic Landmarks in the 1980s.<sup>1</sup>

Although it had its roots in WWII, Winston Churchill's Iron Curtain speech in 1946 marks the beginning of what was to become the Cold War era that continued to 1991 with the collapse of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Unlike previous conflicts, the Cold War saw no direct warfare between the two opposing forces, although both sides' military planners prepared for that contingency (Price 2001). Military planners also came to realize that this was not a short-term conflict and that a different, long-term approach to addressing military needs was required.

With the realization that winning the Cold War was a long-term effort and that technology and changing characteristics of military personnel were becoming dominant factors in the effort, the military realized that addressing building needs using the traditional temporary approach was no longer adequate. The increasing level of technology put into service required greater expenditures to train personnel. Once trained, it became harder to retain personnel who could take what they learned into the private sector and make a better living for their families. Existing military bases designed for men living in large open spaces were not conducive to attract or retain skilled personnel with families (Kuranda et al. 2003a).

Through legislation introduced first by Senator Kenneth Wherry of Nebraska in 1949 and later modified by Senator Homer Capehart of Indiana in 1955, the military embarked on developing suitable base family housing. The Wherry Act and later Capehart Act provided incentives for developers to plan and construct these housing units, and the period between 1949 and 1962 witnessed an explosion of housing projects. Named after the two senators, the Capehart Wherry housing did not represent any single architectural style (Kuranda et al. 2003a). The Corps of Engineers developed standards that the housing needed to meet and turned to private-sector architectural firms to develop the designs. For the first time, the military provided family housing for married nonofficers.

Besides residential building construction, the military turned to the use of concrete as its primary construction material for the utilitarian buildings. The choice of this

material was, in part, because of its durability and commonality. It was also believed that the hardened qualities of concrete could withstand nuclear attacks. Unlike the Capehart Wherry housing, the military developed generic styles for barracks (unaccompanied personnel housing), administration buildings, hangars, ammo storage, warehouses, etc. (Kuranda et al. 2003b; Pedrotty et al. 1999). These generic styles are found nationally and do not reflect regional variations. The use of these generic designs is prevalent on Alaska military installations. Barracks used on Eielson Air Force Base (AFB) are identical to that used on Fort Wainwright, Fort Richardson, and Elmendorf AFB. Capehart Wherry housing on Fort Greely is identical to those found on Fort Richardson, Fort Wainwright, Elmendorf AFB, and what used to be on Eielson AFB. By the end of the Cold War, Alaska installations had been transformed to reflect Cold War architecture. By the early 1960s, over 90 percent of the WWII building stock on Ladd AFB, later to become Fort Wainwright, was replaced, leaving only the buildings relating to the pre-WWII cold-weather testing facility and the hangars and a few ancillary buildings along the runways (Sackett 2002) representing WWII construction. Even the organic nature of Ladd Field's World War II-era had been erased. By the end of the Cold War era, Fort Greely had replaced the same amount of WWII era-buildings with Cold War buildings. Elmendorf AFB, of all the active military installations in Alaska, retains the largest number of WWII buildings.

With the end of the Cold War and changing global politics, military installations are once again redefining themselves architecturally and spatially. Just as changing military needs at the beginning of the Cold War required replacement of outdated WWII buildings, changing military needs today are requiring replacement of outdated Cold War-era buildings. The army in Alaska has transformed into a Stryker Brigade Combat Team, a first step towards a further transformation that is still being defined by the Department of the Army. This transformation requires an infrastructure to support the eight-wheeled Stryker vehicle and high-tech weaponry along with rapid deployment from the airfield or by rail. Training relies more on computer simulations, which places new requirements on buildings that house it. Live-fire exercises require

---

1 Properties designated National Historic Landmarks under the theme of the war in the Pacific include Cape Field at Fort Glenn; Adak Army Base and Adak Naval Operating Base; Dutch Harbor Naval Operating Base and Fort Mears, U.S. Army; Sitka Naval Operating Base and U.S. Army Coastal Defenses; Attu Battlefield and U.S. Army and Navy Airfields on Attu; Japanese Occupation Site, Kiska Island; Kodiak Naval Operating Base and Forts Greely and Abercrombie; and Ladd Field. Only Ladd Field (Fort Wainwright) remains under military management.



more sophisticated ranges with larger designated danger zones to accommodate advances in weaponry. Installation design philosophies are following the now-popular New Urbanism movement. This constant change poses the greatest challenge to cultural resource managers.

## EVALUATING SIGNIFICANCE

Only properties that are eligible for listing in or that are listed in the National Register of Historic Places, either individually or as part of a historic district, require management under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended.<sup>2</sup> To be eligible for listing a property must meet one or more of the following criteria:

- A. Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;
- B. Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;
- C. Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- D. has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

There are also criteria considerations that may apply. The one that is most common for military properties is criteria consideration G, for properties less than 50 years old that have achieved exceptional importance. Evaluation of Cold War-era properties often fall under criteria consideration G as well as one or more of criteria A–D. In addition to the criteria, a property must maintain historic integrity, which is made up of seven aspects: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association (U.S. Department of the Interior n.d.).

Section 110 of the NHPA requires federal agencies to identify historic properties under its management and to manage them appropriately. Section 106 of the NHPA requires federal agencies to consider the effect their un-

dertakings<sup>3</sup> may have on historic properties, with 36 CFR Part 800 providing the process federal agencies should follow in meeting Section 106 obligations. The goal of the process is to lead the agency to select an action that would lead to the preservation of the historic property.

By its nature, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (as amended) does not present adequate time to implement its procedures. Section 106 does not apply until an undertaking occurs. An installation such as Fort Wainwright may generate over 20,000 projects in a year. Cultural resource staff may see these early in the planning process and be able to make recommendations on how to avoid adversely affecting a historic property, but these do not become undertakings until the project is funded. Until that time, the project may disappear or change or no longer reflect what was initially proposed. Once funded, project scheduling does not always allow adequate time to evaluate properties appropriately. The result is that some properties that would be determined not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places are determined eligible just to keep the process going and the proposed undertaking on track.

Section 110 of the act requires, among other things, federal agencies to identify and manage historic properties under their control. The NHPA does not provide a deadline for this identification of historic properties. This is understandable since history is not static; however, because there is no deadline set by the act, the Department of the Army does not see Section 110 activities as a must-fund mandate.<sup>4</sup> This leaves identification and evaluation of historic properties to be addressed under specific undertakings through Section 106 on a case-by-case basis.

The Army Environmental Center is developing historic contexts for evaluating properties on army installations nationwide, in part to help in the evaluation of installations under Section 110 as well as to begin streamlining historic property management requirements. Historic contexts exist for WWII and some of the Cold War-era property types (Grandine et al. 2002; Kuranda et al. 2003a, 2003b;

2 Although it is named the National Historic Preservation Act, this is a procedural act and not a preservation act.

3 Undertaking means a project, activity, or program funded in whole or in part under the direct or indirect jurisdiction of a federal agency, including those carried out by or on behalf of a federal agency; those carried out with federal financial assistance; and those requiring a federal permit, license, or approval (36 CFR Part 800.16(y)).

4 The Department of the Army has a rating system based on categories of 0, 1, 2, and 3. Must-fund categories are based on legal requirements. These are categories 0 (primarily personnel salaries) and 1 (required by law). Categories 2 and 3 tend to be actions that need to be performed but there is no legal mandate and will be done as funding is available (after categories 0 and 1 are met). The majority of funding required for historic properties management is category 2 because there are no time limits required in meeting the laws and there are no penalties if not met.

Murphey et al. 2000; U.S. Army Environmental Center 1996, 1997). These studies base historic significance of military bases and buildings on the national level and not on the state or local level. To understand the base's history and potential significance, its place in the national defense system must be understood. Military bases are neither independent properties that exist only for their own purpose, nor developed to benefit the communities, nor the state they are located in. Military bases reflect national defense strategies and planning. Any impact the military may have on local communities or on the state are ancillary byproducts of its mission and do not reflect the installation's reasons for existing (Enscore et al. 2005). Proper evaluation of military properties is beyond the abilities of the installations until the appropriate historic and architectural contexts on the national level are in place. An exception may be the armories scattered throughout the state as part of the Army National Guard. Unlike the army and air force, the Army National Guard is a quasi-state/federal entity fulfilling interests of both.

There is no question that the military has had and continues to have a significant impact on Alaska. However, military installations are manifestations of the military's mission and not its impacts on the communities or states. Properties that reflect the military's influence on the community are found in the community.

There are two prevailing biases when it comes to looking at military properties in Alaska: (1) the general belief that properties that meet the 50-year criteria and that are associated with the military are eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places, and (2) it is the history and not the integrity that makes a property eligible. An example of the first is the World War II ammunition storage facilities (vaulted concrete bunkers commonly referred to as igloos) on Fort Richardson. The igloos were constructed during World War II as part of Fort Richardson in support of Elmendorf Field. When Elmendorf Field became Elmendorf AFB and the army moved to the present Fort Richardson in 1950, the igloo complex was split between the two installations. Under a contract with Elmendorf AFB, the National Park Service surveyed and evaluated World War II buildings and structures on the airbase (Cook et al. 1997). The project's evaluation centers on a local history of the base and falls into the trap of determining some properties eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A solely because they date from World War II. The army did not concur with this finding for the igloos and submit-

ted it to the keeper of the federal register for a formal determination of eligibility. The keeper concurred with the army's finding that the World War II ammunition igloos were not eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (Shull 2001). The keeper stated:

justification for National Register eligibility needs to document exactly how particular resource types can represent and convey significant aspects of the historic (military/military construction) themes identified. With regard to the ammo Bunker B Igloos, the fact that the resource has survived past the 50-year mark, served as infrastructure for an installation's operations, and retains integrity is not sufficient to justify eligibility. The individual property or properties must convey the significance of the installation in an important way. (Shull 2001)

Ammo storage complexes may be contributing elements to a larger historic district when they are adjacent and visually linked to that district. With the exception of munitions manufacturing facilities, ammo storage facilities on installations are constructed away from cantonments and geographically isolated from mission-critical facilities. Not all military properties are significant. Many are ancillary to the military's significant mission and do not convey that significance.

In addition to the assumption that the igloos are eligible because of their association with World War II, the study's evaluation of Elmendorf AFB World War II properties ignores the national context of the base and focuses on the base in isolation. It provides an inventory of buildings and structures but fails to address the architectural styles or types and how it reflects military architectural movements or how the site plan reflects what the national trend was for military construction. How can a building inventory/survey be conducted and fail to address architecture? When evaluating buildings for eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places, how can Criteria C be ignored? Unfortunately, this approach of evaluating military properties without looking beyond Alaska is a common practice.

The second bias is in the belief that it is the history of the site that makes it eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and that integrity is secondary. Having now had the opportunity to address eligibility of military properties in three different states, Alaska's state historic preservation officer differs from New Mexico and Texas state historic preservation officers. The Alaska state historic preservation officer approaches the National

Register of Historic Places program in evaluating military properties more as a National Register of History, placing little importance on the level of integrity a property must have. An example of this approach is the evaluation of the Gerstle River Test Site.

Gerstle River Test Site was where the army conducted cold-weather testing of chemical and biological weapons in the late 1950s to early 1960s. During the period of significance, individual test sites were carved from or placed in the forest in distinct patterns to test effectiveness of the weapon in forested and open areas. After the facility ceased to be used, portions of the test areas were erased by a forest fire and other areas hydroaxed, erasing the individual test sites. The army found that the site met the “exceptional importance” criteria necessary for properties less than 50 years old, but that the later clearing activities destroyed the integrity of the site. The state historic preservation officer did not concur with the loss of integrity, and the army submitted its finding to the keeper for a formal determination. The keeper concurred with the army’s finding that the site had lost integrity, stating that the site “fails to retain sufficient integrity of the key physical resources associated with the operation of the facility as a Cold War-era weapons testing site” (Shull 2004). The Alaska state historic preservation officer’s emphasis on history with a casual consideration of integrity has been a consistent theme in the evaluation of army facilities.

The keeper’s concurrence with the army’s finding that the site had lost integrity was not a surprise. What was a surprise was that the keeper questioned whether the property even met the exceptional importance criteria (Criterion G) for eligibility. As a recent Cold War facility, much of what took place at Gerstle River Test Site is classified top secret. Meeting the exceptional importance criterion for the eligibility of the property was in part based on the role the facility played as the army’s only cold-weather test facility for its weapons development and testing program, and in part in assuming that because activities conducted on the site are still classified that this suggests significance.

The keeper stated “while the facility appears to be a fairly unique ‘cold weather’ facility, its rarity does not necessarily equate with an exceptional significance.” The keeper also asked “what were the specific important contributions made by the GRTS field-testing site relative to the broader accomplishments carried out at sites like the Dugway Proving Ground, or even the nearby Fort Greely installation?” The keeper ends by stating that the “documentation presented on the actual testing and the classified

nature of the GRTS records results in fairly large gaps in information regarding the resource’s relative importance or contributions to the themes identified.” Classification of information concerning some Cold War properties is an issue when the property requires evaluation for eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places. How can one adequately evaluate a Cold War facility when information on its history and activities is not accessible because it is classified? The more technical the site, the less information will be available for evaluating its significance.

The keeper reinforced the concept that military Cold War-era properties’ significance rests on the national level. For a Cold War property to be eligible, it must have contributed something significant that helped shape the Cold War. The keeper’s finding on the Gerstle River Test Site begs the question of whether any army Cold War-era property in Alaska meets the “exceptionally important” criteria for eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. Testing of material and weapons was the most significant Alaska activity that the army was associated with during the Cold War.

The military in Alaska has completed evaluating their installations under the World War II context. Cold War evaluations are an ongoing process as facilities become 50 years old and do not require exceptional importance consideration. The military branches developed interim guidance to address properties associated with the Cold War in the mid-1990s. These were prepared in recognition that properties associated with the Cold War era may have exceptional importance and be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. The army’s guidance states that properties evaluated under the Cold War contexts are those that directly relate to the Cold War Military-Industrial context (U.S. Army Environmental Center 1997). Properties such as barracks, housing, administration buildings, and recreational facilities are not directly related to the context and therefore do not meet the exceptional importance necessary for eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. For the most part, the interim guidance should be used with caution. As an example, the U.S. Air Force’s interim guidance identifies Strategic Air Command bases as meeting the exceptional importance necessary for eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places. Enough time has now gone by to understand that not all Strategic Air Command bases are significant. The Strategic Air Command was formed at the end of World War II when the U.S. Army Air Corps was reorganized into three com-

mands. When the air force became a separate branch of the Department of Defense, it retained the three commands and inherited the Army Air Corps' assets. As long as the air force maintained a healthy budget, all bases were kept open. However, when the military budget was slashed under the Eisenhower administration, the Strategic Air Command quickly closed bases that were not necessary to meet its mission (Enscore et al. 2006; Sackett 2006). One of the bases that was closed is located on Fort Bliss, Texas (Biggs Air Force Base). Although it maintains integrity as a Strategic Air Command base, it does not meet any of the four criteria for eligibility. It did not have a significant role in the history of Strategic Air Command. The Texas state historic preservation officer concurred with finding the property not eligible.

The Army Environmental Center has begun to prepare historic contexts on the national level for specific building types that are associated with both World War II and the Cold War. Some of the contexts address building types that the army Cold War era interim guidance had identified as not directly tied to the Cold War, i.e., housing. Unlike evaluations done to date on military installations in Alaska, the Army Environmental Center's contexts highlight the architecture of the era as well as the historic events the properties are associated with. Once these historic contexts are completed, the Army Environmental Center finds the building types eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A and Criterion C and defines the level of integrity that the building type needs for eligibility. In this respect, the determinations of eligibility for army buildings and installations are removed from the installation level and placed on the national level. Installations only need to evaluate individual properties under the historic context prepared by the Army Environmental Center for the proper level of integrity. This approach to evaluating properties will continue to address all Department of Defense installations and not just Department of Army facilities.

## MANAGEMENT APPROACHES

Military posts that are extant throughout the country are mid-twentieth century products and ever subject to change (Milnick 1994). Often these changes are unforeseeable, tied directly to changing world politics, threats, and availability of funding. Over the last half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and into this century, there have been three major periods

of change that have transformed the military landscape: World War II, the Cold War, and the present 21st century transformation to meet a world where well-defined battlefields and enemies no longer exist. The majority of buildings and structures on military bases represent efforts taken to win the Cold War. Present transformation is poised to change these facility landscapes to post-Cold War designs. These changes are challenging the approaches the military is taking to manage historic buildings and structures. Although the military has a long history in Alaska, present installations did not exist before World War II. Military properties that predate World War II, and most of the World War II military properties in Alaska, are no longer under military management.

Over 300,000 buildings are under Department of Defense management. Thirty-three percent of these are in the Department of Army. Presently 45 percent of army buildings are over 50 years old and subject to the National Historic Preservation Act. Over the next ten years, this number will increase to 67 percent of the building stock (Sullivan 2005). Military budgeting places emphasis on replacing buildings once they turn 50 years old. Money for rehabilitation is difficult to acquire. In addition, Congress has mandated the Department of Army to reduce its costs associated with the management of historic buildings.

The present army emphasis on managing historic properties as required by the National Historic Preservation Act is to streamline the process as much as possible and to eliminate building types from being subject to Section 106. There are a number of program alternatives that 36 CFR Part 800.14 provide for use by federal agencies to streamline management of historic properties under Section 106. These include alternate procedures, programmatic agreements, exempted categories, standard treatments, and program comments. Of these tools, the army has used programmatic agreements the most on individual installations but has recently developed the Army Alternative Procedures to 36 CFR Part 800 and has begun placing emphasis on program comments to address individual building types. The Army Environmental Center presently discourages installations from developing programmatic agreements, preferring instead for the installation to go under the Army Alternate Procedures. The Army Environmental Center is also placing an emphasis on addressing building types nationwide through development of program comments. In addition to these legal documents, the army also requires installations to have an integrated cultural resource management plan in place.



## WORLD WAR II TEMPORARY BUILDING NATIONWIDE PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

In the mid-1980s, the Department of Defense recognized that the World War II temporary buildings would turn 50 years old over the next decade and would have an increasing management cost. The Department of Defense, through consultation with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and other interested parties, developed a nationwide programmatic agreement to mitigate adverse effects for the proposed removal of World War II temporary buildings (Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement 1986, as amended in 1990).<sup>5</sup> What is significant with this programmatic agreement is that it sets a precedent that the significance of military properties is on the national level, and mitigation for addressing adverse effects is on the national level and not on the local or state levels. It also sets a precedent that military property types are removable nationwide from further Section 106 review through a single documentation process. Although there is strong opposition to this agreement by state historic preservation officers and other preservation organizations, there has been no request to terminate it.

## PROGRAM COMMENT

The Military Construction Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee raised concerns in 2001 about the large number of military housing units that would soon turn 50 years old and potentially be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation n.d.a). In response, the Department of Army developed a program comment to address housing constructed between 1948 and 1961, commonly referred to as Capehart Wherry housing. The final program comment was completed in 2002 (Federal Register 2002). Like the nationwide programmatic agreement addressing World War II temporary buildings, the Capehart Wherry program comment again established that the significance of military properties is on the national level with mitigation measures documenting this level of significance (Kuranda et al. 2003a). The Capehart Wherry program comment also reinforced the earlier approach of removing an entire property type from further

Section 106 review. It eliminated approximately 20,000 army housing units from further Section 106 review (Federal Register 2002). "It has provided a one-time Army wide National Historic Preservation Act compliance for this entire category of housing and serves to significantly check future growth in National Historic Preservation Act requirements" (Department of the Army 2003).

Unlike the World War II programmatic agreement, the Capehart Wherry program comment only addressed housing in the army inventory; it did not address housing under the management of the air force and the navy. As a result, the latter two Department of Defense branches have entered into consultation to develop program comments to address Capehart Wherry housing under their management. It is now the Department of Defense's policy that individual branches will not develop program comments unless the program comment applies throughout the Department of Defense.

Following the success of the Capehart Wherry program comment, the Army Environmental Center undertook to develop program comments to address both World War II and Cold War-era unaccompanied personnel housing (barracks), World War II and Cold War era army ammunition production facilities and plants, and World War II and Cold War era ammunitions storage facilities. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation published its notice of intent to issue these three program comments in the Federal Register (2006a,b,c) on April 12, 2006, and signed the program comments on August 18, 2006. In combination with the Capehart Wherry program comment, these program comments remove a major part of the military's building stock from further Section 106 consideration. It is reasonable to expect further program comments in the future that will address all generic building types under military management.

It will be interesting to see if once the buildings are removed from the Section 106 process, will the military begin approaching archaeological sites in the same manner? Installations with large inventories of archaeological sites<sup>6</sup> are presently under pressure to define archaeological site types and limit mitigation to a few of each type as well as to ignore other specific site types from further consideration (i.e., if fire-cracked rock is observed on the ground, walk on

---

<sup>5</sup> Signatories to this agreement were the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record (NPS), Department of Defense, Department of Army, Department of Navy, U.S. Marine Corps, and Department of Air Force.

by, do not conduct any subsurface testing). This suggests that the same view taken to address building types lends itself to viewing archaeological site types as well. The treatment of buildings under the program comments reflects the “archaeobias” found in the field of cultural resource management (King 2006). This approach only looks at the building types and its original use. It fails to recognize that buildings are reused for other purposes and may have achieved significance under that use. It is not uncommon for unaccompanied personnel housing to be converted into training facilities and administrative offices for various commands and still retain the integrity necessary that defines it architecturally as a hammerhead or rolling pin or other barrack type for purposes of the program comment. The argument that each archaeological site within an archaeological site type may offer unique information and therefore a program comment approach to dealing with an archaeological site type is inappropriate can be made for each building within a building type; each may offer unique information in the history and significance of the installation.

#### **INTEGRATED CULTURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT PLANS**

Army Regulation 200-4 (Department of the Army 1998) requires installations to have an integrated cultural resource management plan (the air force and navy have comparable versions). This is a five-year plan that addresses all aspects of cultural resource management, as required not only by the National Historic Preservation Act but all preservation-related acts and regulations. The integrated cultural resources management plan also contains an implementation section that sets out projects and costs associated with proposed projects to be carried out over the life of the plan. The Department of the Army views integrated cultural resource management plans as an internal document and only that portion of the plan that addresses how the installation will meet its Section 106 obligations is subject to consultation with the state historic preservation officer or other interested parties in its preparation.

Consultation with federally recognized tribes that may have an interest in lands managed by the installation is required throughout the preparation of the document. An environmental assessment is required before implementation of the plan. It is through the environmental assessment public comment period that the public can comment on how an installation will manage its historic properties. However, these plans do not have legal drivers,<sup>7</sup> and installations may or may not follow them once the integrated cultural resource management plan is completed. Without legal drivers, proposed management activities identified in the integrated cultural resource management plan are not must-fund actions and are subject to availability of funds. Installations are audited to ensure an integrated cultural resource management plan is in place and up to date.

#### **ARMY ALTERNATE PROCEDURES TO 36 CFR PART 800**

The Department of the Army has developed and implemented the Army Alternate Procedures to 36 CFR Part 800. The army is the only federal agency that has developed alternative procedures. The goals of the Army Alternate Procedures are to:

1. provide for more efficient, consistent, and comprehensive army compliance with the goals and mandates of Section 106;
2. encourage more thoughtful consideration and planning for historic properties;
3. support the army’s ability to accomplish the critical mission of training soldiers for defense of the nation; and
4. establish a proactive approach to historic preservation and compliance using planning and management to stand in place of the formal case-by-case review process prescribed in 36 CFR Part 800(B) (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation n.d.b).

At present, Army Alternate Procedures are voluntary. Installations that elect to go under the Army Alternate Procedures develop a historic properties component in the integrated cultural resource management plan. The historic properties component defines how the installation

---

6 Fort Bliss has recorded over 17,000 archaeological sites on only 70 percent of land that has been surveyed. Fort Wainwright and its associated training lands has not reached a number of recorded sites to begin feeling the pressure to begin approaching management of archaeological sites similar to how buildings are being addressed. As further surveys are conducted and the number of recorded sites increase in areas required for training, the installations will probably begin feeling this pressure.

7 “Legal drivers” refers to actions subject to law or other legal requirement, such as a programmatic agreement or memorandum of agreement. Army regulations are not legal requirements. These provide nonmandatory guidance to garrison commanders in managing their installations.

will meet its obligations under 36 CFR Part 800. Once the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation certifies the historic properties component, the installation goes under the Army Alternate Procedures. Fort Sam Houston in Texas is the only installation that has a certified historic properties component. Fort Benning in Georgia, Fort Sill in Oklahoma, Fort Hood in Texas, the U.S. Army Garrison Alaska, and the U.S. Army Garrison Hawaii have all selected to go under the Army Alternate Procedures and are in the process of writing their historic properties components. These five installations are pilot projects with the Army Environmental Center and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation actively participating in the development of the historic properties component.

Like many programmatic agreements, the historic properties component defines standard operating procedures that the installation will follow to comply with Section 106. There are a number of mandatory standard operating procedures required in the Army Alternative Procedures for an installation's historic properties components to ensure that they meet at a minimum the procedures as outlined in 36 CFR Part 800. Other standard operating procedures are included based on individual needs of the installations. Consultation as required by 36 CFR Part 800 is achieved up-front in the development of the historic properties component. Once certified, the historic properties component places emphasis on the National Environment Policy Act process for meeting consultation requirements, along with an annual report that addresses how it has met the historic properties component guidance. This places a greater need on the part of state historic preservation officers and other interested parties to understand the National Environment Policy Act process. Although 36 CFR Part 800.8 encourages federal agencies to coordinate compliance with Section 106 and the National Environment Policy Act process, how this is accomplished is not agreed upon. Until the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation provides guidance, this will be a subject of disagreement between those who manage the National Environmental Policy Act and cultural resource managers, as well as between the installations and preservationists.

The Army Alternate Procedures has received mixed reviews both externally and internally. The Alaska and Texas state historic preservation officers have adamantly been opposed to the process. Their opposition is to the limited consultation that occurs once the historic properties component is certified by the Advisory Council on

Historic Preservation, that it removes the ability of the state historic preservation officers to terminate the historic properties component, and that it places a greater emphasis on consultation with the tribes. Internally the army's Installation Management Agency has voiced opposition to Army Alternate Procedures based on budgeting. Because Army Alternate Procedures is a legal driver, historic properties component activities are category 1 in the funding process. The installation management agencies see Army Alternate Procedures as increasing funding requirements for historic properties management, taking funding away from meeting the army's mission—to train soldiers. Over the past decade, installation management agencies successfully removed historic properties from must-fund status. Army Alternate Procedures reverses this trend. Even though it is a category 1, however, funding remains based on availability. The installation management agencies have agreed to allow the pilot projects to continue, be certified by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and operate for a number of years to ensure that it does what the Army Environmental Center has intended it to do without requiring additional funding. If successful, Army Alternate Procedures implementation may change from being voluntary to being mandatory for all large installations.

A major drawback to the Army Alternate Procedures in regards to the installations is the length of time it takes to develop a historic properties component as well as the associated costs. The pilot projects, with the exception of Fort Sam Houston, are entering the fourth year in the process. Some are close to having a document ready for submittal to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation for certification and others are not very far along. Because of the length and costs involved, Fort Bliss, Texas, opted to develop an equivalent historic properties component to its integrated cultural resources management plan as a programmatic agreement among the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the New Mexico and Texas state historic preservation officers. This programmatic agreement has achieved the same outcome as the Army Alternate Procedures in a short seven months. Only consultation that occurs with the state historic preservation officers is in the findings of eligibilities. The state historic preservation officers get to review findings of effect in an annual report upon request. If adverse effects cannot be avoided, the programmatic agreement defines what mitigation measures will be used for the various types of historic

properties and effects, and the state historic preservation officers are provided the opportunity to comment on the mitigation measures in the National Environmental Policy Act public comment process. If adverse effects cannot be mitigated by standard mitigation measures identified in the programmatic agreement, consultation with the appropriate state historic preservation officer may occur. Fort Bliss will take into consideration suggested mitigation measures in selecting final treatment. Since the success of Fort Bliss in developing this programmatic agreement, other installations have expressed an interest in pursuing the same approach. Fort Hood is exploring the possibility of abandoning the Army Alternate Procedures in favor of the programmatic agreement approach.

Alternate procedures, programmatic agreements, exempted categories, standard treatments, and program comments are tools available for federal agencies to streamline Section 106 procedures. Which tool is selected depends on what the circumstances are. For Fort Bliss, the programmatic agreement was the best tool for meeting its management needs. For Fort Sam Houston, the Army Alternate Procedures was the best tool, and I suspect it is also the best tool for U.S. Army Garrison Alaska. However, I believe that the programmatic agreement will be the preferred tool for the majority of army installations unless the Army Alternate Procedures become mandatory.

#### NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARKS

A major historic property management issue for the army in Alaska is the management of Ladd Field National Historic Landmark on Fort Wainwright. Section 110(f) of the National Historic Preservation Act requires “that the agency official, to the maximum extent possible, undertake such planning and actions as may be necessary to minimize harm to any National Historic Landmark that may be directly and adversely affected by an undertaking.” Undertakings that affect a National Historic Landmark require participation of both the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the National Park Service in the consultation process.

Ladd Field National Historic Landmark’s national significance is based on its role in the war in the Pacific theme as a cold-weather test facility, an air depot in support of the campaign in the Aleutian Islands, and as the terminus

of the Lend Lease Program with the Soviet Union. The National Park Service designated Ladd Field as a National Historic Landmark in 1985 (Thompson 1985). Ladd Field was established shortly before World War II as a cold-weather test facility. The buildings associated with this period are permanent garrison buildings. The air depot and Lend Lease Program are World War II-specific events, and buildings that were constructed to house these programs were World War II temporary buildings or theater of operations buildings.<sup>8</sup> Permanent buildings constructed before the war were also used by the World War II programs: for example, Hangar 1 was divided in half with the Lend Lease and cold-weather testing programs each having half of the facility.

Under facilities reduction programs of the 1990s, all of the World War II-era buildings on Fort Wainwright were identified for demolition or replacement. Under a memorandum of agreement, the World War II community center and the World War II post office on the north side of the runways and a few World War II Butler buildings associated with the flightline on the south side of the runway were demolished. The memorandum of agreement required architectural documentation of three of the buildings to the Historic American Buildings Survey Level I standards. A later memorandum of agreement provided for the demolition of ammunition igloos on the south side of the runways. This agreement required the retention of one to be restored and interpreted. This igloo is to be incorporated in the new housing area’s site plan. Management of the landmark through the 1990s was by mitigation and stalling demolition of all buildings identified through holding Fort Wainwright to the 36 CFR Part 800 process.

As the present transformation takes place, the World War II buildings on the south side of the runways (including the two remaining Birchwood hangars) are once again under pressure to be removed to make room for new buildings or replaced by larger buildings to accommodate change in mission requirements. All proposed actions remove those buildings directly associated with the World War II air depot. The removal of the Birchwood hangars will visually impact the World War II feel of Fort Wainwright. Management of the resource by the cultural resources staff was through attempting to raise Fort Wainwright’s consciousness of the national significance of Ladd Field.

8 Theater of operations buildings are temporary buildings designed to meet World War II needs with no life expectancy once the war was over. The Birchwood hangars on Fort Wainwright are an example of a theater of operations building type.



The Tanana-Yukon Historical Society, under contract, prepared a public pamphlet addressing Ladd Field's World War II significance (Tanana-Yukon Historical Society n.d.). The primary target of this pamphlet is military personnel as orientation material as they begin their tour on Fort Wainwright. Under the same contract, interpretive panels were developed and placed near the parade ground and next to World War II era buildings. The message of these panels focuses on the World War II significance of Ladd Field. A report was prepared documenting the history and significance of Ladd Field during World War II by Fort Wainwright cultural resource staff (Price 2004). This report was intended to document all aspects of Ladd Field for command use. Until this report, the only compiled information on Ladd Field was in its National Register of Historic Places nomination (Thompson 1985) prepared for its designation as a National Historic Landmark and a later boundary review of the property (Buzzell 1991). Neither provided a clear interpretation of the history of Ladd Field. In addition to these studies, an architectural firm was contracted to prepare historic structures reports on the three Birchwood hangars. The intent of these was to document the condition of the hangars and whether the hangars can be economically rehabilitated under the guidance of The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. With the exception of the structure reports, the documents and interpretive panels were positively received by the army. Although these increased attention to the significance of Ladd Field, they have not had any influence on the decision makers' desire to pursue demolition. The structures reports were not well received. These suggested that it may be more economical to rehabilitate the Birchwood hangars for continued use as hangars along with building a newer, smaller hangar to accommodate additional hangar space requirements rather than replacing them with two larger hangars. New structures reports are now in preparation to look at the condition of the two remaining Birchwood hangars, asking the same question as the earlier study.<sup>9</sup>

Management of Ladd Field National Historic Landmark has been and continues to be an exercise in crisis management. There is no appreciation for the significance of Ladd Field in decision-making positions within the Directorate of Public Works. Until there is a change in personnel or there is a command directive from above

the Directorate of Public Works to preserve the Ladd Field National Historic Landmark within mission constraints, the World War II era elements of the landmark will continue to be threatened and eventually lost.

## SUMMARY

Before the 1880s, the mission of army forts was to secure the nation's interior as well as the coast. As frontiers changed, forts were abandoned and new ones constructed at the new frontier. With the end of the Indian Wars and development of a national railroad system, the army began consolidating their assets along the railroads. Standardization of installation site plans and architecture became a common theme. During periods of conflict, temporary facilities and buildings were developed and used to meet rapid expansion of military personnel and training needs. Once the conflicts ended, the temporary installations were abandoned and the temporary buildings on permanent installations were removed. This approach of relying on temporary facilities reached its peak in World War II.

The Cold War changed this approach. Recognizing that this conflict was not a short-term one, the military began looking at more permanent architecture to meet changing technological and personnel requirements. Today, the military installations are late 20<sup>th</sup> century products. The military is once again transforming itself to meet 21st century requirements that will change the military landscape once again. Past and present military posts in Alaska follow these national trends. The constant changing of the military landscape presents a challenge for management of historic properties.

The army is taking an aggressive approach to managing the increasing number of buildings that reach the age for potential eligibility to list on the National Register of Historic Places. Approaches are centered on development of program comments to remove building types nationally from further consideration under the National Historic Preservation Act and to have installations go under the Army Alternative Procedures to 36 CFR Part 800 to streamline the Section 106 process and manage historic properties as a program rather than project by project. It is conceivable that all buildings under military management will be removed from further National Historic

<sup>9</sup> The contract was let in the fall of 2006 to an East Coast architectural firm to reevaluate the Birchwood hangars and prepare new historic structures reports addressing potential for rehabilitation. The studies were not completed at the time of this printing.

Preservation Act consideration through the use of program comments, leaving only archaeological sites and properties of traditional, cultural, and religious importance to manage. How the buildings are addressed—as a class of generic buildings that have no individual importance—may lead to using the same approach later on archaeological site types. The buildings are addressed now because of the direct costs that are associated with managing them and the desire to upgrade facilities on installations to meet the 21st century. However, on lands managed by the army, training is affected more by archaeological sites on the ranges than by buildings in the cantonments. This is true throughout the country as training needs change and land becomes more critical for training activities. Has accepting the present approach to how buildings are addressed set the foundation for how archaeological resources may be addressed in the future? Is “seen one hammerhead barracks, seen them all” equivalent to “seen one archaeological site type, seen them all”? The treatment of the buildings reflects the archeobias prevalent in cultural resources management. Army installations are now beginning to feel pressure to treat archaeological sites in a similar manner. Whether it progresses to the point that management of buildings has reached is doubtful. It is one thing to allow buildings to be managed in this manner, but I suspect the archeobias field of cultural resources management will squash any attempt to treat archaeology at the same level. It is ironic, using Fort Bliss and U.S. Army Garrison Alaska as examples, that the army spends over five times more on managing archaeological sites than it does on managing buildings, yet it is the buildings that are identified as being too costly.

## REFERENCES

- Advisory Council on Historic Preservation  
 n.d.a Capehart Wherry Era Military Housing.  
<http://www.achp.gov/army-capehartwherry.html>  
 n.d.b U.S. Army Historic Preservation Program.  
<http://www.achp.gov/army.html>
- Albrecht, Donald  
 1995 *World War II and the American Dream: How Wartime Building Changed a Nation*. MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Buzzell, Rolfe G.  
 1991 Ladd Field National Historic Landmark Nomination. Report on file, Office of History and Archaeology, State of Alaska Division of Parks and Outdoor

Recreation, Department of Natural Resources, Anchorage.

- Cannan, Deborah, Leo Hirrel, Katherine Grandine, Kathryn Kuranda, Bethany Usher, Hugh McAloon, and Martha Williams  
 1995 *National Historic Context for Department of Defense Installations, 1790–1940*, 4 volumes. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Baltimore District, Baltimore.
- Cook, Linda, and Karen Bretz  
 1999 *Elmendorf Air Force Base, Volume I: Historic Context of World War II Buildings and Structures*. National Park Service, Anchorage.
- Cook, Linda, Karen Bretz, Brian Coffey, Anna Lee Hewko, and Frank Broderick  
 1997 *Elmendorf Air Force Base, Volume II: List of Historic Facilities WWII Buildings and Structures*. National Park Service, Anchorage.
- Department of the Army  
 1998 Army Regulation 200-4: Cultural Resources Management. Headquarters, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.  
 2003 Army Historic Preservation Campaign Plan. Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management, Washington, D.C.
- Enscore, Susan, Adam Smith, and Sunny Stone  
 2006 Biggs Army Airfield Architectural Survey (Biggs Air Force Base 1948–1966). Prepared for Conservation Division, Directorate of Environment, Fort Bliss, Texas. Construction Engineering Research Laboratory, Champaign.
- Enscore, Susan, Adam Smith, Sunny Stone, and Patrick Nowlan  
 2005 Inventory and Evaluation of Cold War Era BASOPS Buildings on the New Mexico Ranges at Fort Bliss, 1956–1961. Prepared for Conservation Division, Directorate of Environment, Fort Bliss, Texas. Construction Engineering Research Laboratory, Champaign.
- Federal Register  
 2002 Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Program Comment for Capehart and Wherry Era Army Family Housing and Associated Structures and Landscape Features (1946–1962). *Federal Register* 67(110): Friday, June 7, 2002.
- 2006a Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Draft Program Comment Regarding Cold War Era Unaccompanied Personnel Housing (1946–1974).

- Federal Register* 71(70): Wednesday, April 12, 2006, pp. 18703–18706.
- 2006b Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Draft Program Comment Regarding World War II and Cold War Era Army Ammunition Production Facilities and Plants (1939-1974). *Federal Register* 71(70): Wednesday, April 12, 2006, pp. 18706–18708.
- 2006c Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Draft Program Comment Regarding World War II and Cold War Era Ammunition Storage Facilities (1939–1974). *Federal Register* 71(70): Wednesday, April 12, 2006, pp. 18708–18711.
- Grandine, Katherine, Brian Clevens, Thomas Davis, and Nathaniel Patch  
2002 *Historic Context for Army Fixed-Wing Airfields 1903–1989*. U.S. Army Environmental Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.
- Grashof, Bethany  
1986 *A Study of United States Army Family Housing Standardized Plans 1866–1940*. Center for Architectural Conservation, College of Architecture, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta.
- Hoagland, Alison K.  
1994 Architectural Connections. In *Settler Communities in the West: Historic Contexts for Cultural Resource Managers of Department of Defense Lands. Proceedings of the Settler Communities in the West Symposium*, edited by Robert Lyon, pp. 47–53. National Park Service, Rocky Mountain Region, Division of Partnerships and Outreach, Denver.
- Johnson, Rebecca, and Linda Cook  
1992 Dutch Harbor Naval Operating Base and U.S. Army Defenses. National Historic Landmark Nomination Revision Draft. Alaska Regional Office, National Park Service, Anchorage.
- King, Thomas  
2006 Mea Culpa: How I Infected Cultural Resource Management with Archaeobias. *Society for California Archaeology Newsletter* 40(2):27–29.
- Kuranda, Kathryn, Kristen Peeler, Christine Heidenrich, Carrie Albee, and Katherine Grandine  
2003a *Housing an Army: The Wherry and Capehart Era Solutions to the Postwar Family Housing Shortage (1949–1962)*. R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Frederick, MD.
- Kuranda, Kathryn, Brian Clevens, Nathaniel Patch, Katherine Grandine, and Christine Heidenrich  
2003b *Unaccompanied Personnel Housing (UPH) During the Cold War (1946–1989)*. R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Frederick, MD.
- Milnick, Robert  
1994 Military Posts as Cultural Landscapes. In *Settler Communities in the West: Historic Contexts for Cultural Resource Managers of Department of Defense Lands. Proceedings of the Settler Communities in the West Symposium*, edited by Robert Lyon, pp. 107–120. Division of Partnerships and Outreach, Rocky Mountain Region, National Park Service, Denver.
- Murphey, Joseph, Dwight Packer, Cynthia Savage, Duane Peter, and Marsha Prior  
2000 *Army Ammunition and Explosive Storage in the United States: 1775–1945*. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District, Fort Worth.
- Pedrotty, Michael A., Julie L. Webster, Gordon L. Cohen, and Aaron R. Chmiel  
1999 *Historical and Architectural Overview of Military Aircraft Hangars: A General History, Thematic Typology, and Inventory of Aircraft Hangars Constructed on Department of Defense Installations*. U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratory, Champaign.
- Price, Kathy  
2001 *Northern Defenders: Cold War Context of Ladd Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska 1947–1961*. Center of Ecological Management of Military Lands, Colorado State University, Ft. Collins.  
2004 *The World War II Heritage of Ladd Field, Fairbanks, Alaska*. Center of Environmental Management of Military Lands, Colorado State University, Ft. Collins.
- Sackett, Russell  
2002 Living with a Landmark: Ladd Field National Historic Landmark. Paper presented at the Alaska Historical Society Annual Meeting, Fairbanks.  
2006 *Biggs Air Force Base/Strategic Air Command Historic Context and Evaluation*. Report on file, Directorate of Environment-Conservation, Fort Bliss.
- Sackett, Russell, and Janet Clemens  
1999 Kodiak Naval Operating Base and Forts Greely and Abercrombie. National Historic Landmark nomination revision draft. Alaska Office of History and Archaeology and National Park Service Anchorage.

- Shull, Carol (Keeper of the National Register)
- 2001 Determination of Eligibility Notification: Ammo Bunker B (17 Type 49, WWII Ammunition Igloos) Elmendorf AFB/Fort Richardson. National Park Service, Washington, D.C.
- 2004 Determination of Eligibility Notification: Gerstle River Test Site. National Park Service, Washington, D.C.
- Sullivan, Maureen
- 2005 *Cultural Resource Management in the Department of Defense*. Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.
- Tanana-Yukon Historical Society
- n.d. *Cold Missions: the U.S. Army Air Forces and Ladd Field in World War II*. Tanana-Yukon Historical Society, Fairbanks.
- Thompson, Erwin
- 1984 Sitka Naval Operating Base and U.S. Army Coastal Defenses, Sitka National Register of Historic Places Nomination. Denver Service Center, National Park Service, Denver.
- 1985 Ladd Field National Register of Historic Places Nomination. Denver Service Center, National Park Service, Denver.
- U.S. Department of the Interior
- n.d. *National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*. Cultural Resources, National Park Service, Washington, D.C.
- U.S. Army Environmental Center
- 1996 "For Want of a Home...: A Historic Context for Wherry and Capehart Military Family Housing. Prepared for United States Army Environmental Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.
- 1997 *Thematic Study and Guidelines: Identification and Evaluation of U.S. Army Cold War Era Military-Industrial Historic Properties*. Prepared for United States Army Environmental Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD.
- Wasch, Diane, Perry Bush, Keith Landreth, and James Glass
- n.d. *World War II and the U.S. Army Mobilization Program: A History of 700 and 800 Series Cantonment Construction*. National Park Service, Cultural Resources, HABS/HAER. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
- White, Richard
- 1994 Context of Settler Communities. In *Settler Communities in the West: Historic Contexts for Cultural Resource Managers of Department of Defense Lands. Proceedings of the Settler Communities in the West Symposium*, edited by Robert Lyon, pp. 21–34. National Park Service, Rocky Mountain Region, Division of Partnerships and Outreach, Denver.