

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
IN THE UNITED STATES

Constance Werner Ramirez, Ph.D., AICP
Historic Preservation Officer, U. S. Department of the Army

As stated in the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, it is the policy of the United States government to administer federally owned, administered, or controlled prehistoric and historic resources in a spirit of stewardship for the inspiration and benefit of present and future generations. Federally owned or controlled land includes about one-third of this nation. Responsibility for the identification and protection of historic resources on this land rests with the department or agency of the federal government whose programs may have an affect on them. Although the National Park Service, in the Department of the Interior, provides some general guidance on historic preservation, each federal department must fund, staff, and manage its historic resources concomitant with its Congressionally mandated mission. Since the administration of the federal departments is decentralized with varying amounts of autonomy given to the regional and field offices, historic preservation programs and activities vary widely within the federal government. This paper will describe the historic resources management program developed by the Department of the Army for its military lands.

The federal policy on the protection of historic and archaeological properties and the Army's role have evolved over the last one hundred years. In the mid-19th century when Congress became interested in commemorating historic events, it turned to the War Department to manage federal lands acquired for that purpose. From 1880, when the War Department was given responsibility for maintaining the first national battlefield monuments, Chickamauga and Chattanooga, until these areas were turned over to the National Park Service in 1933, the War Department managed over 25 battlefield sites and military parks. In the same period, there was also a growing public interest in the archaeological sites in the western part of the country. This led to the passage of the Antiquities Act of 1906, which authorized the President to set aside land with significant cultural or scientific resources and made illegal the disturbance of archaeological sites on Federal land without a permit issued by the Departments of Agriculture, Interior or War (now delegated to Defense). The increasing role for government in the identification and preservation of historic resources was recognized by Congress with the enactment of the Historic Sites Act of 1935 which established a national policy of historic preservation and authorized the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a national program. In 1966, that policy was enhanced by the requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act. The 1966 Act, and its amendments, requires all federal departments and agencies to identify the historic buildings,

structures, districts and sites that meet the criteria of the National Register of Historic Places and to review the effect of federal activities on these historic places in order to reduce any harm to them. That activity must be undertaken in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) in each state government and the President's Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

Currently, there are 80 places on Army installations listed on the National Register. These include individual buildings, structures and sites as well as districts, such as West Point (location of the U.S. Military Academy), which may contain hundreds of buildings. Since the requirements of the 1966 Act extend to all places that meet the criteria of the National Register, not just to those that are formally listed, the Army has estimated that there are an additional 2,000 buildings and about 25,000 archaeological sites that may meet the criteria of the National Register. These historic resources are located on areas designated as installations by the Army. In the United States, there are more than 1,000 installations, which vary in size from an individual building and less than an acre to thousands of buildings and over a million acres. Located in every state, this property together amounts to about twelve million acres (the size of the states of Vermont and New Hampshire together, or slightly larger than Switzerland). On this land the Army maintains over 135,000 buildings, of which about 8% were built before 1940.

The history encompassed in the places on Army land spans about 12,000 years from the oldest archaeological sites to structures of the atomic age. Much of this history is related to the maintenance of a fighting force in permanent installations in the United States. As the oldest agency of the federal government, the Army dates its creation to June 14, 1775 when the Continental Congress authorized the muster of troops which formed the beginning of today's Army. Today the Army is still garrisoned on land that was fortified for the Revolutionary War at West Point, New York; laid out in the 1791 L'Enfant plan for Washington, D.C. at Fort McNair; part of the coastal defenses during the War of 1812 at Fort Monroe, Virginia; designated as an arsenal in 1813 at Watervliet, New York; part of the string of installations built to open the west, such as Fort Leavenworth and Fort Riley, Kansas, and Fort Sam Houston, Texas; or built to support World War II, such as Fort Wainwright in Alaska.

As the federal government acquired land and transferred it to the Army, it often obtained buildings, as well as archaeological sites, that are related to earlier, pre-Army occupation of the land. In the northern most part of the State of New York, the Army is now using land that was settled by a French émigré in 1806 who was important in guiding the agricultural development of that area of the state. Today, his mansion is used as visiting officers' quarters and the remains of his estate and adjoining village are being documented as part of

a comprehensive, multi-year archaeological program. In Monterey, California, the Army controls land hallowed by the Spanish explorers who landed there in 1602 and who established a presidio and mission on the same site in 1770. Other installations contain historic places that include buildings dating back to the early 18th century, part of the Santa Fe Trail, and a hacienda designed by the first registered woman architect in California for one of the wealthiest ranch owners in the United States. Archaeological sites on Army land are associated with an ancient temple in Hawaii, the adaptation of man to the change from Lake Mojave to the Mojave Desert, Ice Age activities in central Texas, the mound builders of the Mississippi region, the native cultures first contacted by Europeans, as well as with 18th and 19th century settlers and their changing industrial, agricultural and building systems.

To meet the requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act, the Army issued a regulation that delegates responsibility for compliance with the Act to each installation commanding officer and requires each installation having historic properties to prepare a historic preservation plan. This plan must include a procedure for inventorying the historic and archaeological places to the extent necessary to evaluate their significance and to determine how the historic place should be treated, in consideration of the national policy to safeguard historic places. The plan must be approved by the appropriate SHPO and the Advisory Council. It then documents the compliance by that Army installation with the 1966 Act. In the interim before the plan is prepared and approved, each installation must ensure that any activities that may harm a historic place are reviewed with the SHPO and, when required, with the Advisory Council. For some of the historic installations, this has meant over 40 review cases in a 15 year period. For this reason, increased effort is being made to complete installation historic preservation plans. Once the plan is approved, then the installation carries out the activities covered by the plan for about a four year period before the plan is reviewed and reapproved by the SHPO and the Advisory Council.

On each installation, the preservation program must ensure that historic places are protected to the maximum extent possible without jeopardizing the military mission. In most cases, the program is divided between the historic buildings, primarily in the built-up area or cantonment, and the archaeological sites, located primarily in the open-spaces and training areas. In both cases, the proper preservation treatment must be a prudent use of public funds and be feasible within the constraints and requirements of the military.

In the case of the historic buildings, in addition to the usual problems of maintaining non-contemporary building materials and techniques, there are a number of other issues that the Army's preservation program must address. These include trying to find adaptive uses for the historic buildings. As the military's

needs change so do the uses and occupants of the Army's buildings. Historic Army hospitals are abandoned for new medical facilities or obsolescent stables for new vehicle sheds and wash racks. In both of these cases, the history of Army medicine and of cavalry units is clearly reflected in the history and design of these buildings. For both historic preservation and economic reasons, the Army looks for adaptive uses of these buildings, often making the hospital into the installation headquarters or rehabilitating the stables for machine shops or office space. If an economic use can not be found for a building, the Army may dispose of it either by declaring it excess to its needs and having the government turn it over to another owner or by demolishing it.

One of the exceptions to the adaptive use problem is family quarters. There are over 2,000 family quarters which have been identified as historically significant and are still used for their original purpose. These quarters are a major contributor to the historic character of the cantonment and are frequently associated with former military leaders, such as Robert E. Lee, George S. Patton, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and many others. In response to a Congressional request, the Army has undertaken a survey of all the historic family quarters to assess the suitability of these structures with respect to current housing standards. The survey will identify the work required to bring the quarters to Army housing standards and to maintain or repair the significant historic and architectural features.

Another issue affecting the historic buildings is caused by the requirements by the federal government to reduce energy consumption and maintenance costs of government property. In particular, this has affected thousands of older single-pane wood windows in the Army's historic buildings that are considered high maintenance (scraping and painting) and contributing to high energy costs (due to air infiltration). Lacking experience in preservation, many installations turn to products used in new construction and specify such materials as double-glazed aluminum replacement windows. In consultation with the SHPO, the affect of these changes on the character of the building is evaluated. Alternatives that may be suitable when considering the repair or replacement options for a few windows must also satisfy the government's economic analysis when there are 500 to 1,000 windows, as in historic barracks. Meeting all these requirements puts a burden on the preservation program.

Other issues include incorporating new buildings into the historic cantonments. In such cases, the site design may require the demolition of an existing historic building and ensuring that the new building will be compatible with the adjacent historic buildings. Prior to any demolition, substantial alteration, or transfer of a building off the Army's inventory, it is documented according to the standards of the Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record (HABS/HAER) and the records are deposited in the Library of Congress for use by the

public. Project design must be contracted to firms experienced in meeting historic preservation project requirements.

To resolve the conflicts between building preservation and the military requirements, the installations are developing two documents. The first is an inventory of each building and area that is located in the cantonment and an evaluation of it relative to the history of the installation and to the history of the Army. The evaluation classifies each historic building and area so that the most significant of the buildings and areas are identified and given priority for preservation treatment. To date about 45,000 structures have been inventoried and approximately 200 of the most significant historic buildings have been recorded by HABS/HAER. The second document being prepared by the installations is a maintenance management plan. Army buildings have been preserved for more than a hundred years through good maintenance. The purpose of the plan, however, is to identify the standards, schedules and procedures for historic building maintenance that are different than those for non-historic buildings. The basis for these requirements is "The Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitation." At both the Presidio of San Francisco and Watervliet Arsenal, and in the Army family housing study, the preservation treatment is linked to the level of significance to ensure that all maintenance and repair projects respect the significance of the character defining elements of the historic buildings.

The Army's archaeological program has developed in response to the fact that, due to the scattered location of its installations, it has sites that are associated with almost the entire spectrum of cultural history. In addition, since many military installations are located in areas away from major cities and where the intensity of land use has been slight, many sites are well preserved. The Army's program, in the long-term, is undertaken in order to make a serious contribution to the cultural history of this country. In the short term, however, it is dictated by the intensity of the Army's impact on sites and the need for site data to evaluate and interpret the archaeological record being impacted. Studies conducted at Fort Hood, Fort Bliss and Fort Leonard Wood show that sites near or on the surface are damaged more from repetitive tracked and wheeled vehicles than from any other impacts. Damage from impacts such as vandalism, exploding ordnance, excavation, and recreation is substantially less. For these reasons, the Army's archaeology program has given highest priority to identifying sites that are located in maneuver training areas. Some maneuver areas contain hundreds or thousands of sites and there is insufficient time to complete analysis of all the sites prior to the date that the military needs to use the land. In areas where there is sufficient land to provide a flexible training scenario, sites are protected by being placed into districts of sites. In those cases, there is enough information about the sites to select a

statistically valid representative sample of each site type and to group those samples in an area, or district, which is then marked off limits to military training. In order to further protect site location data (to discourage vandalism) and to integrate the districts into the training scenario, these areas are designated nuclear, biological or chemical warfare areas so that all military personnel know that entering such areas is tantamount to losing the "battle". When there is sufficient plant material, sites are often camouflaged in a manner that discourages drivers of tanks and related tactical vehicles from entering the area.

In some cases, the training cannot avoid the districts and significant sites may be destroyed. In those cases, the Army undertakes extensive testing or excavation, as necessary, to obtain the data needed to respond to explicit research problems. Because field work is so labor intensive and the analysis often requires special and sophisticated equipment, responsible data recovery and the associated curation, analysis, and reporting, can be very expensive. The Army tries to limit excavation to those sites where there is a high probability of there being important and unique data and/or data that will increase knowledge necessary to evaluate other sites about which decisions concerning their treatment need to be made. Records and artifacts from military projects are maintained on the installation or in a nearby facility where they are available to the public. The Army encourages installations to provide information about the archaeological projects to the public in leaflets, exhibits, and technical reports. Since about 90% of the archaeological field surveys, analysis and data recovery is done under contract to private firms, a great deal of the information is immediately available for use in scholarly papers and publications. The history and pre-history of large parts of California, Colorado, Louisiana, Missouri, New Mexico, New York, Texas, and Washington have been rewritten as a result of the Army's archaeology program.

The Army's program has been evolving since the early 1970's to achieve four goals: to preserve places associated with the history of the Army, of the United States, and of America; to integrate historic and archaeological resources management with the long-term management of the installations; to meet high professional standards of historic preservation; and, to provide our citizens with information about the historic and archaeological resources on military land. The Department of the Army has made a commitment to historic preservation. It is proud of its past and wants to ensure that historic places on its land will be protected for future generations.

Summary

HISTORIC PRESERVATION BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY IN THE UNITED STATES

Constance Werner Ramirez, Ph.D., AICP
Historic Preservation Officer, U.S. Department of the Army

The Department of the Army is responsible for preservation of the historic resources on the approximately 12 million acres of land it controls in the United States. Like all federal departments, the Army must ensure that its activities are in compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Currently, there are almost 80 historic places on Army property listed on the National Register. These include individual buildings, structures and sites, as well as districts, containing almost 5,000 buildings. In addition, there are another 2,000 buildings and 25,000 archaeological sites on Army land that meet the criteria of the National Register. These historic places preserve the history and traditions of the Army as well as encompassing over 10,000 years of history from the oldest archaeological sites to structures of the atomic age.

To meet the requirements of the 1966 Act, the Army issued a regulation requiring each installation commanding officer to prepare a historic preservation plan. The plan must be approved by the appropriate State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. In the interim before the plan is approved, the installation must review each activity that may harm a historic place with the SHPO and, when required, with the Advisory Council.

For Army installations with historic buildings, the issues affecting preservation decisions include: finding adaptive uses, reducing energy use and maintenance (labor) costs, and designing new buildings to be compatible with their historic districts. These issues are addressed in the historic preservation plan which includes an inventory of evaluated buildings classified according to their significance to the installation. The plan also includes a maintenance management component and the identification of funds, expertise, and specific responsibilities.

The plan for archaeological sites consists of an inventory of sites, an evaluation of activities that may harm the sites, and a management plan that establishes procedures and priorities for treating the sites. Highest priority is given to identifying sites that can contribute to anthropological and historic research but may be destroyed by military tactical vehicle training. In training areas with hundreds of sites, installations identify districts of sites that contain a statistically representative sample of each site type. These districts are protected by being made off-limits and integrated into the military training scenario as minefields or areas of nuclear, biological or chemical danger. Sites are excavated only when they can not be protected or when the data is needed to evaluate other sites. Because of the time and expense of data recovery, this form of treatment is kept to a minimum.

Resumen

La Conservación de Monumentos Históricos en el Departamento del Ejército de los Estados Unidos

Constance Werner Ramírez, Ph.D., AICP
Oficial de Conservación de Monumentos Históricos,
Departamento del Ejército de los Estados Unidos

El Departamento del Ejército tiene la responsabilidad de conservar los recursos históricos de los aproximadamente doce millones de acres de terreno que controla en los Estados Unidos. Como es el caso de todos los departamentos federales, el Ejército debe cerciorarse de que todas sus actividades cumplan con las normas de la Ley Nacional de Conservación de Monumentos Históricos de 1966. Actualmente, en las propiedades del Ejército, hay cerca de 80 lugares históricos inscritos en el Registro Nacional, los cuales incluyen cerca de 5,000 edificios. Además hay otros 2,000 edificios y 25,000 yacimientos arqueológicos ubicados en terrenos del ejército que, no obstante a cumplir con las condiciones estipuladas en el Registro Nacional, aún no han sido inscritos en el mismo. Estos lugares históricos conservan la historia y las tradiciones del Ejército así como también abarcan más de 12,000 años de historia; desde los yacimientos más antiguos hasta las estructuras de la era atómica. En cumplimiento de la Ley de 1966, el Ejército expidió una regulación que requiere que el oficial al mando de la instalación elabore un plan de conservación de monumentos históricos.

El plan debe ser aprobado por el Ejército, el oficial correspondiente de Conservación de Monumentos Históricos del Estado pertinente (SHPO) y el Consejo Asesor de Conservación de Monumentos Históricos. En el interín, antes de que el plan sea aprobado, los funcionarios de las instalaciones, en colaboración con el SHPO y, si fuera necesario, con el Consejo Asesor, deben revisar toda actividad que pudiera comprometer un lugar histórico.

En instalaciones del ejército con edificios históricos, los aspectos que mayormente afectan las decisiones de conservación comprenden: la readaptación de usos apropiados, la reducción del uso de energía, el costo de mantenimiento (mano de obra) y el diseño de nuevos edificios que sean compatibles con las características de los distritos históricos. Todos estos aspectos están señalados en el plan, el cual muestra un inventario de edificios evaluados de acuerdo a las normas del Registro Nacional, y clasificados de acuerdo a su significación con respecto a la instalación. Incluye también una sección de administración de mantenimiento y la apropiación de fondos, la capacitación técnica y la asignación de responsabilidades.

El plan de los yacimientos arqueológicos consiste de un inventario de los mismos, una evaluación de actividades que pudieran dañarlos y un plan de administración que establezca procedimientos y prioridades para su conservación. Recibiendo la más alta prioridad está la identificación de yacimientos que puedan contribuir a la investigación antropológica e histórica, pero que pudieran ser destruidos por los vehículos táctico militares utilizados en las maniobras. En zonas de entrenamiento que contengan centenares de yacimientos, los funcionarios de las instalaciones identifican los lugares específicos que tengan muestras representativas de cada sitio-tipo. Estos lugares son, luego, integrados en el escenario de entrenamiento militar como áreas minadas o de peligro nuclear, biológico o químico. Los sitios son excavados sólo cuando no puedan ser protegidos, o cuando los datos se necesiten para la evaluación de otros yacimientos. Debido al tiempo y costo de la recopilación de datos este tipo de procedimiento se utiliza al mínimo.

Traducido por Abad Ramírez, AIA