

**Delivery Order 21  
Contract No. DACW31-89-D-0059**

**US Army Corps  
of Engineers  
Baltimore District**

---

**HISTORIC CONTEXT FOR  
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FACILITIES  
WORLD WAR II PERMANENT CONSTRUCTION**

**May 1997**

**R. Christopher Goodwin and Associates, Inc.  
241 E. Fourth Street  
Suite 100  
Frederick, Maryland 21701**

---

**Prepared for**

**U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Baltimore District  
P.O. Box 1715  
Baltimore, MD 21203-1715**

**HISTORIC CONTEXT FOR  
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE  
WORLD WAR II PERMANENT CONSTRUCTION**

**FINAL REPORT**

---

**Kathryn M. Kuranda, M. Arch. Hist.  
Principal Investigator**

**by**

**Deborah C. Whelan, Leo Hirrel, William T. Dod, J. Hampton Tucker, and  
Katherine Grandine**

**R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc.  
241 E. Fourth Street  
Suite 100  
Frederick, Maryland 21701**

**June 1997**

**for**

**U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Baltimore District  
P.O. Box 1715  
Baltimore, MD 21203-1715**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The *Historic Context for Department of Defense (DoD) World War II Permanent Construction* combines two previous reports: *Historic Context for Department of Defense Facilities World War II Permanent Construction* (Hirrel et al., draft June 1994) and *Methodology for World War II Permanent Construction* (Whelan, draft August 1996). This project was designed to meet the following objectives:

- To analyze and synthesize historical data on the military's permanent construction program during World War II.
- To assist DoD cultural resource managers and other DoD personnel with fulfilling their responsibilities under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended. Section 110 of the NHPA requires federal agencies to identify, evaluate, and nominate to the National Register of Historic Places historic properties under their jurisdiction. Section 110 Guidelines, developed by the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, direct federal agencies to establish **historic contexts** to identify and evaluate historic properties (53FR 4727-46).
- To develop a consistent historic context framework that provides comparative data and background information in a cost-effective manner, which will allow DoD personnel to assess the relative significance of World War II military construction.
- To develop a standardized methodology for the identification and evaluation of World War II permanent construction.

The report is divided into two parts. Part I examines the historical, architectural, and technological development of permanent facilities constructed on behalf of, and by, the military on the home front during World War II. Part II provides a framework for identifying and evaluating DoD permanent facilities constructed during World War II applying the National Register Criteria for Evaluation.

The military's World War II construction program was a massive effort that expended billions of dollars in the construction of thousands of facilities. While no one facility made the difference in the result of the war of resources, the cumulative effect of the effort was a decisive factor in the allied victory. Preliminary analysis of DoD real property data indicates that approximately 55,000 buildings currently classified as permanent and semi-permanent constructed during the World War II era are included in the DoD real property inventory. World War II-era properties now meet the 50-year age requirement of the National Register of Historic Places. This study describes the reasons for permanent vs. temporary construction and the role of permanent construction in the overall war effort.

This project was designed to assist DoD with the execution of their responsibilities under Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, and to fulfill the legislative purposes of the Legacy Program. R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc., undertook this project on behalf of the Department of Defense, through the Baltimore District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, as a demonstration project for the DoD Legacy Resource Management Program.



---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	iii
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b> .....	xiii
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	xvii
<b>I. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	1
Cultural Resources in the Department of Defense .....	1
Project Description .....	1
Legislative Background .....	2
Project Objectives.....	2
Application of the Historic Context for DoD Facilities World War II Permanent Construction .....	3
Information Needed .....	3
Identification of Historic Properties .....	3
Evaluation of Historic Properties .....	4
Treatment of Historic Properties.....	4
Relationship to Other DoD Context Studies .....	5
Methodology .....	5
Archival Research.....	5
Field Survey .....	6
Data Synthesis and Analysis .....	6
Project Background .....	7
Report Organization .....	8
<b>II. WORLD WAR II PERMANENT CONSTRUCTION HISTORIC CONTEXT AND ASSOCIATED PROPERTY TYPES</b> .....	11
Definition of the Historic Context.....	11
Types of Construction: Permanent vs. Temporary .....	12
Property Types Associated with World War II Permanent Construction .....	14
Construction and Installation Types .....	14
Buildings and Structures.....	15
<b><u>PART I - HISTORICAL OVERVIEW</u></b>	
<b>III. BACKGROUND OF THE MILITARY WORLD WAR II PERMANENT CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM</b> .....	29
The U.S. Military after World War I .....	29
The Beginnings of War .....	30
Military Operations.....	31
Europe .....	31
Asia and the Pacific .....	32
Organization of the Military Establishment .....	32
Army .....	32
Navy .....	33

<b>IV.</b>	<b>THE HOME FRONT AND MILITARY CONSTRUCTION</b> .....	37
	World War II on the American Home Front .....	37
	Military Construction and Wartime Logistics .....	39
<b>V.</b>	<b>COMMAND PERMANENT CONSTRUCTION</b> .....	47
	Combat Operations and Coastal Defense.....	47
	Hawaii.....	47
	Alaska.....	48
	United States.....	52
	Navy Yards .....	52
	Navy Bases and Stations.....	60
	Training Installations.....	64
	Army Air Forces Installations .....	73
	Navy and Marine Corps Air Stations.....	85
	Storage and Logistics Functions.....	92
	War Department.....	92
	Navy Department.....	98
	Research, Development, and Testing .....	100
	Medical Facilities .....	111
	Strategic Communications .....	118
<b>VI.</b>	<b>INDUSTRIAL PERMANENT CONSTRUCTION</b> .....	127
	Ammunition Production .....	127
	Artillery and Associated Components.....	134
	Tank Production .....	139
	Chemical Warfare Service Facilities .....	141
	Navy Ordnance Production Facilities .....	142
	Aircraft Production and Assembly.....	146
	Social Conditions .....	147
	New Workers.....	147
	Living Conditions and Effects on Local Economies.....	153
	Conclusion .....	154
<b>VII.</b>	<b>SPECIAL CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS: THE PENTAGON AND THE MANHATTAN PROJECT</b> .....	163
	The Pentagon .....	163
	The Manhattan Project and the Atomic Bomb .....	164
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>EXPLOSIVES</b> .....	169
	Department of Ordnance Works .....	169
	Propellants.....	172
	High Explosives .....	177
	Production Facilities .....	178
<b>IX.</b>	<b>ASSEMBLY OF LARGE AMMUNITION</b> .....	183
	Development of Ammunition Assembly Plants .....	183
	Projectiles .....	183
	Propellants.....	186
	Production Facilities .....	189
<b>X.</b>	<b>SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION</b> .....	191

<b>XI.</b>	<b>AMMUNITION DEPOTS</b> .....	199
	Ammunition Depot Design .....	199
	Ammunition Depot Facilities.....	200
<b>XII.</b>	<b>MODERN INDUSTRIAL ARCHITECTURE AND THE RISE OF THE WORLD WAR II INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX</b> .....	209
	European Roots of the 1930s Industrial Building .....	209
	American Roots of the 1930s Industrial Building .....	210
	Characteristics of the 1930s Industrial Building .....	211
	Influence of Albert Kahn .....	212
	World War II Military Industrial Facilities.....	213
	Conclusion .....	227

**PART II - APPLICATION OF THE HISTORIC CONTEXT**

<b>XIII.</b>	<b>IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES</b> .....	235
	Background.....	235
	Identification.....	235
	Objectives.....	236
	Methodology.....	236
	Evaluation .....	237
	National Register Criteria for Evaluation .....	237
	National Register Categories of Historic Properties .....	238
	Evaluating Properties Within Historic Contexts .....	239
	Issues Related to Evaluating Properties Using the World War II Permanent Construction Historic Context .....	240
	Historic District vs. Individual Eligibility .....	240
	Comparing Related Properties.....	240
	Properties Significant Within More than One Historic Context.....	241
	Levels of Significance .....	241
	Applying the National Register Criteria for Evaluation.....	242
	Criterion A: Association with Events .....	242
	Criterion B: Association with People .....	242
	Criterion C: Design/Construction.....	243
	Criterion D: Information Potential .....	244
	Integrity.....	245
	National Register Aspects of Integrity.....	245
	Integrity Issues Related to World War II Construction.....	246
	Re-categorization of Temporary Construction as Permanent or Semi-Permanent.....	246
	Continued Use Over Time.....	246
	Industrial, Scientific, and Technical Facilities .....	247
	Criteria Considerations .....	247
	Religious Properties.....	247
	Moved Properties.....	247
	Graves and Birthplaces .....	247
	Cemeteries.....	247
	Reconstructed Properties .....	248
	Commemorative Properties.....	248
	Properties Less than Fifty Years Old .....	248
	National Historic Landmarks.....	248

**XIV. APPLICATION OF THE EVALUATION METHODOLOGY TO WORLD WAR II**

<b>PERMANENT CONSTRUCTION</b> .....	251
World War II Properties Previously Listed in the National Register .....	251
Evaluation Methodology.....	251
Aircraft Production and Assembly.....	257
Significance .....	257
Registration Requirements .....	257
Examples.....	257
Airfields and Air Stations .....	257
Significance .....	257
Registration Requirements .....	258
Examples.....	258
Ammunition Depots.....	259
Significance .....	259
Registration Requirements .....	259
Examples.....	260
Chemical Warfare Service Facilities .....	260
Significance .....	260
Registration Requirements .....	260
Examples.....	261
Coastal Defense .....	261
Significance .....	261
Registration Requirements .....	261
Examples.....	261
Combat Operations .....	262
Significance .....	262
Registration Requirements .....	262
Examples.....	262
Depots (non-ordnance) and Ports of Embarkation .....	263
Significance .....	263
Registration Requirements .....	263
Examples.....	264
Industrial Construction Production Facilities .....	264
Significance .....	264
Registration Requirements .....	265
Examples.....	265
Medical Facilities .....	266
Significance .....	266
Registration Requirements .....	266
Examples.....	267
Navy Bases and Stations.....	267
Significance .....	267
Registration Requirements .....	267
Examples.....	268
Navy Yards .....	268
Significance .....	268
Registration Requirements .....	268
Examples.....	269
Research, Development and Testing .....	269
Significance .....	269
Registration Requirements .....	270
Examples.....	270
Special Projects.....	270
Significance .....	270
Registration Requirements .....	271



Examples.....	271
Strategic Communications .....	271
Significance .....	271
Registration Requirements.....	272
Examples.....	272
Training.....	272
Significance .....	272
Registration Requirements .....	273
Examples.....	273
<b>XV. CASE STUDIES .....</b>	<b>275</b>
Indiana Army Ammunition Plant .....	275
Location and Current Status .....	275
Summary History .....	276
Historic Context.....	276
Identification .....	277
Properties Associated with Administration.....	277
Properties Associated with Health Care .....	277
Properties Associated with Industrial Functions .....	277
Properties Associated with Infrastructure .....	278
Properties Associated with Personnel Support .....	278
Properties Associated with Research, Development, and Testing.....	279
Properties Associated with Residential Use .....	279
Properties Associated with Storage .....	279
Properties Associated with Transportation .....	279
Evaluation.....	279
Sources of Information.....	281
Fort George G. Meade .....	282
Location and Current Status .....	282
Summary History .....	282
Historic Context.....	282
Identification .....	283
Properties Associated with Administration.....	283
Properties Associated with Industrial Functions .....	283
Properties Associated with Infrastructure .....	283
Properties Associated with Personnel Support .....	284
Properties Associated with Storage .....	284
Evaluation.....	285
Sources of Information.....	286
McAlester AAP .....	287
Location and Current Status .....	287
Summary History .....	287
Historic Context.....	287
Identification .....	288
Properties Associated with Administration.....	288
Properties Associated with Health Care .....	288
Properties Associated with Industrial Functions .....	288
Properties Associated with Infrastructure .....	289
Properties Associated with Personnel Support .....	289
Properties Associated with Research, Development, and Testing.....	289
Properties Associated with Residential Use .....	289
Properties Associated with Storage .....	290

Properties Associated with Transportation .....	290
Evaluation.....	290
Sources of Information.....	291
Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division, China Lake .....	292
Location and Current Status .....	292
Summary History .....	292
Historic Context.....	293
Identification .....	293
Properties Associated with Administration.....	293
Properties Associated with Industrial Functions .....	293
Properties Associated with Infrastructure .....	294
Properties Associated with Personnel Support .....	294
Properties Associated with Research, Development, and Testing.....	294
Properties Associated with Residential Use .....	296
Properties Associated with Storage .....	297
Properties Associated with Transportation .....	297
Evaluation.....	297
Sources of Information.....	299
Naval Station Anacostia .....	300
Location and Current Status .....	300
Summary History .....	300
Historic Context.....	300
Identification .....	301
Properties Associated with Administration.....	301
Properties Associated with Industrial Functions .....	302
Properties Associated with Infrastructure .....	302
Properties Associated with Research .....	302
Properties Associated with Residential Use .....	302
Properties Associated with Transportation .....	302
Evaluation.....	302
Sources of Information.....	303
Naval Surface Warfare Center Crane Division.....	304
Location and Current Status .....	304
Summary History .....	304
Historic Context.....	305
Identification .....	305
Properties Associated with Administration.....	305
Properties Associated with Education.....	306
Properties Associated with Health Care .....	306
Properties Associated with Industrial Functions .....	306
Properties Associated with Infrastructure .....	306
Properties Associated with Personnel Support .....	306
Properties Associated with Research, Development, and Testing.....	306
Properties Associated with Residential Use .....	306
Properties Associated with Storage .....	306
Properties Associated with Transportation .....	307
Evaluation.....	307
Sources of Information.....	308
Ravenna AAP .....	309
Location and Current Status .....	309
Summary History .....	309
Historic Context.....	310
Identification .....	310
Properties Associated with Administration.....	310

Properties Associated with Health Care .....	311
Properties Associated with Industrial Functions .....	311
Properties Associated with Infrastructure .....	312
Properties Associated with Personnel Support .....	312
Properties Associated with Residential Use .....	312
Properties Associated with Storage .....	312
Properties Associated with Transportation .....	312
Evaluation.....	312
Sources of Information.....	314
Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant.....	315
Location and Current Status.....	315
Summary History .....	315
Historic Context.....	316
Identification .....	316
Properties Associated with Administration.....	316
Properties Associated with Industrial Functions .....	316
Properties Associated with Infrastructure .....	318
Properties Associated with Personnel Support .....	318
Properties Associated with Research, Development and Testing.....	318
Properties Associated with Residential Use .....	319
Properties Associated with Storage .....	319
Properties Associated with Transportation .....	320
Evaluation.....	320
Sources of Information.....	321
Wright-Patterson AFB .....	322
Location and Current Status.....	322
Summary History .....	322
Historic Context.....	323
Identification .....	324
Properties Associated with Administration.....	324
Properties Associated with Communication .....	324
Properties Associated with Defense .....	324
Properties Associated with Education.....	324
Properties Associated with Health Care .....	324
Properties Associated with Industrial Functions .....	325
Properties Associated with Infrastructure .....	325
Properties Associated with Personnel Support .....	325
Properties Associated with Research, Development, and Testing.....	326
Properties Associated with Storage .....	327
Properties Associate with Transportation .....	328
Evaluation.....	328
Sources of Information.....	330
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>333</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....</b>	<b>347</b>

- APPENDIX I - Time Line of Selected Events Related to World War II (1939 - 1946)**
- APPENDIX II - DoD Installations with Properties Classified as Permanent and Semi- .....  
Permanent Construction Between 1939-1946**
- APPENDIX III - List of Programmatic Agreements Regarding World War II Historic  
Properties .....and Related Documents**
- APPENDIX IV - Military Properties Associated with World War II Listed in the National ..  
Register of Historic Places Between 1993 and April 1997**
- APPENDIX V - Resumes of Key Project Personnel**

---

## LIST OF FIGURES

---

Figure 1.	Value of military construction work from the Protective Mobilization Plan of 1940 to the end of World War II in 1945. (From Fine and Remington, <i>Construction in the United States</i> , 606) .....	41
Figure 2.	Map of the major military installations of the Aleutian Campaign, Alaska. (From Craven and Cate, <i>Plans and Early Operations</i> , Vol. 1, 463).....	49
Figure 3.	Dry Dock #8 at the Norfolk Navy Yard under construction during World War II. (Courtesy of the U.S. Navy).....	61
Figure 4.	Airborne trainees dropping from the 250-foot training tower at Fort Benning, Georgia, in April 1942. (Courtesy of U.S. Army Military History Institute) .....	75
Figure 5.	Locations of Air Corps Training Installations, 1942. (From "Service of Supply Report to Congress," 1942, MS, U.S. Air Force Historical Research Center).....	77
Figure 6.	1943 Army Air Force hangar at Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio .....	83
Figure 7.	Example of typical multi-story, concrete warehouse constructed by the Navy during World War II. This example was located at Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Virginia .....	101
Figure 8.	The ENIAC, or Electronic Numerical Integrator And Computing machine, was used at Ballistic Research Laboratory, Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, to calculate trajectories. (Courtesy of U.S. Army Military History Institute) .....	103
Figure 9.	Wright Field, now part of Wright-Patterson AFB in Ohio, was the principal research and development center for the Army Air Forces. The aerial photograph ( <i>above</i> ) taken in 1939, depicts the pre-war installation. The aerial photograph ( <i>below</i> ) taken in 1944 depicts the tremendous expansion of the air field during World War II. (Courtesy 2750th Air Base Wing Historian's Office).....	107
Figure 10.	From the "bridge" of the main range at Naval Proving Ground Dahlgren, Virginia, the Fire Control Officer observes the firing of eight-inch guns, July 21, 1943. (National Archives Photograph 80-G-100165).....	109
Figure 11.	Dehydration House, a typical building in the industrial process, at Indiana Ordnance Plant, now Indiana Army Ammunition Plant.....	131

Figure 12.	A "melt-pour" building, <i>above</i> , at Ravenna Ordnance Plant, now Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant, in Ohio; note the escape chutes for an emergency exit. Covered ramps ( <i>below</i> ) were used to move material between buildings, which were widely separated due to the danger of explosions.....	135
Figure 13.	Time clock alley ( <i>above</i> ) and the change house ( <i>below</i> ) marked the beginning and end of the workers' day at ordnance plants. The change house was particularly important because the shower facilities allowed workers to wash off toxic chemicals. These examples are located at Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant, Ohio .....	137
Figure 14.	The M4 or Sherman Tank was one product of the Detroit Tank Arsenal. (Courtesy U.S. Army Military History Institute).....	143
Figure 15.	Signs within the work place appealed to the workers' patriotism while exhorting them to work harder. This example is located at the Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant, formerly the Twin Cities Ordnance Plant, in Minnesota (Courtesy of Twin Cities AAP).....	149
Figure 16.	Women Ordnance Workers, or WOWs, cleaning and greasing a 20 mm cannon at Naval Proving Ground Dahlgren, Virginia, July 21, 1943. (National Archives Photograph 80-G-100194).....	151
Figure 17.	African-American workers in a storeroom with 155 mm shells at the Wolf Creek Ordnance Plant, Texas. (National Archives SC-137-882).....	155
Figure 18.	Smokeless powder production process. Although this diagram illustrates Picatinny Arsenal in New Jersey, the same process was used throughout the nation. (HAER Drawing, 14 Dov, v 2-6, Prints and Photographs Division, Library of Congress) .....	173
Figure 19.	Multiperforated Powder Grains..	175
Figure 20.	Workers purifying TNT by washing with water and sellite, Volunteer Ordnance Works, Tennessee, October 1942. (National Archives SC-144095). .....	179
Figure 21.	Workers pouring liquid TNT into 20-pound fragmentation bombs by hand, at an unknown location. The workers on the right are breaking up bubbles in the liquid TNT. Better methods of loading shells later replaced this laborious process. (National Archives SC 111-SC-131110).....	187
Figure 22.	Diagram of the many steps involved in producing a small arms cartridge. Between the steps, the brass was heat treated and then washed to remove metal stress caused by the reshaping. (From Herb, <i>Ordnance Production Methods</i> , 4-5).....	193
Figure 23.	Gage and Weight Machine, St. Louis Ordnance Plant, Missouri, 1943. (National Archives, SC 111-SC-173871).....	195

Figure 24.	Typical high explosives ammunition magazine (also known as "igloo"), designed to minimize the effects of an explosion. The same design was used at production facilities, ammunition depots, and other types of installations. This example is located at the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane, Indiana (formerly Crane Naval Ammunition Depot) .....	201
Figure 25.	Locations of Ordnance Department Storage facilities for both ammunition and general supplies. Facilities shown on this map either were leased or built by the Army. (From Thomson and Mayo, <i>Procurement and Supply</i> , 384) .....	203
Figure 26.	View of Tracer Charge Wing of Building 103, a .50 Caliber Shop, Twin Cities Ordnance Plant, Minnesota. The building exhibits the clean-cut profile and horizontal lines typical of modern industrial design .....	217
Figure 27.	View of receiving end of Building 103, a .50 Caliber Shop, Twin Cities Ordnance Plant, Minnesota. The flat, overhanging, steel roof and low-lying monitors emphasize the horizontal lines of the composition.....	219
Figure 28.	Main Entrance of Building 103, a .50 Caliber Shop, Twin Cities Ordnance Plant, Minnesota.....	221
Figure 29.	Explosive-loading Building, Building 109, at McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, Oklahoma, formerly McAlester Navy Ammunition Depot. Explosive loading facilities were the largest facilities at most ordnance plants. Building 109 enclosed twice as much space as any other building in its production line .....	223
Figure 30.	Sifting Building, Building 110, McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, Oklahoma, formerly McAlester Navy Ammunition Depot. The Sifting Building was designed with second-story escape chutes, providing escape routes for workers in case of emergency .....	225
Figure 31.	Covered sidewalks, such as this one at McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, linked buildings within a production plant. Workers carted munitions from work station to work station under the protection of these covered walkways.....	229





---

**LIST OF TABLES**

---

Table 1.	Cost of World War II Army and Navy Domestic Construction.....	13
Table 2.	Command Construction Installation Types and Component Property Categories.....	17
Table 2a.	Command Construction Installation Types and Component Property Categories (continued).....	20
Table 3.	Industrial Construction Installation Types and Component Property Categories.....	23
Table 3a.	Industrial Construction Installation Types and Component Property Categories (continued).....	25
Table 4.	Special Projects and Component Property Categories.....	26
Table 4a.	Special Projects and Component Property Categories (continued).....	27
Table 5.	World War II Army Coastal Fortifications.....	53
Table 6.	World War II Navy Yards.....	57
Table 7.	World War II Navy Operating Bases.....	63
Table 8.	World War II Army Mobilization Training Camps.....	65
Table 9.	World War II Navy Training Stations and Bases.....	71
Table 10.	World War II Army Airfields now Active DoD Installations.....	79
Table 11.	World War II Navy Air Stations.....	86
Table 12.	World War II Marine Corps Air Stations.....	91
Table 13.	World War II Army Depots (Non-ordnance).....	93
Table 14.	World War II Navy and Marine Corps General Supply Depots (Non-ordnance).....	99
Table 15.	World War II Army General Hospitals.....	112

Table 16.	World War II Naval Hospitals ....	115
Table 17.	World War II Explosives and Raw Ingredients Ordnance Works .....	170
Table 18.	World War II Large Ammunition Assembly Plants.....	184
Table 19.	World War II Small Arms Ammunition Plants .....	192
Table 20.	World War II Army Ordnance Depots .....	205
Table 21.	World War II Navy Ammunition Depots .....	206
Table 22.	Secretary of the Interior's <i>Standards for Identification</i> .....	235
Table 23.	Secretary of the Interior's <i>Standards for Evaluation</i> .....	237
Table 24.	National Register Criteria for Evaluation.....	238
Table 25.	National Register Aspects of Integrity .....	245
Table 26.	National Historic Landmark Criteria .....	249
Table 27.	Military Properties Associated with World War II listed in the National Register of Historic Places, with National Historic Landmarks Noted .....	252

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### **Cultural Resources in the Department of Defense**

The Department of Defense (DoD) manages 25 million acres within the United States. These lands contain a range of properties associated with the historical development of the military, as well as with many other facets of North American history and prehistory. Cultural resources are non-renewable resources that document the historical development of the nation; they include real property, personal property, records, and community resources.

Military cultural resource programs, including the identification, evaluation, and management of historic properties, are on-going functions within the respective services. Although Federal Preservation Officers for each service provide guidance in cultural resource management, responsibility for the majority of DoD cultural resource management duties falls upon individual installations, activities, and commands.

As installation-based cultural resource programs evolved, DoD recognized the complex historical inter-relationship of properties associated with the military services. Military construction typically was planned and executed as part of a national defense program. As a result, assessment of the historical significance of DoD properties requires comprehensive comparative data on the historical development of DoD construction. Such comparative data provides a basis for developing consistent management strategies for historic properties. Through the development of comprehensive historic context studies, DoD seeks to provide background and comparative information in a practical and cost-effective manner that is in the public interest.

### **Project Description**

The *Historic Context for Department of Defense World War II Permanent Construction* presents the historic background of World War II permanent and semi-permanent construction and a methodology for identifying and evaluating World War II permanent and semi-permanent construction on Department of Defense (DoD) facilities. This report combines the draft reports *Historic Context for Department of Defense Facilities World War II Permanent Construction* (Hirrel et al., draft June 1994), which examined the historical, architectural, and technological development of U.S. military permanent construction built from 1940 to 1945 on the home front, and *Methodology for World War II Permanent Construction* (Whelan, draft August 1996), which provided a methodological framework for identifying and evaluating World War II permanent construction. The integration of this work into a single report will facilitate the distribution and application of the project results.

The military's World War II construction program was a massive effort that expended billions of dollars in the construction of thousands of facilities. World War II often is characterized as a war of resources, a race to mobilize the men and materiel needed for victory. While no one facility made the difference in the result of the war of resources, the cumulative effect of the effort was a decisive factor in the allied victory. The fiftieth anniversary of World War II has sparked great interest in the physical remnants of wartime construction on the home front. Thus far, historic context studies of World War II construction have focused on the temporary construction program developed to erect temporary facilities to house and train millions of men quickly.<sup>1</sup> The low cost and speedy construction rate of temporary buildings best served the war emergency. However, some specialized facilities necessary to the war effort were not suited to temporary buildings, and thus the military also built permanent construction.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

Permanent and semi-permanent construction built by the military during World War II is the subject of this historic context study, which describes the reasons for permanent vs. temporary construction and the role of permanent construction in the overall war effort. Preliminary analysis of DoD real property data indicates that approximately 55,000 buildings currently are classified as permanent and semi-permanent constructed during World War II (Army, 32,909; Navy and Marine Corps, 16,781; Air Force, 5,310).<sup>ii</sup>

Buildings originally built from temporary construction mobilization plans that have been renovated and currently are classified as permanent or semi-permanent in DoD real property inventories are not the subject of this study. Historic contexts define properties by their historic rather than current real property classifications. Buildings originally built as temporary mobilization construction should be evaluated within the context of World War II temporary construction; modifications to their original design and materials should be assessed in relationship to the property's integrity, and its ability to convey its association with its historic context.

## Legislative Background

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, established the legislative basis for federal historic preservation programs. The act established the National Register of Historic Places, the national inventory of properties significant in American history, architecture, engineering, archeology, and culture. The National Register is continually updated to include significant properties that represent many facets of American history. Section 110 of NHPA requires federal agencies to identify, evaluate, and nominate to the National Register historic properties under their control or jurisdiction. Section 110 also requires federal agencies to consider the preservation of the cultural and historical values of historic properties under their control or jurisdiction (16 U.S.C. 470h-2).

The Section 110 Guidelines, developed by the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, direct federal agencies to establish **historic contexts** to identify and evaluate historic properties (53FR 4727-46). The *Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation* provide technical guidance about historic preservation activities and methods, including identifying and evaluating historic properties.<sup>iii</sup> These standards also recommend developing historic contexts to assist with preservation planning.

## Project Objectives

This project to develop a historic context for World War II permanent construction had several objectives:

- To synthesize and analyze historical data on the military's permanent construction program during World War II.
- To assist DoD cultural resource managers and other DoD personnel with fulfilling their responsibilities under Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended. Section 110 of the NHPA requires federal agencies to identify, evaluate, and nominate to the National Register of Historic Places historic properties under their jurisdiction. World War II-era properties now meet the 50-year age requirement of the National Register of Historic Places.
- To develop a consistent historic context framework that provides comparative data and background information in a cost-effective

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

manner, allowing DoD personnel at individual installations to assess the relative significance of World War II military construction without conducting extensive historic context development.

- To develop a standardized methodology for the identification and evaluation of World War II permanent construction.

## **Application of the Historic Context for World War II Permanent Construction**

### Information Needed

DoD personnel undertaking the identification and evaluation of historic buildings on DoD installations can apply the methodology presented in this report as the basis for their evaluation of the significance of World War II military permanent construction. To apply the World War II permanent construction historic context to a particular property, whether an entire installation or an individual building, the following information about the property is needed:

- (1) location;
- (2) date of construction;
- (3) type of construction, as classified during World War II;
- (4) World War II function of the particular buildings or structures; and,
- (5) World War II installation type.

### Identification of Historic Properties

Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, requires the identification of historic properties. Identification requires gathering information and establishing a research design to identify historic properties on the installation. The identification of historic properties is an on-going process; World War II properties, which only recently have reached the 50-year mark, often have not been identified in earlier surveys of installation historic properties. The World War II Permanent Construction Historic Context can be used to identify historical patterns and associated themes relevant to the development of a specific installation during World War II. Cultural resource managers can use the historic context to predict the range and type of historic properties on an installation. Useful material in determining installation- or property-specific significance include: real property lists that include dates of construction and construction material, building plans, historic maps, historic photographs, and studies documenting the installation's organization and mission during World War II.

While this study does not replace the need for site-specific archival and field investigations, it does provide a broad framework within which site-specific data can be integrated and information needs assessed. The discussion of the roles of different installations during World War II establishes the connection between the real property and historic events, and places the facility within the overall historical development of DoD construction activities.

### Evaluation of Historic Properties

Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, also requires the evaluation of historic properties. The National Register Criteria for Evaluation (36 CFR, Part 60.4) are the primary criteria for evaluating the qualities of significance and integrity in historic properties. To qualify for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, a property must possess the qualities of significance defined under one of the National Register criteria and possess several of the seven qualities of integrity. Properties may be significant on a local, state, or national level.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

Evaluating an historic property is a four-step process: (1) categorize the property; (2) determine what historic context the property represents; (3) determine whether the property is significant under National Register criteria; and, (4) determine whether the property retains integrity. The application of the World War II Permanent Construction Historic Context to the evaluation of historic properties follows this same process. Chapter XIII of this report lists the National Register Criteria and provides a methodology for evaluating World War II permanent construction.

### Treatment of Historic Properties

Federal agencies are required to take into account the effects of their actions on historic properties. This responsibility was established in the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended; in the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; in Executive Order No. 11593 (Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment); and, in numerous subsequent federal laws and regulations. This project is designed to assist DoD in executing these responsibilities, applying the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for Preservation Planning*.

The Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for Preservation Planning* established a three-step approach to preservation planning:

1. Establishment of historic contexts;
2. Use of historic contexts to develop goals and priorities for identification, evaluation, and treatment of historic properties; and,
3. Integration of the results of preservation planning into the broader planning process.<sup>iv</sup>

Preservation planning is a dynamic process. The World War II Permanent Construction Historic Context includes comparative data and context statements that provide the basis for new or expanded historic contexts. This study also can assist DoD cultural resource managers in developing preservation goals and priorities.

DoD regulations require that installations develop management plans for historic properties. The World War II Permanent Construction Historic Context can be used as a predictive model to anticipate the property types associated with the World War II mission of an installation, and it can assist in the development of plans to identify historic properties.

The World War II Permanent Construction Historic Context also may be used in developing treatment strategies for historic properties. The study defines the installation types that possess important and specific associations with the World War II historic context. Through the determination of why a property is significant, a variety of treatment strategies that best preserve the cultural and historical values of the property may be developed. As this documentation indicates, many World War II permanent facilities represent standardized construction techniques. Programmatic Agreements have been developed that allow documentation of some types of installations (see Appendix III). Similar Programmatic Agreements could be formulated to document classes of property types, such as ammunition bunkers.

### **Relationship to other DoD Context Studies**

Many installations were built over a period of years including, but extending beyond, World War II. DoD has sponsored other nationwide historic context studies, including *National Historic Context for Department of Defense Installations, 1790 - 1940*; *World War II and the U.S. Army Mobilization Program: A History of 700 and 800 Series Cantonment Construction*; *World War II*

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

*Temporary Military Buildings: A Brief History of the Architecture and Planning of Cantonments and Training Stations in the United States; Support and Utility Structures and Facilities (1917 - 1946) Overview, Inventory, and Treatment Plan; and Navy Cold War Guided Missile Context: Resources Associated with the Navy's Guided Missile Program, 1946 - 1989.*<sup>v</sup> Additional studies related to the Cold War era are underway. To evaluate fully the significance of DoD properties, a holistic approach incorporating guidance from these various context studies is necessary. Understanding an installation may require evaluating several layers of historic development, from establishment in the nineteenth century, through use during World War I and 1930s expansion, to World War II mission, and use during the Cold War. Facilities, including individual buildings and entire installations, may have undergone numerous transformations in response to changing military needs. The significance of various phases of development can be understood only within their relevant historic contexts.

## **Methodology**

The Secretary of the Interior's *Standards for Preservation Planning* and technical literature from the National Register Program of the National Park Service were used to develop and implement the research design for this project. Three primary tasks were completed to develop a historic context for World War II-era permanent construction at DoD installations within the fifty states. These tasks were archival research, field investigation, and data synthesis. Data were collected and analyzed to identify the broad patterns of military construction immediately before and during World War II; to develop specific historic themes; and, to develop a method of categorizing property types related to World War II permanent military construction.

### Archival Research

A literature search was completed of standard military secondary sources, both published and unpublished. The Technical Services portion of the "U.S. Army in World War II" series (the so-called "Green Books") proved an invaluable source of information. For the Navy Department, the best source of information on administration and logistics was the "Naval Administrative Histories of World War II," a manuscript available at the Navy Department Library, Washington Navy Yard. *Building the Navy's Bases* (1947) provided the best source for the Navy's World War II construction program. Semi-official and official monographs, such as Buford Rowland and William Boyd's history of the Navy Ordnance Bureau, also provided excellent overviews. Specialized monographs completed the secondary literature overview.

Published primary material that was consulted included memoirs, government documents, and periodicals. Memoirs of such men as Levin H. Campbell (Chief of Ordnance) and Donald M. Nelson (War Production Administration) provided valuable information. Periodicals reviewed included both military journals and trade publications. Some of the most useful magazines included: *Architectural Forum*, *Architectural Record*, *Engineering News-Record*, and *Army Ordnance*. Government publications varied from military technical manuals to studies by the Labor Department Women's Bureau.

Unpublished primary source research encompassed both archival works and special research collections. At the National Archives, some of the most valuable Records Groups included RG 71 (Records of the Bureau of Yards and Docks); RG 74 (Records of the Navy Bureau of Ordnance); RG 77 (Records of the Chief of Engineers); and RG 156 (Records of the Chief of Ordnance). Within RG 156, Entry 646 (Histories of Ordnance Installations and Activities) proved to be a lucrative source of information on ammunition production facilities. The files of the National Register of Historic Places, in Washington, D.C., were reviewed to identify World War II properties listed in the National Register.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

Research in the Washington area was supplemented by work at some repositories elsewhere in the United States. The Library of the Naval Construction Battalion Engineering Center, Port Hueneme, California, contained the papers of Ben Moreell, head of the Bureau of Yards and Docks during World War II. The U.S. Air Force Historical Research Center, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, contained collections on specific installations and War College papers. At the Armament, Munitions, and Chemical Command (AMCCOM) Historical Office, Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, historians examined the collection of documents on microfiche and special studies on AMCCOM installations, which include most of the Army's World War II-era industrial facilities that remain under DoD control.

### Field Survey

Field visits to seven DoD installations with large inventories of World War II permanent construction provided additional information for the historic context. Four criteria were used to select the installations: (1) concentration of World War II facilities; (2) high level of integrity from the World War II period; (3) ability to illustrate a representative type of World War II facility; and, (4) geographic distribution. Installations visited included two former Navy ammunition depots (Crane and McAlester), one ammunition loading plant (Ravenna), one smokeless powder works (Indiana), one small arms ammunition plant (Twin Cities), one Navy research and development center, (China Lake), and one Air Force research and development center (Wright-Patterson AFB). These installations illustrated some of the most important categories of military permanent construction. At each installation, R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc., examined historic records and surveyed representative building types. In addition, the Baltimore District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers released information on Fort George G. Meade and Naval Station Anacostia for inclusion in this study. The results of these investigations were incorporated into the historic context, evaluation methodology, and case studies.

### Data Synthesis and Analysis

This project required an analysis of the broad trends and patterns of the U.S. military permanent construction program from 1940 to 1945. The reasons for permanent construction and the role that these buildings and structures played in World War II were examined. Permanent construction was selected for buildings used in military operations, training, logistical support, research and development, and industrial production. The various World War II domestic installations all contributed to the Allied victory; construction undertaken to support the war effort was part of a vast system of interdependent installations. The surviving examples of permanent construction are best understood in comparison to similar facilities and their role in the war effort. Thus, the historic context is organized according to the various functions of the installations. While recognizing the differences between the services, this analysis emphasizes the common trends that reflected the role of the armed forces in marshalling the resources required by a global conflict.

Three primary functional categories of military construction were identified: command construction, industrial construction, and construction for special projects. Command construction includes facilities that operated in direct support of military forces. Industrial construction includes facilities that produced explosives, ammunition, weaponry, and associated implements of war; industrial construction was particularly noteworthy because the War and Navy Departments established a munitions industry during the war, using primarily permanent construction. The third category, construction on behalf of special projects, includes the Pentagon and the Manhattan Project; this study provides only a brief summary of these two important projects, which are the subject of several in-depth studies.

The archival research also was analyzed to identify specific themes especially relevant to World War II permanent construction: military, technology, social history, and architecture. The military theme is incorporated into the discussion of the overall military construction program and in

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.



the three primary categories of permanent construction. The technology theme is developed through separate analyses that describe the major technological processes housed in the World War II industrial facilities. The basic steps of the process, the design requirements of the technology, and the properties associated with the technology were identified. Industrial production facilities were designed as integrated systems; to evaluate the structures associated with industrial facilities, the processes contained within the buildings must be understood.

The theme of social history was developed in conjunction with the analysis of industrial facilities. The rapid development of enormous production facilities had a tremendous influence on the lives of those who remained on the home front. Two major topics within the theme of social history were identified during archival research: changes in the composition of the labor force, and the "boom town" effects on local economies. To illustrate this theme, examples of major shifts in employment patterns and of the effects of World War II factory construction on a few communities were selected. These examples, by no means exhaustive, provide a basis for further research and analysis of the social history relevant to specific facilities.

The theme of architecture was developed through an analysis of the development of the factory as a twentieth century building type and of the development of modern architecture as a twentieth-century building expression. Examples of World War II production works were examined within the framework of the development of modern factory design.

## **Project Background**

The World War II Permanent Construction Historic Context is a demonstration project of DoD Legacy Cultural Resource Program. The Legacy Program was created by the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1991 (P.L. 101-511). The purpose of the Legacy Program is:

To better integrate the conservation of irreplaceable biological, cultural, and geophysical resources within the dynamic requirements of military missions. To achieve this goal, the Department of Defense will give high priority to inventorying, conserving, and restoring biological, cultural, and geophysical resources in a comprehensive, cost-effective manner in partnership with federal, state, and local agencies and private groups.<sup>vi</sup>

The lessons and data derived from demonstration projects are designed to be incorporated into the DoD cultural resource management program, and then applied to the on-going mission of cultural resource stewardship.

R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc., completed this project on behalf of the Department of Defense, through the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District (DACA31-89-D-0059). This project encompassed research at regional military archival repositories, field visits to selected installations with representative examples of World War II permanent construction, and analysis. The final report is a combined version of two draft reports, *Historic Context for Department of Defense Facilities World War II Permanent Construction* (D.O. 21) and *Methodology for World War II Permanent Construction* (D.O. 25).

The project research design was developed in consultation with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, and the DoD Legacy Program. The World War II Permanent Construction Historic Context project was designed to fulfill the Legacy Program legislative objectives and to assist DoD in meeting its responsibilities under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

## Report Organization

Chapter I describes the purpose, organization, and background of the report. Chapter II summarizes the framework of the historic context developed for World War II permanent construction. Part I provides the historic background for the development of World War II permanent facilities. Part II presents a methodology for identifying and evaluating World War II permanent construction and case studies. Appendix I includes a time-line of events related to World War II. Appendix II contains lists of the number of buildings **currently classified** as permanent or semi-permanent construction, built between 1939 - 1946, at DoD installations. Programmatic Agreements relevant to World War II historic properties under DoD jurisdiction are included in Appendix III. Appendix IV contains a list of military properties documented as associated with World War II and listed in the National Register of Historic Places between 1993 and April 1997. Appendix V includes the resumes of key project personnel.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

## NOTES

1. Diane Shaw Wasch, Perry Bush, Keith Landreth, and James Glass, *World War II and the U.S. Army Mobilization Program: A History of 700 and 800 Series Cantonment Construction* (Washington, D.C.: United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Cultural Resources, HABS/HAER, 1993) and John Garner, *World War II Temporary Military Buildings: A Brief History of the Architecture and Planning of Cantonments and Training Stations in the United States* (Champaign, Illinois: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Construction Engineering Research Laboratory, 1993).

2. These figures are based on an analysis of the real property inventories of the service branches performed by the U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratory (Keith Landreth, personnel communication, October 22, 1992). These inventories are included in Appendix II of this report.

3. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, "Archeology and Historic Preservation: Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines," *Federal Register* 48, no. 190 (29 September 1983).

4. "Archeology and Historic Preservation: Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines," *Federal Register*, 44717.

5. Deborah Cannan, et al., "National Historic Context for Department of Defense Installations, 1790-1940" (MS, R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates Inc., 1995; Wasch et al., *World War II and the U.S. Army Mobilization Program*; Garner, *World War II Temporary Military Buildings*; Katherine Grandine, et al., "Support and Utility Structures and Facilities (1917-1946) Overview, Inventory, and Treatment Plan" (MS, prepared by R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc., 1995); Brooke V. Best, et al., "Navy Cold War Guided Missile Context" (MS, prepared by R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc., 1995).

6. U.S. Department of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Environment, *Legacy Resource Management Program*, Report to Congress, September 1991, 3.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

## CHAPTER II

### WORLD WAR II PERMANENT HISTORIC CONTEXT AND ASSOCIATED PROPERTY TYPES

#### Definition of the Historic Context

Historic contexts are organizational frameworks that assist in interpreting the broad patterns of history by grouping information related to shared time period, geographic area, and theme. The World War II Permanent Construction Historic Context provides an historical framework for assessing the relative significance of Department of Defense (DoD) facilities constructed as part of the domestic war effort between 1940 and 1945.

The three elements of a historic context are time period, geographic area, and theme(s). This historic context was defined as follows:

Time Period:	1940 - 1945
Geographic Area:	United States
Theme:	World War II Military Permanent and Semi-permanent Construction on the Home Front

The time period defined for this project includes the years 1940 - 1945. For the purposes of this study, World War II-era construction begins with Protective Mobilization in the summer of 1940 and ends with the capitulation of Japan in August 1945.

The geographic area for this project is the United States, including the contiguous 48 states, Alaska, and Hawaii. Construction in overseas territories or other countries is not included in the project.

The theme or subject matter included in this project is the military's World War II permanent and semi-permanent construction program. For ease of reference, the term "permanent construction" is used to encompass both permanent and semi-permanent construction in this report. The properties related to this theme represent several facets of history. The research design for this project focused on developing four topics within the historic context: (1) military - the home front military construction program's contribution to the war effort; (2) industry -the development of industrial technology; (3) social history - the effects of the permanent construction program on social groups and local communities; and (4) architecture - the development of modern industrial architecture represented by permanent World War II construction.

The United States expended billions of dollars to construct thousands of World War II facilities to train and arm its military forces. World War II was a war of resources and a race to mobilize rapidly the men and materiel needed to defeat the Axis nations. The domestic construction program associated with military mobilization constituted an unprecedented wave of building activity across the nation. No one facility won the war of resources; however, the cumulative effect of the entire mobilization effort was a decisive factor in the victory of the Allied forces.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

## **Types of Construction: Permanent vs. Temporary**

The military employed two general types of construction in the war effort: temporary and permanent. These general types of World War II construction may be further subdivided into four categories: (1) permanent; (2) semi-permanent; (3) temporary; and (4) theater-of-operations. Permanent construction was intended for use after the war; it typically was built of masonry (brick, tile, or concrete) and metal frame. Semi-permanent construction typically consisted of cinderblock construction, wooden-frame construction clad with synthetic siding, or a mixture of wooden frame and masonry. Semi-permanent construction often resulted from ad hoc compromises between the desire for permanent construction and shortages of time and material. Temporary construction consisted of wooden-frame buildings, typically built according to standardized plans, and of modular metal buildings. Temporary construction was not intended for use after the war. Theater-of-operations (T.O.) construction was the least durable type of construction; it typically consisted of wood lath on wall sheathing covered in felt. Few, if any, examples of T.O. construction survive. These different methods of construction are associated with distinct functions and periods during the war effort. **For the purposes of evaluating historical significance and integrity, the type of construction is determined by the construction category at the time of construction.**

In order to maximize on the scarce resources of time and material, the military built temporary construction wherever possible. Temporary buildings particularly were associated with housing and training during the early mobilization phase of the war. The military built training camps and stations across the nation characterized by row upon row of standardized wooden-frame barracks and supporting facilities. By the end of 1944, the Army could house six million troops, in contrast to the 270,000 soldiers housed in 1939. Separate studies, *World War II Temporary Military Buildings: A Brief History of the Architecture and Planning of Cantonments and Training Stations* (Garner 1993) and *World War II and the U.S. Army Mobilization Program: A History of 700 and 800 Series Cantonment Construction* (Wasch 1993), provide historic contexts for temporary construction.

The military did not maintain separate accounts of the costs for temporary and permanent construction. Table 1 presents the overall cost of the domestic construction program. No cost breakdowns differentiating between permanent and temporary construction have been located. However, ratios of permanent and temporary construction may be estimated by comparing the costs of installations dominated by permanent construction with the costs of installations dominated by temporary construction. Rough estimates of these percentages indicate that permanent construction comprised approximately one-third of Army domestic construction and possibly as much as two-thirds of Navy domestic construction during World War II.

Despite the preference for temporary buildings, some wartime construction required permanent facilities. The military used permanent construction materials and designs for selected buildings intended for post-war use. Aside from these miscellaneous buildings, certain types of activities typically could not be accommodated in temporary buildings and required permanent construction. Permanent construction was used for industrial facilities; research and development facilities that required specialized or sterile laboratory conditions; storage facilities for volatile or perishable supplies; coastal fortifications; and, medical facilities.

By far, industrial facilities comprise the bulk of World War II permanent construction. While World War II temporary construction is associated particularly with troop housing, the wartime permanent construction is emblematic of the effort to arm and equip the newly expanded military in the war of resources.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

**table 1**

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

## Property Types Associated with World War II Permanent Construction

Property types are groupings of properties that share common physical or associative characteristics. Specific property types are associated with specific historic contexts. Property types link the theoretical construct of a historic context to real property. This study adopts a three-level hierarchy in the analysis of World War II permanent construction. The first level of this hierarchy is construction category (i.e., Command, Industrial, or Special Projects). The second level is installation type (i.e., shipyard, depot, training, etc.). The final level of this hierarchy is building and structure specific.

### Construction and Installation Types

The most useful way to group properties associated with World War II permanent construction is by the function they served in support of the war effort. The first broad classification is the definition of construction category. During World War II, there were three construction categories: Command, Industrial, and Special Projects. Command construction included installations that directly supported training, operational and logistical activities. Industrial construction included installations operated to produce war materiel. Special Projects were defined by the War Department.

The second classification of property is the type of installation based on its purpose or military mission. World War II installations generally comprise interrelated individual buildings and structures built to accomplish the mission of the installation. This is particularly true of the industrial facilities built to produce, repair, assemble, and store war materiel. Grouping the properties into broad categories that correspond to installation missions provides the best method of understanding the relationship between the historic context and its associated real property. An analysis of World War II permanent construction identified the following types of installations, which are organized to correspond to their appropriate construction category:

#### *Command Construction*

- Air Fields and Air Stations
- Coastal Defense and Combat Operations
- Depots (Non Ordnance) and Embarkation Ports
- Medical Facilities
- Navy Bases and Stations
- Navy Yards
- Research, Development, and Testing
- Strategic Communications
- Training

#### *Industrial Construction*

- Aircraft Production
- Ammunition Depots
- Artillery/Artillery Parts Production Plants/Arsenals
- Chemical Warfare Service Facilities
- Explosive Production Works
- Large Ammunition Assembly Plants
- Small Arms Ammunition Plants
- Tank Arsenals

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.



### *Special Projects*

- Manhattan Engineering District (Manhattan Project)
- Pentagon

Some installations can be categorized as both command or industrial construction. To simplify discussions for the purposes of this report, each installation was categorized as one type. Shipyards, for example, although designed to build and repair ships, were classified as command construction due to their role in supporting the fleet. Ammunition depots, whether they included production facilities or only storage facilities, were classified as industrial construction because of their close relationship to the other types of industrial installations.

### Buildings and Structures

Each installation encompasses buildings and structures necessary to support its mission. The buildings and structures can be classified according to their use:

- *Administration:* Properties related to administration. Examples include the administration building, guard house, gate house or sentry box, fire station, and post office. Most installations had one or more buildings that housed the installation's administrative functions. Installations that served as regional or command headquarters also included buildings that housed the headquarters offices.
- *Communication:* Properties that house communication technology or perform communication functions. Examples include radio towers, radio houses, and telephone exchanges. All installations possessed communications facilities necessary to allow internal and external communication. Installations with the primary mission of communication operated facilities that were part of national or global strategic communications system.
- *Defense:* Properties related directly to combat operations or coastal defense. Examples include batteries, coastal fortifications, and airfields located in theatres of operation (i.e., Alaska and Hawaii) or coastal defenses.
- *Education:* Properties associated with the training and education of military personnel. Examples include classrooms and specialized training facilities. The vast majority of World War II training facilities, whether for the Navy, Army, or Army Air Forces, were constructed using temporary mobilization construction. A few specialized facilities and facilities intended for post-war use were built using permanent construction.
- *Health Care:* Properties associated with the medical care of military personnel and civilian workers. Examples include dispensaries, which were located on most installations, and complexes of hospitals, isolation wards, and nurses quarters located at regional medical facilities. The dispensaries at training camps and cantonments typically were built using temporary construction plans; general hospitals that served military personnel in wider regions were more likely to receive permanent construction.
- *Industrial:* Properties associated with the assembly, production, or repair of war materiel. Examples at shipyards include dry docks, shop buildings, and cranes. Examples at arsenals and ordnance works and plants include manufacturing facilities or assembly lines. Other types of industrial properties include aircraft production or assembly facilities and maintenance and repair shops for routine maintenance of installation equipment.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

- *Infrastructure:* Properties associated with providing power, water, and waste disposal to installations. Examples include heating plants, electric substations, power houses, water towers, water treatment plants, sewage plants, and sewage pumping stations. Power sources were essential in the operation of industrial facilities.
- *Personnel Support:* Properties associated with the daily living requirements of personnel and workers. Examples include mess halls for military personnel, cafeterias for civilian workers, and recreation buildings. Industrial facilities include specialized personnel facilities such as change/shower houses and clock houses. Most personnel support facilities at command installations were housed in temporary buildings. During the mobilization phase of 1940, some personnel support facilities at command installations utilized permanent construction designs; these facilities typically were designed for post-war use. Naval operating bases, depots, Army airfields, and Navy air stations, which were installations that served the military's newly recognized aviation and logistics functions, tended to receive more funds for permanent construction for personnel support facilities than mobilization installations. The personnel support buildings at industrial installations typically were similar in design and construction materials to the other installation buildings.
- *Research, Development, and Testing:* Properties associated with research, testing, and development of military technology. Examples include laboratories, wind tunnels, test ranges, and specialized test facilities.
- *Residential:* Properties associated with housing military and civilian personnel at installations. Examples include barracks, bachelor officers quarters, single family detached houses, and multi-family housing. The majority of barracks were built using temporary construction; however, some barracks built during the mobilization period were constructed of permanent materials.
- *Storage:* Properties associated with the storage of military materiel. Examples include warehouses, ammunition magazines, igloos, and a wide array of various types of storage buildings. All installations included some storage facilities, which supported the installations' primary activities. Installations that served as regional centers of logistical support and storage, such as supply depots and ammunition depots, include large numbers of storage facilities.
- *Transportation:* Properties associated with the transport of military personnel and materiel, including air, rail, and water. Examples include hangars, runways, piers, rail lines, loading platforms, and roads. Often properties related to transportation and storage are interrelated, as the government developed new and utilized existing transportation networks systems for moving stored materiel.

Tables 2, 2a, 3, 3a, 4, and 4a list specific buildings and structures likely to be found on various types of installations, and also indicate which properties were critical to the installation mission. Some categories of properties were essential to and inextricably linked with the mission of an installation, while others are incidental supporting structures. Identifying the purpose of the installation and understanding how the surviving properties contributed to that purpose are

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

**TABLE 2: COMMAND CONSTRUCTION INSTALLATION TYPES AND COMPONENT PROPERTY CATEGORIES**

INSTALLATION TYPES	PROPERTY CATEGORIES					
	Administration	Communication	Defense	Education	Health Care	Industrial
Airfields/ Air Stations	<b>administration building</b> , fire station, gate, guard house <b>operations building</b>	<b>control tower</b> , radio house	n/a	<b>academic building</b> , <b>celestial navigation training building</b> , <b>hangars</b> , <b>parachute training facility</b>	dispensary	<b>aviation maintenance shops/assembly and repair shops</b> , engine test cells, radio repair shop, vehicle maintenance shop, wash rack
Coastal Defenses/ Combat Operations	<b>command post station</b> , <b>fire control station</b>	<b>radar station</b> , <b>switchboard building</b>	<b>anti-submarine net</b> , <b>bunkers</b> , <b>coastal searchlight shelters</b> , <b>gun emplacements</b> , <b>harbor entrance control post</b> , <b>personnel shelters</b> , <b>runways</b>	n/a	dispensary	n/a
Depots (non-ordnance) and Ports of Embarkation	<b>administration building</b> , fire station, gate, guard house	radio house	n/a	n/a	dispensary	<b>engine test building and repair hangar</b> (air depots), <b>maintenance and repair shops</b>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

INSTALLATION TYPES	PROPERTY CATEGORIES					
	Administration	Communication	Defense	Education	Health Care	Industrial
Medical Facilities	<b>administration building</b> , fire station, gate, guard house, post office	n/a	n/a	<b>corpsmen training school</b>	<b>clinics (dental, EENT, laboratory, X-ray, surgery, physiotherapy, etc.), hospital wards, mortuary, sick officers quarters, occupational therapy building, specialized wards</b>	n/a
Navy Bases/Stations	<b>administration building</b> , fire station, gate, guard house	radio station, telephone exchange	n/a	n/a	dispensary	maintenance and repair shops
Navy Yards	<b>administration building</b> , fire station, gate, guard house	radio control building	n/a	shop buildings	dispensary	<b>bulkheads, compressor house, dry docks, galvanizing plant, foundry, piers, pumphouses, shops</b> (electric, forge, layout, machine, ordnance, pattern, pipe, riggers, sheetmetal, shipfitters, shopfitters utility, sub-assembly, turbine

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

INSTALLATION TYPES	PROPERTY CATEGORIES					
	Administration	Communication	Defense	Education	Health Care	Industrial
						blading, utility)
Research, Development, and Testing	<b>administration building</b> , fire station, gate, guard house	radio house	n/a	classroom buildings	dispensary	loading/assembly buildings, maintenance and repair shops, workshops
Strategic Communications	<b>administration building</b>	<b>antenna, helix house, operations building</b>	n/a	n/a	dispensary	maintenance and repair shops
Training	<b>administration building, operations building</b>	radio house	n/a	<b>classroom buildings, drill hall, ranges, operational training facilities and training devices, training towers</b>	hospital	maintenance and repair shops

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

**TABLE 2a: COMMAND CONSTRUCTION INSTALLATION TYPES AND COMPONENT PROPERTY CATEGORIES (CONTINUED)**

INSTALLATION TYPES	PROPERTY CATEGORIES					
	Infrastructure	Personnel Support	Research, Development, and Testing	Residential	Storage	Transportation
Airfields/ Air Stations	electric substations, sewage pumping station, sewage disposal facility, steam plant, water pumping station, water storage	chapel, enlisted mens lounge, mess hall, officers club, post exchange, post office, PX gas station, recreation building, Red Cross building, swimming pool and bath house, theatre	n/a	bachelor officer quarters, barracks, NCO quarters, officers family quarters, garages	aviation supply, flammable materials (paint, oil, dope) storage, fuel storage, general storage, ordnance storage	<b>hangars</b> (heavier-than-air landplane, lighter-than-air, seaplane), <b>runways</b> , vehicle fueling station
Coastal Defenses	power plant	mess hall	n/a	barracks, officers quarters	magazines, ration storehouse	n/a
Depots (non-ordnance) and Ports	electric substations, heating plant, sewage disposal facility, water distribution and storage	mess hall/cafeteria	n/a	barracks, civilian housing, officers quarters	<b>cold storage, fuel storage, general supply warehouses/storehouses, heavy materials warehouses, open storage yards, transit sheds</b>	<b>air freight terminal, garages, loading ramps, piers, pier sheds, roads, rail lines</b>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

Medical Facilities	electric substations, incinerator, laundry, power house, steam plant, water storage	<b>chapel, libraries, Med. Det. recreation, mess halls, officers and nurses recreation, patient recreation and welfare building, post exchange, Red Cross building, theatre</b>	n/a	<b>corpsmens barracks, guest house, nurses quarters, officers quarters</b>	medical storehouse, storehouses	gas stations
Navy Bases/Stations	electric substations, incinerator, sewage treatment plant, steam plant, water storage	chapel, enlisted personnel club, gymnasium, exchange, mess, officers club mess, post office, recreation building, theatre	n/a	bachelor officers quarters, barracks, receiving barracks, family housing	<b>general storage, warehouses, community storage, specialized storage, ordnance storage</b>	<b>piers, rail lines</b>
Navy Yards	boiler house, electric substations, incinerator, <b>power house</b> , transformer stations, water storage	cafeteria, latrine, laundry, officers mess, post office, recreation building, time clock station, civilian support buildings	n/a	barracks, officers family quarters, bachelor officer quarters	coal storage yards, fuel storage tanks, general storehouses, <b>industrial storehouses, ordnance storage, heavy materials storage, general storage warehouses</b>	<b>crane tracks, rail lines</b>
Research, Development,	electric substations, <b>power house</b> , steam	cafeteria, civilian support buildings	<b>laboratories, wind tunnels, firing ranges, test track,</b>	bachelor officer quarters, barracks, single	flammable material storage, general storage,	n/a

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

and Testing	plant, sewage treatment, water storage		<b>observation towers, airfield, test sites</b>	family housing	ordnance storage, specialized storage as needed	
Strategic Communications	electric substations, power house/stand-by generator	cafeteria, mess, recreation facilities	<b>laboratories, radar test buildings</b>	barracks, officers quarters	general storage, open storage	n/a
Training	electric substations, sewage pumping station, sewage disposal facility, steam plant, water pumping station, water storage	chapel, bakery, enlisted mens lounge, laundry, mess hall, exchange, officers club, post office, PX gas station, recreation facilities, Red Cross building, swimming pool and bath house, theatre	n/a	<b>bachelor officer quarters, barracks, NCO quarters</b> , officers family quarters	fuel storage, commisionary storage, general storage, ordnance storage	rail lines, gas stations, motor pools, vehicle fueling station

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.



**TABLE 3. INDUSTRIAL CONSTRUCTION INSTALLATION TYPES AND COMPONENT PROPERTY CATEGORIES**

INSTALLATION TYPES	PROPERTY CATEGORIES			
	Administration	Health Care	Industrial	Infrastructure
Aircraft Production	<b>administration building</b> , guard house and gate	flight hospital	<b>assembly plant</b> (large single structure), <b>sub-assembly areas</b> , <b>production buildings</b>	<b>boiler house/power house</b> , electric substations, water storage facilities, water wells
Ammunition Depots	<b>administration building</b> , fire station, guard house and gate	dispensary	<b>maintenance and repair shops</b> , cranes	boiler house/power house, electric substations, sewage treatment plant or pumping station, water treatment plant
Artillery/Artillery Parts Production Plants/Arsenals	<b>administration building</b> , fire station, guard house and gate, sentry boxes	dispensary	<b>assembly buildings</b> , <b>factories</b> , <b>forge shop</b> , <b>machine shop</b>	<b>boiler house/power house</b> , electric substations, water pumping station
Chemical Warfare Service Facilities	<b>administration building</b> , fire station, guard house and gate	dispensary	<b>assembly and loading plants</b> , <b>manufacturing plants</b> , <b>pilot plants</b>	electric substations, power house, sewage pumping station, water treatment plant

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

INSTALLATION TYPES	PROPERTY CATEGORIES			
	Administration	Health Care	Industrial	Infrastructure
Explosive Production Works	<b>administration building</b> , fire station, guard house and gate, radio house	dispensary	<b>acid concentration plants, ammonium oxidation plants, machine maintenance shops, propellant manufacturing lines</b> (dehydrating press house, ether mix house, mixer house, horizontal screening and press house, solvent recovery house, controlled circulation dryer house, blending tower)	electric substations, <b>power plant</b> , sewage pumping station, water treatment plant, water wells, water pumping houses
Large Ammunition Assembly Plants	<b>administration building</b> , fire station, guard house and gate, radio house	dispensary	<b>bag-loading plants, bag sewing buildings, bomb- and mine-filling plants, booster loading buildings, ignition filling houses, loading plants</b> (large caliber, medium caliber), <b>mine assembly plants, rocket motor loading buildings, ammonium nitrate manufacturing buildings</b>	boiler house/power house, electric substations, sewage pumping station, water treatment plant
Small Arms Ammunition Plants	<b>administration building</b> , fire station, guard house and gate, radio house, sentry boxes	hospital	<b>.30 and .50 caliber shops, ballistics building, lead shop, powder canning house, primer chemical distribution house, primer dry houses, primer manufacturing building, primer mixing building, proof houses, salvage building, tool and gauge shop, tracer chemical distribution house, tracer composition manufacturing building</b>	boiler house/power house, electric substations, sewage pumping stations, water treatment plant, well houses
Tank Arsenal	<b>administration building</b> , personnel building, sentry building, telephone exchange	n/a	paint shop, <b>tank assembly plant</b> (single large structure with receiving, manufacturing, and assembly areas), <b>tank repair shop</b>	electric substations, power house, pump house, sewage treatment plant, water storage

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

table 3a

**TABLE 3a. INDUSTRIAL CONSTRUCTION INSTALLATION TYPES AND COMPONENT PROPERTY CATEGORIES (CONTINUED)**

INSTALLATION TYPES	PROPERTY CATEGORIES				
	Personnel Support	Research, Development, and Testing	Residential	Storage	Transportation
Aircraft Production	cafeteria, commissary	test facilities	barracks, single family detached houses	warehouses	loading platforms, rail lines, roads, runways
Ammunition Depots	change house	n/a	barracks, single family detached houses	<b>high explosives magazines (igloos), inert storehouses, magazines</b> (high-explosive, projectile, smokeless powder), <b>torpedo storehouses</b>	<b>loading platforms, piers, rail lines, roads</b>
Artillery/Artillery Parts Production Plant	n/a	n/a	N/A	storehouses for parts, storehouses for finished production	loading platforms, rail lines, roads
Chemical Warfare Service Facilities	change/shower house, mess hall	<b>laboratories, test facilities, observation bunkers</b>	bachelor officer quarters, barracks, single family detached houses	high explosives magazines (igloos), storehouses, above ground magazines	loading platforms, rail lines, roads
Explosive Production	cafeteria, canteen, change house,	n/a	single family	magazines,	loading platforms, rail

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

Works	clock house, search house		detached houses	storehouses	lines, roads
Large Ammunition Assembly Plants	cafeteria, change/shower house, clock house	n/a	barracks, single family detached houses	magazines, storehouses	loading platforms, rail lines, roads
Small Arms Ammunition Plants	cafeteria, commissary kitchen	<b>target houses, tool and gauge laboratories</b>	single family detached houses	magazines, storehouses	loading platforms, rail lines, roads
Tank Arsenal	commissary kitchen	<b>test track</b>	n/a	storehouses	loading platforms, rail lines, roads

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

table 4a

---

**TABLE 4. SPECIAL PROJECTS AND COMPONENT PROPERTY CATEGORIES**


---

INSTALLATION TYPES	PROPERTY CATEGORIES				
	Administration	Communication	Health Care	Industrial	Infrastructure
Manhattan Engineering District	<b>administration building, fire house, gate house, guard house, offices, police station</b>	post office, telephone exchange	dispensary, hospital	<b>specialized assembly plant, sub-assembly areas, specialized production facilities, electromagnet separation plant, gaseous diffusion plant, plutonium production plant, specialized manufacturing plant, heavy water plant</b>	<b>boiler house/power house</b> , electric substation, sewage treatment plant, water treatment plant, sewage pumping stations
Pentagon	<b>administration building</b>	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

TABLE 4a. SPECIAL PROJECTS AND COMPONENT PROPERTY CATEGORIES

INSTALLATION TYPES	PROPERTY CATEGORIES				
	Personnel Support	Research, Development, and Testing	Residential	Storage	Transportation
Manhattan Engineering District	cafeteria commissary, theater, commercial areas	<b>laboratories, test sites, workshops</b>	civilian housing, barracks, single family detached houses, family housing, apartments, dormitories	warehouses, specialized storage buildings	vehicle fueling station, loading platforms, rail lines, roads
Pentagon	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

essential in determining which properties represent the historic context. Part II of this report presents a methodology for identifying and evaluating properties within the World War II Permanent Construction Historic Context.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

# PART I

## HISTORICAL OVERVIEW AND THEME STUDIES

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.



## CHAPTER III

### BACKGROUND OF THE MILITARY WORLD WAR II PERMANENT CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

#### The U.S. Military after World War I

Following World War I, the United States hoped to avoid future world-wide conflicts and public opinion shifted in favor of isolationism. President Woodrow Wilson sought to prevent future conflicts by creating an international organization known as the League of Nations. But the Senate rejected the treaty, largely because of a fear of foreign entanglements. The United States did participate in the Washington and London Naval Disarmament Conferences of the 1920s and early 1930s, at which time limits were placed on ship construction. In 1928, the United States made another gesture towards world peace by signing the Kellogg-Briand Pact, which renounced war as an instrument of national policy.

With the expectation of an enduring peace, interest in the nation's military establishment declined. New weapons, such as tanks, were not developed to their full capabilities. The Army Air Corps profited from the growth and technological developments of civilian aviation; but the Air Corps remained tied to the ground forces. The Navy and Marine Corps grew irregularly during these years. The Navy did incorporate new types of ships, such as aircraft carriers and submarines, into its inventory. Yet the disarmament conferences of the 1920s and 1930s discouraged ship construction. Another factor limiting military expenditures was the severe economic constraints of the Great Depression, when the United States lacked the funds to invest in military build-up.

Hopes for a permanent peace proved illusory. Benito Mussolini established a fascist dictatorship over Italy in 1922. Germany's Nazi Party, under Adolf Hitler, seized control of Germany in 1933. Japan fell under the control of militarists who wished to expand into China. As the decade progressed, Germany, Italy, and Japan coalesced into an understanding known as the Axis Powers.

As Americans observed the growing instability in Europe and Asia, the nation was divided between a desire to remain out of foreign conflicts and the recognition of the importance of military preparedness. Advocates of neutrality found a congressional champion in Senator Russell Nye, who conducted a well publicized series of hearings on the munitions industry in World War I. He charged that these so-called "merchants of death" had encouraged American involvement in European affairs in anticipation of increased profits. Between 1935 and 1937, Congress passed three neutrality acts intended to avoid future foreign wars.

Nevertheless, the dangers for Nazi or Japanese expansion were sufficient to stimulate a modest increase in military and naval appropriations. Beginning in 1935, the strength of the armed forces increased steadily. The Army General Staff developed emergency mobilization plans. In 1938, Congress authorized "educational orders," which were small scale contracts designed to familiarize potential contractors with the requirements of manufacturing for the military.<sup>vii</sup>

Navy and Marine Corps officers generally recognized that Japan presented the most serious naval threat, and developed their plans accordingly. The Navy began shifting its forces to the Pacific bases of San Diego, Puget Sound, and Pearl Harbor. As the London and Washington Treaties expired in 1936, Congress authorized increased tonnages for the Navy, most notably in the Second Vinson Act of 1938.<sup>viii</sup> Marine Corps leaders recognized that any war in the Pacific would require seizure of island bases, and developed the amphibious assault techniques that they would use so effectively in the Pacific.<sup>ix</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

## The Beginnings of War

Germany's Adolf Hitler proved to be a particularly dangerous menace to world peace. After the Nazi party gained control of Germany in 1933, Hitler initiated a German re-armament program. He then systematically began annexing neighboring countries, beginning with Austria in 1938. Germany continued its expansion unchecked until the invasion of Poland caused Britain and France to declare war on Germany in September 1939.

The German Army soon demonstrated that this time the war would be characterized by rapid movement. Using a combination of infantry, armor, and aircraft, the Germans overran Poland in one month, using "blitzkrieg" tactics. The British sent an expeditionary force to France, which first deployed on the French - Belgian border, then moved to Dyle River in central Belgium. In May 1940, the Nazi Army bypassed the fortifications, forcing the British and French to fall back in confusion. The British narrowly averted a complete disaster by evacuating their forces through the French port of Dunkirk. With the defeat of France almost assured, Italy declared war on France on June 10. France surrendered to Germany on June 22.

A complete German victory seemed imminent. Only Great Britain and her empire presented a credible barrier to Nazi conquests. German plans for a rapid invasion of Britain failed after the Royal Air Force denied the Germans air superiority in the Battle of Britain. Later that year, the Axis tried to defeat Britain by capturing the Suez Canal, which would have separated Britain from its Persian Gulf oil supplies and its Indian empire. The German action opened fighting in North Africa that continued through 1943. In the Atlantic, German submarines attempted to destroy British shipping, but never quite succeeded.

The prospects for an Axis victory led the United States to take its first tentative steps toward direct involvement in the war. In September 1940, President Franklin Roosevelt approved the transfer of 50 destroyers to Britain, in return for a lease on British bases in the Caribbean. That September, the United States initiated a peacetime Selective Service and a partial mobilization of the National Guard. In December 1940, Roosevelt announced the United States would provide military supplies to Britain under a policy termed "lend-lease." The President justified his actions by declaring that the United States must become the "arsenal of democracy." In the summer of 1941, Roosevelt ordered the Navy to escort merchant convoys as far as Iceland. This order resulted in an undeclared war between American destroyers and German submarines, and led to the sinking of the destroyer *Reuben James* by the Germans on 31 October 1941.

In the summer of 1941, Hitler made one of the greatest blunders of the war by invading the Soviet Union. Although initially successful, the German campaign could not overcome the vast distances of the Soviet Union, the harsh winter, or the fierce resistance they met. The exceptionally brutal fighting on the eastern front destroyed a large portion of the German Army. Following the German invasion, the United States included the Soviet Union in its lend-lease program.

The United States, in addition to the war in Europe, had to contend with the military expansion of Japan in the Pacific region. Japan rapidly emerged as a leading Asian power, following its opening to Western influences in the middle of the nineteenth century. It became a serious threat to Asian stability when a clique of aggressively militaristic officers and politicians gained control of the government during the 1930s. Japan invaded China, resulting in a full scale war by 1937. The Japanese war with China continued longer than the Japanese had expected, as Japan became mired in the vastness of China. The Japanese continued their expansion, and entered French Indochina in 1941.

Reasoning that their expansion made war with the United States inevitable, the Japanese decided to initiate hostilities with a decisive offensive action. On 7 December 1941, they launched

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

an attack upon the United States fleet anchored in Pearl Harbor, sinking four battleships, badly damaging four others, and destroying over 200 aircraft.

The Japanese attack upon Pearl Harbor triggered direct American involvement in the war. Immediately after the attack, the United States declared war upon Japan. Three days later, Germany and Italy declared war upon the United States and Congress reciprocated. With American entry into the war, the coalition against the Axis nations coalesced into the Allied powers. Led by the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union, the alliance also included members of the British Commonwealth, China, and exiled governments of occupied nations. During the first year of American involvement in the war, the military lacked the trained personnel and other resources to exert a decisive influence.

## **Military Operations**

### Europe

As American combat strength increased through the early stages of the war, American and British forces launched their first offensive actions. In November 1942, the Allies landed in North Africa. By May 1943, the British and Americans had cleared the Germans from North Africa. Next, they began a campaign against Italy, which soon resulted in the surrender of the Italian government. Although German soldiers continued fighting in Italy for the remainder of the war, the Allied victory secured the British lifeline to Asia through the Mediterranean. At approximately the same time, the British and American Navies gained supremacy over German submarines in the Atlantic.

By the spring of 1944, the Allies were strong enough to challenge the Germans in northern Europe. On 6 June 1944, the Allies invaded France through Normandy, and by September they almost reached the German border. Inadequate supplies stalled the Allied offensive, which was delayed further by a German counter offensive that winter in the Ardennes forest. By the spring of 1945, American and British forces reached the German western border while the Soviets reached the German eastern border. Germany surrendered on 7 May 1945.

The scope of the American contribution to the war against Germany and Italy started modestly and grew to enormous proportions. At the beginning of the North African invasion, the United States could provide only one corps. By the close of the war, six numbered American armies operated in western Europe, although the Fifteenth Army was not organized until the end of the war. Americans provided 61 of 91 Allied divisions in the western Europe theater of operations, plus 7 of 18 divisions in Italy. Four of the six Allied tactical air commands were American. Even these figures do not represent the full American contribution to the Allied victory. The United States provided ammunition, equipment, and other essential military supplies to British and Russian forces.<sup>x</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

## Asia and the Pacific

Japan followed its attack on Pearl Harbor with a successful invasion of the Philippines. By mid 1942, the Japanese had established a defensive perimeter that extended as far as the Solomon Islands and New Guinea. In May and June 1942, the Americans stopped the Japanese offensive with their victories at Coral Sea and Midway. Nevertheless, the Japanese control over the islands of the western Pacific created a formidable barrier to any Allied attempts to reach Japan. The Americans were forced to fight island by island to gain control of the Pacific.

The American counter-offensive advanced along two axes. American forces under General Douglas MacArthur or Admiral William Halsey advanced along a southern route towards the Philippines. Meanwhile, other forces under Admirals Chester Nimitz and Raymond Spruance moved through Micronesia in the central Pacific towards the Mariana Islands. By the middle of 1945, the two axes converged at Okinawa, on Japan's doorstep. Next the Allies began preparations for a bloody invasion of Japan.

The development of the atomic bomb made the assault upon Japan unnecessary. The United States secretly had developed a new weapon that unleashed tremendous energy through a process of nuclear fission. Production of the first nuclear weapons had required extensive efforts within the United States, and the strictest security measures. By the summer of 1945, the new bomb had been tested successfully, and it was used against the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. On August 15 the Japanese announced their surrender to the Allies.

## **Organization of the Military Establishment**

During World War II, the military was organized into separate War and Navy Departments. This organization differed significantly from today's Department of Defense. These differences affected the roles of each defense agency, and their construction activities.

### Army

On 9 March 1942, the War Department adopted an organizational structure that remained essentially unchanged for the duration of the war. The War Department General Staff developed overall policies for the Army, including its air component. Theater commanders, such as General Dwight Eisenhower or General Douglas MacArthur, exercised control over all Army elements within their respective commands. Within the continental United States, three major commands executed the policies established by the War Department headquarters. These commands were the Army Ground Forces, the Army Air Forces, and the Army Services Forces.<sup>xi</sup>

The Army Ground Forces commander, General Leslie McNair, was responsible for organizing and training ground combat units. These duties included operating training centers, developing combat doctrine, and commanding Army ground forces within the United States. Units or personnel became the responsibility of the theater commander outside of the continental United States.

The commander of the Army Air Forces, General Henry H. (Hap) Arnold, exercised similar authority with respect to the air component. Within the continental United States, the Army Air Forces trained pilots, air crews, plus ground support personnel. These personnel then were organized into units for further training prior to transfer overseas. Once outside of the continental United States, Army Air Forces units became part of their respective theater commands. Unlike the Army Ground Forces, however, the Army Air Forces assumed greater logistical responsibilities, including the design and procurement of aircraft, and Air Corps specific equipment, in addition to responsibility for installation management.<sup>xii</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

The expansion of the Army Air Forces, as the equal of the Army Ground Forces, reflects the growing importance and independence of the air component, which eventually resulted in the creation of an autonomous Air Force. Throughout World War II, however, the air component was an integral part of the War Department. Senior aviation officers served in key command and staff positions, including command of the Army component of joint commands. Army aviation drew upon the same logistical system that served the Army Ground Forces, especially from the Corps of Engineers, the Ordnance Department, and the Quartermaster Corps.

The Army Service Forces represented a significant change from the peacetime methods of providing logistical support within the War Department. Prior to World War II, Quartermaster, Ordnance, Engineer, Signal, Medical, and Chemical Warfare branches, which were known collectively as the "technical services," operated independently with each branch chief reporting directly to the War Department. To achieve a unified logistical effort, the Army combined the technical services into a single command, under the energetic, if acerbic, leadership of General Brehon Somervell. Originally termed the "Services of Supply," the organization was renamed the "Army Service Forces" to reflect its diverse responsibilities. In addition to the technical services, the Army Service Forces eventually encompassed the offices of the Adjutant General, the Judge Advocate General, and the Provost Marshall General. During the war, the Transportation Corps became a separate branch within the Service Forces. The official history of the Army Service Forces summarized the mission of the organization by noting that "all responsibilities which did not fit into the Ground or Air Forces were dumped into the Service Forces. The ASF thus became a catch-all command . . . . Some of the duties logically belong in it; others were put there because they could not logically be placed anywhere else."<sup>xiii</sup>

The Army Service Forces was responsible for both supporting the ground and air forces within the United States and for providing materiel to forces overseas. The latter mission required an extensive effort, especially by the Ordnance Department. With its responsibility for weapons and ammunition, the Ordnance Department either contracted for purchases directly from private industry, or supervised production of weapons or ammunition at government facilities. The Department also stored munitions prior to overseas shipment. Other technical services, such as the Quartermaster or Signal Corps, also procured and stored military supplies, but these items did not require the special care required by weapons and explosives.

Military construction was an important and controversial portion of the mission of the Army Service Forces. Until 1940, the Quartermaster General was responsible for cantonment construction, while the Chief of Engineers was responsible for the construction of fortifications and waterway projects. This system worked well during peacetime, when the pace of construction was relatively slow, but the massive pace of wartime construction overwhelmed the Quartermaster General's office. The Corps of Engineers seemed better suited to manage all construction because of its district offices, which could provide less centralized control. In the spring of 1941, the Corps of Engineers assumed responsibility for air field construction. In November 1941, Congress enacted legislation transferring all Army construction to the Corps of Engineers; President Roosevelt signed the bill on 1 December.<sup>xiv</sup>

## Navy

The Navy Department consisted of both the United States Navy and the Marine Corps, along with the administrative and logistical infrastructure to support both services. The Navy was divided into the numbered fleets directly engaged in combat and the Navy establishment within the United States. The latter consisted of the Navy headquarters, its bureaus, shore bases, and other supporting forces. The Marine Corps was composed of a Fleet Marine Force and its supporting structure. In wartime, the Coast Guard became a part of the Navy Department, while retaining its separate identity. After the war, the Coast Guard reverted to the Treasury Department.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

The Navy's shore establishment evolved from the nineteenth-century bureau system. The Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Ernest King, directed a staff that provided overall direction to the service. Most routine support functions were performed by the respective bureaus, which included Naval Personnel, Ordnance, Ships, Yards and Docks, Medicine and Surgery, Supplies and Accounts, and Aeronautics.

The Bureau of Yards and Docks had primary responsibility for Navy construction. It also was responsible for the maintenance and administration of Navy shore installations that were not under the control of a special bureau. As a result, the Bureau of Yards and Docks built and administered most Navy yards and bases. The most notable exceptions consisted of ordnance or aviation installations. The Bureau of Yards and Docks designed and built these installations, but the Bureaus of Ordnance or Aeronautics assumed responsibility for maintenance.

The Bureau of Ordnance also played an important role in the expanded permanent construction program. This bureau was responsible for all tasks related to Navy ordnance. These responsibilities included the production of weapons and ammunition, the development of experimental weapons systems, and the improvement of existing systems. Real property related to these tasks included production facilities, ammunition depots, and experimental stations. Although the Marine Corps obtained the majority of its weapons through the Army Ordnance Department, the Navy Ordnance Bureau provided weapons that could not be obtained from the Army.

The Marine Corps' fighting forces was designated the "Fleet Marine Force" and consisted of units assigned to support naval operations. The Marine Corps fighting units were composed primarily of infantry, with some support and aviation units. Marine Corps contingents based within the United States supported the Fleet Marine Force by providing trained personnel and equipment. Marine Corps shore installations primarily fulfilled training and logistical functions. The Bureau of Yards and Docks was responsible for construction of Marine Corps installations.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE HOME FRONT AND MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

#### World War II on the American Home Front

World War II affected Americans on the home front in ways that varied from the selection of movies to rationing of consumer goods. A crucial element of the home front effort was the mobilization of resources in support of the fighting forces. The tremendous mobilization of resources made the Allied victory possible. Mobilization included the training of personnel, and the production of weapons, ammunition, and equipment. These activities required an extensive domestic construction program to build the facilities necessary to train and equip the Allied forces.

Mobilization of resources within the United States began in earnest after the fall of France in June 1940. Americans were no longer secure behind the combined forces of France and Britain. Britain's tenuous position forced Americans to consider the possibility that the United States would confront Germany without any allies. In the late summer of 1940, President Roosevelt implemented a partial mobilization program known as the Protective Mobilization Plan.

The most publicized aspects of the Protective Mobilization Plan included the activation of National Guard units, establishment of a peacetime Selective Service for the Army, and strengthening the Navy. The increase in size of both services resulted in the initiation of wartime construction programs, comprising primarily temporary construction. The War Department immediately needed training facilities and hurriedly constructed mobilization cantonments. For the most part, these camps consisted of temporary buildings, constructed according to the so-called "700 series" plans.<sup>xv</sup>

The protective mobilization phase spurred other activities within the Army. For the first time since World War I, the Army conducted large-scale field maneuvers. The most notable of these exercises, the "Louisiana Maneuvers," engaged the Third Army against the Second Army during the spring of 1941. These exercises provided invaluable training to senior officers in the management of large formations of soldiers and operational logistics.

A critically important result of the Protective Mobilization Plan, which affected permanent construction, was the beginning of industrial mobilization. The military of the late 1930s lacked the materiel readiness to fight a sustained war, especially using the blitzkrieg tactics of World War II. The requirements for supplying materiel to Britain and the Soviet Union further amplified the challenges of industrial production.

The lack of all types of ammunition was among the most critical shortfalls. Speaking in 1943, the Secretary of War, Henry Stimson, recalled that in 1940 the United States lacked even a one day's supply of smokeless powder, and supplies of other types of weapons and ammunition also were critically low. Even worse, the capacity for the production of munitions disappeared following the close of World War I.<sup>xvi</sup> The few existing Army arsenals and the Navy Powder Factory at Indian Head, Maryland, had preserved a knowledge of the processes of ammunition production, but these facilities did not have the capability for mass production of explosives. During the protective mobilization phase, the Army created the foundations of a munitions industry.

Immediately after the fall of France, the Navy also initiated an expansion program. On 19 July 1940, less than a month after the French surrender, Congress authorized the acquisition of 13 battleships, 6 aircraft carriers, 32 cruisers, 39 submarines, and 101 destroyers. The carriers were of the *Essex* variety, which constituted the backbone of the Pacific fleet in the forthcoming war.<sup>xvii</sup> The increased number of ships was accompanied by a comparable expansion of shore facilities. In

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

the eighteen months before Pearl Harbor, the Bureau of Ships transferred over \$250 million to the Bureau of Yards and Docks to prepare dry docks, maintenance shops, and other facilities for supporting an expanded fleet. Congress also recognized the need for expanded shore facilities and appropriated additional funds for improvement of shore installations.<sup>xviii</sup>

The threatened war also propelled the Navy toward greater activity in both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. In the Atlantic, the Navy escorted convoys of both British and American merchant ships as far as Iceland. In the Pacific, President Roosevelt ordered the fleet to Hawaii in May 1940 as a deterrent to Japanese expansion. The fleet based in Hawaii proved to be vulnerable to a surprise carrier strike, which the Japanese executed on 7 December 1941. The attack upon Pearl Harbor thus ended the Protective Mobilization phase of United States involvement in World War II.

An official Army history of economic mobilization during World War II summarized the importance of mobilization before Pearl Harbor:

Historians of America's total military and logistic effort in World War II may well agree that the eighteen months of preparations before Pearl Harbor played a crucial, if not decisive, part in the outcome of the war. During this period the Military establishment of the United States was rehabilitated and the foundation laid for America's tremendous war production achievement. The greatest barrier to military preparedness at the time of the crisis of 1940 was the lack of capital facilities, and these required from several months to two years or even longer to create. To have delayed the construction of such facilities until the United States was actually involved in battle might have lost the war before it began.<sup>xix</sup>

After the Japanese attack upon Pearl Harbor, American energies were concentrated on the defeat of the Axis powers. Though the conversion to wartime production in 1940 and 1941 provided a transition to declared war, even greater efforts were required after the United States entered the war. The industrial mobilization process begun during the protective mobilization phase intensified until the United States could overwhelm the Axis powers with its material resources.

More so than in previous wars, the outcome of World War II depended upon marshalling resources. These resources included trained personnel, weapons, ammunition, food, military clothing, transportation facilities, money, and all the other items needed to sustain the fighting forces. In order to provide the materiel required, the United States government needed to allocate raw materials, especially steel, rubber, petroleum, or cotton. The distribution of raw materials required the establishment of priorities within the military, and provisions for essential civilian needs. The war within the United States was characterized by managed scarcities.

Rather than rely upon the market forces to allocate resources, President Roosevelt formulated new government agencies or restructured existing agencies to control essential elements of the economy. As the war in Europe began, Roosevelt created the National Defense Advisory Council, which was soon followed by the Office of Production Management. The Office of Production Management tried to establish a system of priorities to allocate scarce materials until it was superseded by the Supply, Priorities, and Allocations Board (SPAB). In January 1942, Roosevelt created the last of the wartime administrative offices, the War Production Board, chaired by Donald M. Nelson. Like its predecessors, it attempted to divert scarce materials to defense industries by creating priority systems. With the priority systems, critical materials, such as structural steel, could only go to War or Navy Department projects that were certified as necessary to national defense, and using the minimum amount of resources.<sup>xx</sup>

Despite the shortages of raw materials, American industry soon began the transition to wartime production. Automobile factories converted their production lines to military vehicles, and other factories made similar conversions. Where existing facilities were unsuited for munitions production, new factories or shipyards were constructed to meet the production requirements. As the war progressed, the logistical advantages of the United States provided a crucial edge to the

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.



Allies. As the Axis powers gradually lost their war production capabilities to Allied bombing, the Allies increased their capabilities until the final defeat of Germany and Japan.

### **Military Construction and Wartime Logistics**

Because the outcome of this war depended so much upon the proper management of resources, military construction received considerable attention. New military facilities universally were recognized as necessary for training, equipping, and maintaining the rapidly expanding forces. Other construction was necessary to create a munitions industry. Yet because all construction also consumed vital resources, even military construction required the strictest economy measures. The story of military construction, therefore, became a balance between the requirements for facilities and the conservation of scarce resources.

To balance these conflicting requirements, the services used temporary construction wherever feasible. Temporary construction conserved three of the most precious resources of the war: time, money, and building materials. These shortages became increasingly acute through the summer of 1942, with corresponding pressures to use temporary construction.

Temporary construction was most evident in the training camps that the military rapidly constructed throughout the nation. The training camps and stations consisted of wooden frame buildings with few amenities. Barracks often contained exposed 2 x 4 in framing, or ceiling trusses. Structures might be mounted on cinder blocks for support or placed upon a simple concrete floor. Within the War Department, these buildings were called the 700 or 800 series of buildings, because they followed standardized plans numbered from 700 to 799 or 800 to 899. The 700 series plans were drafted by the Quartermaster Corps before the war, while the 800 series reflected minor improvements to the basic design.<sup>xxi</sup> Within the Navy Department, the Bureau of Yards and Docks constructed standardized wooden frame temporary barracks of 2 x 4 in stud walls clad with either wood siding or asbestos-cement shingles.<sup>xxii</sup> Temporary construction was designed to last at least five years. For even more short-term construction needs, the military employed theater-of-war construction, which consisted of flimsy wood frame covered with tar paper.

Though temporary construction was preferred, the military could not avoid more substantial construction for some essential purposes. The most numerous examples of permanent construction were industrial facilities, such as ammunition factories or shipyards, where structural requirements precluded temporary construction. Several other types of specialized facilities required permanent construction. Research and development work might require a "clean" environment or special structures unsuitable for temporary construction. Some storage facilities, particularly those for ammunition or perishable subsistence, required permanent buildings. Coastal fortifications and medical facilities might also employ permanent construction. Anticipated use after the war might justify permanent construction during the earliest and the latest stages of the war, when materials shortages were least serious.

War Department construction, both temporary and permanent, was concentrated during the first years of the war. Following the fall of France in 1940, construction programs accelerated under the Protective Mobilization Plan, and reached a spending peak of over \$200 million per month in the summer of 1941. These figures seemed enormous by previous standards, but America's entry into the war soon caused construction to exceed all previous expectations. In July 1942, spending for construction within the United States reached a peak of about \$750 million per month, and declined sharply thereafter. By December 1942, 85 per cent of all War Department World War II construction was complete. Within another year, that figure reached 98 per cent (Figure 1).<sup>xxiii</sup>

The problems of building material shortages plagued the military construction program throughout the years of the war, worsening as the pace of building increased. Shortages during the protective mobilization period were serious, but not insurmountable. Following America's entry into the war, shortages suddenly became the greatest obstacle to timely completion of the needed

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

construction. Not only did the services multiply their construction efforts, but so did civilian defense industries. Civilian defense workers also required housing as they moved to new job locations. Although all materials were in critical supply, steel was of particular concern because it was essential for ships and for shell casings.<sup>xxiv</sup>

Materials shortages were most critical in the middle of 1942, at the same time that construction was reaching its peak. On 20 May 1942, the War Production Board adopted a directive intended to establish tighter priorities for construction. Even defense related construction would receive approval only if:

- (1) it was essential for the war effort;
- (2) postponement of construction would be detrimental to the war effort;
- (3) it was not practical to rent or convert existing facilities;
- (4) the construction would not result in the duplication or unnecessary expansion of existing plants or facilities then under construction or about to be constructed;
- (5) all possible economies had been made in the project in order to delete all nonessential items or parts; and
- (6) the design for the structure was of the simplest type. All construction should be of the cheapest, temporary character and should use materials which were most plentiful.

In practice, this directive allowed military construction to continue, but limited such construction to the most austere designs feasible.<sup>xxv</sup> After military construction had passed its peak in the fall of 1942, critical materials shortages became less of a problem. While the need to conserve materials, especially steel and copper, remained, shortages were less likely to delay construction.<sup>xxvi</sup>

With the materials shortages easing, field commanders attempted to initiate new military construction projects. Within the War Department, however, General Somervell opposed most new construction projects as unnecessary wastes of money. Rather than flatly refuse requests for new construction, he used bureaucratic delays to minimize the number of requests. At a service command conference, Somervell spoke quite bluntly to his subordinate commanders: "I have attempted to interpose all the red tape possible -- and that is a lot." He went on to explain, "I cannot stand up before the country and before Congress and justify the expenditure of millions of dollars for construction work which is desirable but which does not have anything to do with winning the war; and so I have adopted . . . a policy of delay in the hope that eventually you will get tired of asking for new construction and quit."<sup>xxvii</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 1

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

Nevertheless, some new construction projects were inevitable during the last years of the war. With the success of medium artillery, especially the 155mm howitzer, the combat forces suddenly increased their demands for this caliber ammunition. Consequently, the War Department hurriedly constructed a new set of ammunition production facilities. With the prospect of a large number of seriously wounded service members returning home, more hospitals became necessary. The new B-29 "Superfortress" bomber required new landing fields and hangars. The still secret Manhattan Project required a substantial expenditure of resources, especially at Clinch River, Tennessee, and Hanford, Washington. Small construction projects and improvements to existing installations continued throughout the war.<sup>xxviii</sup>

The Navy Department experienced a similar change in its construction programs after the initial buildup. Except for an amphibious training facility built in early 1944, new training installations were not required. Instead, Navy Department construction focused upon supporting committed Navy and Marine Corps units, especially in the Pacific. The Navy constructed additions to its depots on the Atlantic Coast and created a major annex to the Oakland Naval Supply Depot. Late in the war, the Bureau of Ordnance improved its ammunition handling facilities. Its later ordnance installations included a new ammunition and new depot at Seal Beach, and another ammunition magazine at Bangor, Washington. With the increasing numbers of Navy and Marine Corps casualties, hospital construction continued to the end of the war.<sup>xxix</sup>

The Navy also added to its research and development facilities during the later war years. One of its most important new installations was the Naval Ordnance Test Station at Inyokern, California, better known as China Lake. Here scientists and Navy officers tested new rockets. Near Washington, D.C., the Navy constructed a new Naval Ordnance Laboratory at White Oak, Maryland.<sup>xxx</sup>

From the first projects of the mobilization period to the final efforts at the close of the war, military construction within the United States played an essential role in the Allied victory. Construction work produced the training facilities to instruct service members, the logistical facilities to support the forces, the industrial facilities to manufacture materiel, the research and development facilities to improve existing weapons, the medical facilities to treat sick or wounded service members, plus an assortment of other types of facilities. Given the limitations on both time and building materials, the military's domestic construction programs of the war were a remarkable achievement. The construction programs aided the marshalling of men and materiel necessary to defeat the Axis nations.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

## CHAPTER V

### COMMAND PERMANENT CONSTRUCTION

The War and Navy Departments divided their construction programs into command construction, industrial construction, and special construction projects.<sup>xxx1</sup> Command construction, the subject of this chapter, included all installations that operated in direct support of the military forces. Examples included cantonments, air bases, Navy yards and bases, storage and maintenance facilities, ports of embarkation, headquarters, medical facilities, communications installations, and all other types of construction necessary for the actual operation of the forces. Command facilities construction programs were characterized by a wide variety of building types and purposes. In keeping with wartime economy measures, the military used temporary construction wherever possible. Yet some command facilities unavoidably required permanent construction. In other cases, permanent construction presented long range advantages for use after the war, which outweighed its short term disadvantages.

#### Combat Operations and Coastal Defense

The Japanese threat in the Pacific presented the most pressing need for military construction directly related to combat operations. Even before the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor, the defense of American possessions in the Pacific was a vital concern to both the War and Navy Departments. The Hawaiian territories long had been recognized as a key outpost in the Pacific, and both the Navy and Army had established their presence in the islands. After the war commenced, Japanese landings in the Aleutian Islands made Alaska a theater of operations. In fact, Alaska was the only one of the present states to be the scene of ground combat. In the United States, permanent construction related to operations included additions to the coastal defenses, and operating bases for anti-submarine activities.

#### Hawaii

Ever since the U.S. annexation of the Hawaiian islands, the U.S. military had established outposts on the islands. The Navy held an operating base and shipyard at Pearl Harbor since the beginning of the century, with smaller installations also located on the islands. The Army's most important posts included Schofield Barracks, an infantry garrison; Fort Kamehameha, a coastal artillery position in defense of Pearl Harbor; and, an airfield on Ford Island in the middle of Pearl Harbor.

As the probability of war with Japan rose, both services sharply increased their levels of activity in Hawaii. In 1940, President Roosevelt ordered the Pacific Fleet to remain in Hawaii as a deterrent against Japanese expansion. The Japanese threat induced greater construction activities by the Navy, which built a new air station at Kaneohe and increased its depot activities at Pearl Harbor.

The War Department similarly expanded its Hawaii facilities, including accelerated construction of Hickam Field. During the late 1930s, the Army began construction at Hickam to replace the smaller field in the middle of Pearl Harbor; the first personnel occupied the site in 1937. By the winter of 1940/1941, the new installation was nearing completion. The Hawaiian Air Force headquarters moved to Hickam in July 1941. The new barracks at Hickam Field constituted an especially noteworthy feature. The huge building could house 3,000 enlisted personnel, and contained a mess hall large enough to serve this population. Married officers and senior non-commissioned officers lived in stucco houses with red tile roofs. During 1941, construction of temporary barracks began at Hickam.<sup>xxxii</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

Following the Japanese attack of December 7, the services rushed reinforcements to Hawaii. With the influx of new personnel came more construction, both temporary and permanent. Temporary housing sheltered over a million service personnel who arrived in Hawaii, often for further training enroute to the front lines. Storage depots, including steel petroleum tanks and ammunition igloos, often required permanent construction. Both the Army and Navy constructed communications facilities, typically on remote mountain tops.<sup>xxxiii</sup>

During the emergency following the Japanese victory at Pearl Harbor, the Army pressed its construction of coastal defenses of the islands. Coastal artillery officers obtained surplus Navy guns, including guns recovered from the sunken battleship *Arizona*. The batteries for these guns were largely underground, with openings only for the turret. These fortifications were the product of round-the-clock work immediately after Pearl Harbor. New anti-aircraft weapons complemented the coastal artillery positions.<sup>xxxiv</sup>

Among the more exotic forms of construction were the extensive underground projects built throughout the island of Oahu. The Army excavated an extensive ordnance storage tunnel near Fort Shafter beneath Alilamanu Crater, but converted it to a joint Army-Navy command post just prior to the attack upon Pearl Harbor. Elsewhere on Oahu, the Army and Navy employed an extensive system of tunnels for storage of both ammunition and petroleum. In early 1941, the Army built five additional bomb-proof and gas proof shelters for communications equipment. Near Schofield Barracks, in the center of the island of Oahu, the Army created an underground three-story structure. It originally was intended to be an aircraft assembly plant, but the Army instead used it to reproduce maps and charts.<sup>xxxv</sup>

The Navy expanded its operating facilities on Oahu and the outer islands. Pearl Harbor became the base for submarine and surface ships, with the necessary piers, warehouses, shops, and other additions to the installations facilities. The Navy constructed an air station at Barber's Point on Oahu as an air center and technical school. On the island of Maui, the Navy built another air station as a maintenance installation for carrier aircraft.<sup>xxxvi</sup>

## Alaska

Alaskans also found themselves in a combat arena. Here the Japanese threat centered on the Aleutian Islands, which stretched from Alaska across the Pacific. Although the unpredictable climate proved a serious obstacle to military operations, the proximity of the Aleutians to both Japan and the United States made the islands a potentially valuable prize for either side (Figure 2).

Alaskan geography dictated that any defense of the territory would require the cooperation of the Navy, Army, and Air Corps. Much of the territory to be defended consisted of islands, and even mainland regions were separated so widely that the only practical transportation was by sea. Inattention to Alaska during the pre-war years further complicated the military situation. During the inter-war years, the Army maintained only a small garrison in Alaska. The Air Corps established Ladd Field, near Fairbanks, in 1939, primarily for the purpose of cold weather research. In 1939, a Navy study, known as the Hepburn Board, recommended reenforcement of Alaska at Sitka, Kodiak Island, and Unalaska Island (Dutch Harbor).<sup>xxxvii</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 2

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

During the protective mobilization period, construction began at these three sites. Naval facilities consisted of airfields, seaplane ramps, base facilities for surface ships and submarines, communications equipment, and quarters for the sailors and marines. The Army built coastal artillery batteries and infantry barracks near each of the three Navy bases. Because the Army had the responsibility of defending these bases, Army installations were co-located with Navy bases. The Army built coastal batteries at Sitka, Fort Greeley near Kodiak (not the present Fort Greeley), and Fort Mears near Dutch Harbor. Army Air Force defenses of Dutch Harbor were located at Cold Harbor and Unak Island, neither of which was within close range of Dutch Harbor. Near Anchorage, the Army completed its important installations with the construction of Fort Richardson and Elmendorf Air Field. Fort Richardson served as the Army headquarters; Kodiak Island, as the Navy Headquarters.<sup>xxxviii</sup>

Dutch Harbor was a typical example of wartime construction in Alaska. The installation was located on Unalaska Island, toward the eastern edge of the Aleutian Islands. In January 1941, work began on a naval base, with construction of a seaplane ramp, steel frame hangar, repair shop, ammunition storage facility, petroleum handling facilities, housing, and administrative buildings. During the summer of 1942, the Navy expanded the installation with an anti-submarine net depot, marine railroad with shops, fire station, and warehouses. By January of 1943, the base included an air station, submarine base, radio station, section base, fueling depot, and Marine Corps barracks. The Navy contracted the initial design to the architectural firm of Albert Kahn, which used large, multi-functional buildings to conserve scarce space in the mountainous terrain. The first plans called for reinforced concrete, but the design specifications were changed to steel and later to wood due to materials shortages. To protect the naval facilities, the Army built Fort Mears, using 700-series temporary construction plans, which were modified by the addition of blackout shutters and drying rooms.<sup>xxxix</sup>

The types of military construction in Alaska varied immensely. Much of the construction was temporary, yet some forms of permanent construction were inevitable. The most prominent type of permanent construction was the steel and concrete gun batteries for coastal artillery fortifications. At locations such as Sitka, Kodiak, Amaknak Islands, or Dutch Harbor, the Army built new batteries to protect both Army and Navy installations from air or sea attacks. Elsewhere, a few logistical activities such as a small torpedo assembly plant and ammunition magazines at Dutch Harbor were built from permanent materials.<sup>xl</sup>

In May 1942, the Japanese seized the outer islands of Kiska and Attu, marking the only time in the war that what would be one of the fifty states became the scene of ground combat during World War II. The ground attacks were accompanied by carrier-based air attacks upon the Navy and Army facilities at Dutch Harbor on 3 and 4 June, with a loss of 43 American lives. At that time, American forces in Alaska were not strong enough to eject the Japanese; they could merely hold their ground.

American forces continued to move to Alaska, until they were willing to take the offensive. On 11 May 1943, about one year after the Japanese invasion, Americans landed at Attu. For the remainder of the month, the island was the scene of bloody fighting. After defeating the Japanese on Attu, the Americans then landed at Kiska in July, but a Japanese evacuation of that island prevented any serious fighting.<sup>xli</sup> For the remainder of the war, the Alaskan theater diminished in importance. The miserable weather precluded use of the Aleutians as a staging area for further advances against Japan.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.



## United States

Within the United States, the Army maintained and improved its coastal artillery fortifications on a less ambitious scale. Ever since the 1790s, the Army stationed heavy artillery units near strategic harbors to defend the nation against foreign invasions. During World War II, the threat of either Japanese or German amphibious attack against the United States itself was not likely. Still, the pressures of war produced an increase in seacoast fortifications.

In July 1940, the War Department decided to increase its fortifications, primarily with the addition of 27 new batteries along both the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts (Table 5). Each battery contained two 16-inch guns protected with overhead cover. The 16-inch guns were to be supplemented with 50 batteries of 6-inch guns, also protected from air attack.<sup>xiii</sup>

In practice, the competition for scarce resources limited the scope of the coastal defense projects. In July 1941, when only four of the new 16-inch batteries were ready for operation, the War Department decided to limit its efforts to those projects that could be completed by 1944, reducing construction to 23 new batteries. As the war began to turn in favor of the Allies, the pressure for coastal defenses declined. By 1945, only 90mm anti-aircraft batteries were manned fully. The Army supplemented its artillery with underwater mines, anti-submarine nets and other devices. The World War II coastal defenses represented the end of a long tradition of harbor defenses within the U.S. Army. Following the war, the Coastal Artillery Corps was disbanded.<sup>xliii</sup>

## **Navy Yards**

Navy yards have performed essential work in support of the fleet since the Navy operated its first yards in the late eighteenth century. The Navy constructed its own ships, repaired ships, and provided logistical or administrative support to the fleet from its yards. During World War II, Navy yards performed both construction and repair functions (Table 6). Because the bulk of their work was repair, Navy yards are treated as command construction for the purposes of this study. This study uses the World War II-era term "navy yard," although the Navy currently designates these facilities as "naval shipyards." For example, the Norfolk Navy Yard is now the Norfolk Naval Shipyard.

Following the Washington Naval Disarmament Conferences, the U.S. Navy experienced a period of stagnation. Congress was reluctant to appropriate large sums of money to a Navy, when no war appeared likely. Increasing Japanese expansion in the Pacific, and a desire to create public works projects during the Depression years, however, resulted in a modest increase in the Navy funding during the mid 1930s. Depression-era relief measures such as the National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA) of 1932 provided \$238,000,000 for new naval vessel construction and \$30,000,000 for shore facility improvements.<sup>xliv</sup>

Under these programs, the Navy built a modest number of ships, especially destroyers. These vessels were important to the United States' military build-up since the country had far fewer destroyers than Japan by the early 1930s. The Norfolk, Charleston, and Mare Island Navy Yards were some of the primary construction yards for these ships.<sup>xlv</sup>

The construction work carried out at each yard under these New Deal relief measures was based on peacetime expansion plans developed by each facility.<sup>xlvi</sup> Most of the construction funded by these relief measures was permanent construction. Among the most essential construction undertaken at this time was the modernization and improvement of building ways and dry docks. Officials extended the New York Navy Yard building ways to handle battleship

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

table 5

**TABLE 5: WORLD WAR II ARMY COASTAL FORTIFICATIONS**

<b>WWII Name</b>	<b>Current DoD Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date Established</b>
Camp Hero	N/A	NY	1941
Fort Adams	N/A	RI	1799
Fort Andrews	N/A	MA	1901
Fort Armstong	N/A	HI	1907
Fort Babcock	N/A	AK	1942
Fort Baker	N/A	CA	1897
Fort Baldwin	N/A	ME	1905
Fort Banks	N/A	MA	1899
Fort Barrancas	N/A	FL	1839
Fort Barry	N/A	CA	1904
Fort Bulkley	N/A	AK	1942
Fort Brumbeck	N/A	AK	1942
Fort Canby	N/A	WA	1864
Fort Casey	N/A	WA	1890s
Fort Church	N/A	RI	1940
Fort Columbia	N/A	WA	1896
Fort Constitution	N/A	NH	1791
Fort Crockett	N/A	TX	1897
Fort Cronkhite	N/A	CA	1937
Fort (John) Custis	N/A	VA	1942
Fort Dawes	N/A	MA	1940
Fort Dearborn	N/A	NH	1941
Fort Delaware	N/A	DE	1814
Fort DeRussy	Fort DeRussy	HI	1908
Fort DuPont	N/A	DE	1898
Fort Duvall	N/A	MA	1921
Fort Ebey	N/A	WA	1942

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

<b>WWII Name</b>	<b>Current DoD Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date Established</b>
Fort Emory	U.S. Naval Communications Station, Imperial Beach	CA	1942
Fort Flagler	N/A	WA	1897
Fort Funston	N/A	CA	1898
Fort Gaines	N/A	AL	1822
Fort Getty	N/A	RI	1900
Fort Glenn	N/A	AK	1942
Fort Greble	N/A	RI	1900
Fort Greely	N/A	AK	1943
Fort Greene	N/A	RI	1940
Fort Hamilton	Fort Hamilton	NY	1825
Fort Hamilton	N/A	RI	ca. 1810
Fort Hancock	N/A	NJ	1813
Fort Haydon	N/A	WA	1941
Fort Heath	N/A	MA	1899
Fort Hunt	N/A	VA	1898
Fort Jay	Governors Island (Coast Guard)	NY	1794
Fort Kamehameha	Fort Kamehameha	HI	1909
Fort (Philip) Kearney	N/A	RI	1909
Fort Lawton	N/A	WA	1899
Fort Levett	N/A	ME	1894
Fort Lyon	N/A	ME	1873
Fort Macon	N/A	NC	1826
Fort Mason	N/A	CA	1864
Fort McArthur	Fort McArthur (subpost of Fort Ord)	CA	1914
Fort McClary	N/A	ME	1776
Fort McGilvray	N/A	AK	1942
Fort McKinley	N/A	ME	1893
Fort McRee	N/A	FL	1834
Fort Mears	N/A	AK	1941

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

<b>WWII Name</b>	<b>Current DoD Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date Established</b>
Fort Michie	N/A	NY	1900
Fort Miles	N/A	DE	1941-1942
Fort Miley	N/A	CA	1892
Fort Monroe	Fort Monroe	VA	1818
Fort Morgan	N/A	AL	1819
Fort Morrow	N/A	AK	1942
Fort Mott	N/A	NJ	1872
Fort Moultrie	N/A	SC	1809
Fort Peirce	N/A	AK	1943
Fort Pickens	N/A	FL	1829
Fort Preble	N/A	ME	1808
Fort Randall	N/A	AK	1942
Fort Ray	N/A	AK	1941
Fort Revere	N/A	MA	1901
Fort Rodman	N/A	MA	1898
Fort Rosecrans	Naval Complex, Point Loma	CA	1852
Fort Rousseau	N/A	AK	1942
Fort Ruckman	N/A	MA	1921
Fort Ruger	N/A	HI	1906
Fort San Jacinto	N/A	TX	1898
Fort Saulsbury	N/A	DE	ca. 1918
Fort Schwatka	N/A	AK	1943
Fort Schuyler	N/A	NY	1833
Fort Screven	N/A	GA	1898
Fort Slocum	N/A	NY	1861
Fort Smith	N/A	AK	ca. 1942
Fort (Myles) Standish	N/A	MA	1900
Fort Stark	N/A	NH	1873
Fort Stevens	N/A	OR	1903
Fort Story	Fort Story	VA	1917

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

WWII Name	Current DoD Name	Location	Date Established
Fort Strong	N/A	MA	1899
Fort Sumter	N/A	SC	1828
Fort Taylor	N/A	FL	1845
Fort Terry	N/A	NY	1898
Fort Tidball	N/A	AK	1942
Fort Tilden	N/A	NY	1917
Fort Totten	Fort Totten	NY	1862
Fort Townsend	N/A	WA	1856
Fort Travis	N/A	TX	1898-99
Fort Varnum	N/A (National Guard)	RI	1943
Fort Wadsworth	Fort Wadsworth (subpost of Fort Totten)	NY	1847
Fort Warren	N/A	MA	1837
Fort Washington	N/A	MD	1808
Fort Weaver	N/A	HI	ca. 1920
Fort Wetherill	N/A	RI	1776
Fort Whitman	N/A	WA	1909
Fort Williams	N/A	ME	1872
Fort Winfield Scott	N/A	CA	1905
Fort Wool	N/A	VA	1819
Fort Worden	N/A	WA	1898
Fort Wright (H.G.)	N/A	NY	1898
Presidio of San Francisco	N/A	CA	1776

Sources:

Stetson Conn, Rose C. Engelman, and Byron Fairchild, *Guarding the United States and Its Outposts* (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Center of Military History, Government Printing Office, 1964), passim.

Emanuel Raymond Lewis, *Seacoast Fortifications of the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Center for Military History, 1979), passim.

Robert B. Roberts, *Encyclopedia of Historic Forts* (New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1988).

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

table 6

**TABLE 6: WORLD WAR II NAVY YARDS**

<b>WWII-era Name</b>	<b>Current Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date Established</b>
Bayonne Repair Base (Annex of New York Navy Yard)	N/A	NJ	1940
Boston Navy Yard	N/A	MA	1800
Charleston Navy Yard	Charleston Naval Shipyard	SC	1901
Hunters Point Navy Yard	N/A	CA	1940
Mare Island Navy Yard	Mare Island Navy Base	CA	1853
Pearl Harbor Navy Yard	Naval Complex Pearl Harbor	HI	1900
New York Ship Yard	N/A	NY	1800
Norfolk Navy Yard	Norfolk Naval Shipyard	VA	1800
Philadelphia Navy Yard	Philadelphia Naval Shipyard	PA	1872 (League Island)
Portsmouth Navy Yard	Portsmouth Naval Shipyard	NH	1800
Puget Sound Navy Yard	Puget Sound Naval Shipyard	WA	1891
South Boston Annex (Annex to Boston Navy Yard)	N/A	MA	1919
Terminal Island Dry Docks	Naval Shipyard Long Beach	CA	1940
Washington Navy Yard	Washington Navy Yard	DC	1800

Source: United States Navy, Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases in World War II* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1947).

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

construction.<sup>xlvii</sup> Workers also carried out modernization work on dry docks such as replacing Norfolk Navy Yard Dry Dock No. 2's rotting wood timbers with concrete.<sup>xlviii</sup>

The Axis nations' military expansions during the late 1930s led the United States to increase its fleet even further. The 1938 Vinson Bill approved a 20 per cent increase in the Navy's size.<sup>xlix</sup> Until 1939, the Navy carried out most of the shore construction based on Bureau of Yards and Docks plans. The Bureau's increasing work load caused the office to ask for and receive Congressional permission to use private architecture and engineering firms for most Navy building design work.<sup>i</sup> Under this arrangement, the Bureau still undertook work of a confidential, specialized, or very repetitive nature.<sup>ii</sup> Such buildings normally were permanent. The numerous examples included a four-story shop structure built at Mare Island Navy Yard, new sheet metal, pipe, and electric shops erected at Charleston Navy Yard, a steel turret welding house at New York Navy Yard, and a machine shop erected at Puget Sound Navy Yard.<sup>iii</sup> Construction of additional dry docks was a crucial part of this expansion, because the Navy needed additional docks to augment its twenty-five extant structures. Anticipating the possible struggle against Japan, the Navy improved its Pacific bases. During the late 1930s, the Navy began to construct a 435-foot dry dock at the Mare Island Navy Yard to service submarines, small craft, and destroyers. Additionally, work was begun on two large dry docks at Puget Sound in 1938 and 1939 to accommodate the largest battleships planned for the Navy.<sup>liii</sup>

With the beginning of the protective mobilization period in 1940, the U.S. Navy entered into a massive fleet and shore establishment buildup. Congress passed a bill calling for the establishment of a "two-ocean" navy and increasing the existing force by 70 per cent.<sup>liv</sup> The massive increase in fleet size demanded more shore facilities, while placing severe constraints on the availability of steel and other essential materials. Due to the constraints of time and material shortages, the Bureau ordered that all new naval building construction, except for structures whose function or intended post-war use required permanent construction, consist of temporary construction. As a rule, Ben Moreell, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, recommended that construction speed was the primary consideration in the construction of naval shore facilities, with cost or architectural planning ranking as secondary factors.<sup>lv</sup>

For the planned fleet buildup, the Navy established priorities for construction. In May 1940, the Bureau of Yards and Docks recommended that shipbuilding facilities receive the highest priority within this effort.<sup>lvi</sup> On 11 June 1940, the passage of the Naval Appropriation Act initiated a massive naval building construction program.<sup>lvii</sup> Later that year, the Navy convened the Greenslade Board to prepare a shore station master development plan to support the expanding fleet through 1946. The Secretary of the Navy eventually approved the Board's recommendations and advised all naval shore facilities planning agencies to use the recommendations as a guide in planning new facilities. The board recommended that shipyards on the East and West Coasts should have the capacity to maintain up to sixty per cent of the contemplated fleet. The Board determined that installations on the Eastern Seaboard already possessed the ability to perform this work. The Greenslade plan recommended that no yard use more than twenty per cent of its capacity for ship construction, with the rest being utilized for ship repair in case the United States entered the war. Congress appropriated up to \$350,000,000 for these improvements.<sup>lviii</sup>

Of the structures built during the protective mobilization period, some of the most important were new dry docks to accommodate construction and repair of the Navy's largest ships. The most valuable of these docks included Pearl Harbor Navy Yard's 1,000-foot dry dock Number 2, which was capable of handling battleships, and 497-foot Dry Dock Number 3, which was able to dock ships as big as submarines and destroyers.<sup>lix</sup> Workers used relatively new underwater concrete pouring methods in the construction of these dry docks.<sup>lx</sup> Both of these structures used the tremie concrete-deposition method, named for the tremies or pipes used in the construction process. This method involved pouring concrete through nine, 17-inch pipes at 10-foot intervals into forms supported by steel piles driven into a foundation bed. Once the forms were filled, the concrete cured underwater, then a cofferdam of steel-reinforced concrete was constructed. With the cofferdam in place, water was pumped from the dock and the non-tremie concrete floor and side

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

walls were built in dry conditions.<sup>lxi</sup> This building method enabled the workers to finish the dry docks in approximately two years as compared to the 10 years required for Dry Dock No. 1 at Pearl Harbor.

Additionally, the Navy began construction on other large dry docks at the Norfolk, Philadelphia, and Mare Island Navy Yards (Figure 3). A 1,092-foot dock constructed at Norfolk and a similar structure built at Philadelphia were the Navy's first "super docks" capable of handling the service's largest battleships.<sup>lxii</sup> The tremie concrete construction methods cut construction time as much as 75 per cent. Other smaller shipbuilding and repair docks started during this time included a 435-foot dry dock built for submarine production and submarine, destroyer, and small ship repair at Portsmouth, New Hampshire.<sup>lxiii</sup> At the Norfolk and New York Navy Yards, massive 350-ton hammerhead cranes dominated the skyline, while smaller cranes were operated at other yards.

Navy dry docks also were constructed using another engineering innovation known as the steel box caisson. This large box sealed the basin for pumping after the ship entered its interior. The Bureau of Yards and Docks first employed caissons in 1940. Other sealing structures for dry dock entrances included miter gates favored for European dry docks and recessed caissons utilized at British dry docks.<sup>lxiv</sup>

Following American entry into the war, the Navy hurriedly finished the dry docks then under construction and began new structures. Most of these dry docks were intended for ship repair. Examples include a 1,092-foot "super" dock and two smaller 420-foot docks built at the Hunter's Point Repair Facility. Workers used tremie construction methods and also employed pre-cast concrete forms for the Hunter Point docks. Selected shipbuilding and repair dry docks were designed to accommodate specialized ships, including 365-foot docks built at Charleston for destroyer escort work.<sup>lxv</sup>

By January 1945, the Navy had constructed 30 dry docks. These structures enabled the Navy to build and repair the multitude of ship types in the United States fleet that served during World War II.<sup>lxvi</sup> In addition to new dry docks, the Navy constructed shop and storage buildings at its yards. Examples include a turret shop building, foundry buildings, shipfitters assembly shops, and large machine shops.<sup>lxvii</sup> In May 1940, the Navy further augmented its repair capability with the acquisition of two new repair stations at Hunters Point, California, and Terminal Island, California.<sup>lxviii</sup>

With additional activity at the yards and the resulting increase in personnel, the Navy needed more housing at its facilities. The Navy built a six-story, reinforced-concrete receiving barracks at New York Navy Yard; at Philadelphia Navy Yard, the Navy constructed three-story, permanent, fireproof barracks to house up to 1,575 ships' crew members and an eight-story, permanent quarters to house 50 officers and 875 enlisted men.<sup>lxix</sup>

After the United States' declaration of war, the Navy accelerated its existing fleet expansion program, augmented that work with specialized ship construction, and quickened its shore facility improvement effort. The Navy divided its existing warship construction and repair work between both coasts. Early heavy ship construction focused on launching battleships from East Coast facilities, including the New York and Philadelphia Navy Yards, but later turned to aircraft carriers as naval aviation dominated the fighting within the Pacific theater.<sup>lxx</sup> By 1944, as Navy and private yards neared completion of new ships needed for the war against Japan, Navy officials had redirected most of the facilities' work towards ship repair.<sup>lxxi</sup>

The size of the Navy increased beyond all previous experience. Not only did the number of ships increase, but the types of ships changed. Although battleships remained a vital part of the fleet, aircraft carriers assumed greater prominence. New categories of ships included destroyer escorts (used in anti-submarine warfare), and landing craft (used for amphibious operations). These new vessels were produced in prefabricated sections and assembled at Navy yards.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.



Navy officials also directed the building of many industrial structures to build and maintain the fleet during the war. These buildings ranged from a galvanizing plant at Portsmouth Navy Yard to a boiler shop and material storage building and a field shop building constructed at Norfolk Navy Yard to a seven-story fireproof general storehouse and a steel-frame shipfitters shop built at Puget Sound.<sup>lxxii</sup>

Living quarters were an important part of permanent building construction at Navy yards during the war years. The increase in naval personnel stationed at these facilities, as well as ship crews located there temporarily while their ship was under repair, led to a need for more housing. For example, a four-story, concrete-frame and brick barrack with a 2,000-man capacity was built at Philadelphia in 1942. The Navy also built family housing for uniformed personnel or defense workers near its installations. These projects were completed in cooperation with federal housing programs and included new housing complexes at Charleston and Mare Island.<sup>lxxiii</sup>

The navy yard building construction program reached its peak on the East Coast in early 1943.<sup>lxxiv</sup> Building construction continued at a significant pace at West Coast navy yards until the end of the war.<sup>lxxv</sup> The total value of structures built for ship construction and repair purposes between 1 July 1940 and 31 December 1945 was \$1,116,258,384.00 or 13.7 per cent of total building construction performed for the Navy shore establishment.<sup>lxxvi</sup>

For the Navy, the buildup of its yards during the 1930s, mobilization, and declared war periods played a vital role in the support of the American fleet. The modest construction and modernization work on industrial buildings, dry docks, and building ways during the 1930s allowed the Navy to start a fleet enhancement program that prepared its facilities for even greater ship production and repair work later. During the navy yard emergency building construction work in mid-1940 and the expanded construction program after the Pearl Harbor attack, the Navy produced many of its warships and specialty vessels, such as destroyer escorts and landing craft. This building construction effort also produced a shore establishment capable of carrying out repair and refit work on the two-ocean U.S. fleet and ships from other nations. This massive industrial construction in support of the U.S. fleet was essential to the war effort.

## **Navy Bases and Stations**

The Navy supported the fleet's vessels and ships crews at naval bases and stations. Naval operational facilities fell into two categories: naval operating bases, and smaller operating bases (Table 7). Naval operating bases provided "safe anchorage for combatant and auxiliary vessels, replenishment of fuel, ammunition, and supplies, facilities for making minor repairs, [and] recreational and hospital facilities for personnel." Examples of this type of installation included Naval Operating Base Norfolk and the Naval Base Pearl Harbor, which were distinct from the yards at those locations. Naval operating bases had administrative control over activities such as Marine Corps barracks, training functions, naval air stations, and supply depots located within the installation's boundaries. The second type of operational facilities were small operating bases that had the capacity to handle "specific types of vessels [and were] known as destroyer bases, submarine bases,..." They are equipped to furnish rapid servicing and repairs for these smaller vessels, and accommodations for their personnel, so that the larger yards will be left free for larger

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 3

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

table 7

---

**TABLE 7: WORLD WAR II NAVY OPERATING BASES**


---

<b>WWII Name</b>	<b>Current Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date Established</b>
Fleet Operating Base Terminal Island	Naval Shipyard Long Beach	CA	1940
Naval Base Dutch Harbor	N/A	AK	1942
Naval Operations Base Kodiak	CG Base Kodiak	AK	1941
Naval Operating Base Norfolk	Naval Base Norfolk	VA	1917
Naval Destroyer Base San Diego/Naval Repair Base San Diego (renamed in 1943)	Naval Station San Diego	CA	1922
New London Submarine Base	Naval Base New London	CT	1915
Pearl Harbor Navy Base	Naval Facility Pearl Harbor	HI	1900

Source: United States Navy, Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases in World War II* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1947).

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

vessels." These facilities included the New London Submarine Base, Connecticut, and the San Diego Destroyer Base, California.<sup>lxxvii</sup>

Like Navy yards, naval operating bases were improved only modestly during the 1930s. Following the fall of France, however, Navy bases played an increasingly important role in American mobilization. The Pacific Fleet transferred to Pearl Harbor in 1940 to discourage further Japanese aggression. The newly created Atlantic Fleet established its headquarters at Naval Operating Base Norfolk. The Norfolk base also played an important role as the staging area for neutrality patrols on the East Coast.<sup>lxxviii</sup>

As part of the mobilization efforts, the Navy increased its building construction programs at naval operational facilities. As a general rule, operating bases required fewer permanent buildings than Navy yards. However, in cases where construction was intended to outlast the war, the Navy chose permanent construction. For example, the Navy expanded a brick power plant at the Norfolk naval base to meet the base's additional requirements for electricity. At the San Diego destroyer base, the Navy built a graving dry dock to repair smaller ships.<sup>lxxix</sup>

Smaller operational installations also received permanent construction during the war. The New London Submarine base, which served as the home for a number of submarines operating in the Atlantic and a training facility for submariners, is a typical example. Among the structures built were "keyport" torpedo warhead storage magazines, a small arms magazine, a pyrotechnic magazine, two fixed-ammunition magazines, and a fuze magazine.<sup>lxxx</sup>

Like Navy yards, naval operational facilities were the site of projects to provide low-cost housing to Navy personnel and civilian workers. The first and most noted of these developments was Ben Moreell Park, in Norfolk, Virginia, which was intended for the families of enlisted Navy personnel. The project consisted of 57 twelve-family apartments, 11 two-family apartments, and 24 fourteen-family apartments. Buildings were steel frame with either stucco or asbestos siding. The first phase of the project was completed in May 1940 with another 300 units ready for residents by October of the next year.<sup>lxxxi</sup>

## **Training Installations**

Mobilization of personnel was one critical aspect in preparing for war. Mobilization required expansion of existing training facilities and extensive new construction. Both the War and Navy Departments sought to use temporary construction for operations and training wherever possible, although some permanent construction was unavoidable or else considered desirable. During the early phases of the protective mobilization period, the Army and Navy anticipated a long term expansion of their forces, and constructed permanent buildings. Even temporary mobilization installations required some permanent buildings, while special purpose facilities required permanent structures. Air Corps training installations are included under the section entitled "Army Air Forces Installations."

In June 1940, the United States Army quickened its mobilization activities to train personnel in response to the situation in Europe. In the fall of 1939, Army personnel numbered a little more than 200,000 men. By November 1944, the Army had facilities to house and train six million troops in the continental United States. Most of the troops were billeted in temporary wood-frame construction. Only 270,000 out of the six million troops were housed in permanent buildings.<sup>lxxxii</sup> Table 8 provides a list of Army mobilization camps.

Although temporary construction was the norm for mobilization training camps, some installations received permanent construction to support either the camps or long term expansion.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

table 8

**TABLE 8: WORLD WAR II ARMY MOBILIZATION TRAINING CAMPS**

<b>WWII Name</b>	<b>Current Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date Established</b>
Camp Adair	N/A	OR	1943
Camp Atterbury	N/A	IN	1942
Camp Barkeley	N/A	TX	1941
Camp Beale	N/A	CA	1941
Camp Beauregard	N/A	LA	1917
Camp Blanding	N/A	FL	1939
Fort Belvoir	Fort Belvoir	VA	1912
Fort Benning	Fort Benning	GA	1919
Fort Bliss	Fort Bliss	TX	1890
Camp Bowie	N/A	TX	1917
Fort Brady	N/A	MI	1892
Fort Bragg	Fort Bragg	NC	1918
Camp Branch	N/A	NC	1942
Camp Breckinridge	N/A	KY	1941
Camp Bullis	Fort Sam Houston	TX	1917
Camp Butner	N/A	NC	1942
Camp Callan	N/A	CA	1940
Camp Campbell	Fort Campbell	KY	1942
Camp Carson	Fort Carson	CO	1942
Camp Chaffee	Fort Chaffee	AR	1942
Camp Claiborne	N/A	LA	1940
Fort Clark	N/A	TX	1852
Camp Cooke	N/A	CA	1942
Camp Croft	N/A	SC	1941
Fort Custer	N/A	MI	1917
Camp Davis	N/A	NC	1941
Fort Devens	Fort Devens	MA	1917

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

<b>WWII Name</b>	<b>Current Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date Established</b>
Fort Dix	Fort Dix	NJ	1917
Camp Edwards	N/A	MA	1941
Camp Ellis	N/A	IL	1942
Fort Ethan Allen	Fort Ethan Allen	VT	1892
Fort Eustis	Fort Eustis	VA	1918
Camp Forrest	N/A	TN	1941
Camp Funston	Fort Riley	KS	1942
Camp Gillespie	N/A	CA	1942
Camp Gordon	Fort Gordan	GA	1941
Camp Grayling	N/A	MI	1911
Camp Grant	N/A	IL	1918
Camp Gruber	N/A	OK	1942
Camp Guernsey	N/A	WY	1932 ca
Camp Haan	N/A	CA	1941
Fort Benjamin Harrison	Fort Benjamin Harrison	IN	1903
Fort A.P. Hill	Fort A.P. Hill	VA	1941
Camp Hood	Fort Hood	TX	1941
Camp Howze	N/A	TX	1941
Fort Huachuca	Fort Huachuca	AZ	1882
Camp Hulen	N/A	TX	1940
Hunter Liggett Military Reservation	Fort Ord (sub-post)	CA	1941
Indiantown Gap Military Reservation	Fort Indiantown Gap	PA	1931
Camp Irwin	Fort Irwin	CA	1940
Fort Jackson	Fort Jackson	SC	1917
Fort Knox	Fort Knox	KY	1918
Camp Kohler	N/A	CA	1942
Camp Langdon	N/A	NH	1941
Fort Lawton	N/A	WA	1891
Fort Leavenworth	Fort Leavenworth	KS	1827
Camp Lee	Fort Lee	VA	1917

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

<b>WWII Name</b>	<b>Current Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date Established</b>
Fort Leonard Wood	Fort Leonard Wood	MO	1940
Fort Lewis	Fort Lewis	WA	1917
Camp Livingston	N/A	LA	1940
Camp Luna	N/A	NM	1942
Fort MacArthur	N/A	CA	1888
Camp MacQuaide	N/A	CA	1940
Madison Barracks	N/A	NY	1815
Camp Maxey	N/A	TX	1942
Camp McCain	N/A	MS	1942
Fort McClellan	Fort McClellan	AL	1917
Camp McCoy	N/A	WI	1909
Fort Meade	Fort Meade	MD	1917
Camp Millard	N/A	OH	1941
Fort Monmouth	Fort Monmouth	NJ	1917
Camp Murphy	N/A	FL	1942
Fort Myer	Fort Myer	VA	1863
Fort Oglethorpe	N/A	GA	1903
Fort Ord	Fort Ord	CA	1917
Camp Phillips	N/A	KS	1942
Camp Pickett	Fort Pickett (subinstallation of Fort Lee)	VA	1942
Camp Pike	Camp Joseph T. Robinson (National Guard)	AR	1917
Camp Pinedale	N/A	CA	1942
Pine Camp	Fort Drum	NY	1908
Camp Plauche	N/A	LA	1942
Camp Polk	Fort Polk	LA	1941
Camp Rapid	N/A	SD	1925
Camp (William C.) Reid	N/A	NM	1942
Camp Reynolds	N/A	PA	1942
Fort Riley	Fort Riley	KS	1852
Camp Ritchie	Fort Ritchie	MD	1926

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

<b>WWII Name</b>	<b>Current Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date Established</b>
Camp Roberts	N/A	CA	1941
Camp Rodman	Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	1941
Camp Rucker	Fort Rucker	AL	1942
Fort Sam Houston	Fort Sam Houston	TX	
Camp San Luis Obispo	N/A	CA	1928
Camp Santa Anita	N/A	CA	1942
Camp Savage	N/A	MN	1942
Schofield Barracks	Schofield Barracks	HI	1908
Camp (Thomas A.) Scott	N/A	IN	1942
Camp Seeley	N/A	CA	1942
Camp Shanks	N/A	NJ	1943
Camp Shelby	N/A	MS	1917
Fort Sheridan	Fort Sheridan	IL	1887
Camp Sibert	N/A	AL	1943
Fort Sill	Fort Sill	OK	1869
Fort Snelling	N/A	MN	1819
Camp Stewart	Fort Stewart	GA	1940
Camp Swift	N/A	TX	1942
Camp Sutton	N/A	NC	1942
Camp Toccoa	N/A	GA	1943
Camp Travis	Fort Sam Houston	TX	1917
Camp (Jesse) Turner	N/A	AR	1942
Camp Tyson	N/A	TN	1942
Camp Upton	N/A	NY	1917
Camp Van Dorn	N/A	MS	1942
Camp Wallace	N/A	TX	1941
Camp White	N/A	OR	1942
Camp Whiteside	Fort Riley	KS	1924
Camp Wolters	Fort Wolters	TX	1941
Camp (Charles) Wood	Fort Monmouth	NJ	1942
Camp Young	N/A	CA	1942

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.



Sources: Union Pacific Railroad, "Geographically Correct Map of the United States Issued by Union Pacific Railroad," Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis, 1942.

Robert B. Roberts, *Encyclopedia of Historic Forts* (New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1988).

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

Typical support facilities that required permanent construction included water or sewage treatment facilities and associated wells, pumps, and collection and distribution infrastructure; electrical distribution infrastructure; heating plants/boiler houses; cold storage; shops; ammunition magazines; and, general and specialized storage facilities. Some specialized projects also were constructed. Fort Knox, for example, was the site of an extensive enlisted family housing project sponsored by the Federal Works Agency; however, the housing at Fort Knox, reflecting the growing war emergency, was built of semi-permanent construction and did not resemble the inter-war housing.<sup>lxxxiii</sup>

In 1939, the number of Navy personnel was 110,000; by September 1945, personnel numbered 3,009,380. These vast numbers of personnel passed through the Navy's training stations (Table 9). The Navy entered the war years with four existing recruit training stations: Newport, Rhode Island; Great Lakes, Illinois; Norfolk, Virginia; and, San Diego, California. Norfolk was the largest of the four training stations. At that time, the Norfolk station had facilities for 10,000 men. The demand for new personnel rapidly outstripped the capacity of these stations. After the German invasion of France in May 1940, the authorized number of naval personnel was increased to 172,000. The existing training stations were expanded during the Protective Mobilization phase, with permanent barracks, mess halls, and recreation facilities that were streamlined versions of the inter-war construction built by the Navy. New construction could not keep up with the ever-expanding number of recruits. By the end of 1941, the training stations were severely overcrowded. After the attack on Pearl Harbor, recruits flocked to the Navy. Construction was immediately increased to accommodate the influx of recruits and the Navy planned new training stations built of temporary construction. The criteria for the locations of the new stations were: large areas of cleared, level land; proximity to a body of water; proximity to a city for liberty calls; adequate access to rail and road networks; availability of utilities; and, an adequate labor supply for construction. The three new stations opened in 1942 were: Bainbridge, in Maryland; Farrugut, in Idaho; and, Sampson, in New York. These stations were constructed primarily of temporary construction.<sup>lxxxiv</sup>

The Navy also constructed specialized training stations in addition to recruit training stations. Specialized training consisted of schools, where individuals received additional training in specific skills, and operational training, where groups of personnel participated in "team" training. During World War II, the Navy operated its schools in a variety of places, including factories, colleges, hotels, private houses, and trade schools, in addition to navy yards and other naval shore facilities. Operational training included a wide variety of activities at disparate installations: Acorn assembly and training at Port Hueneme, California; airship training at Lakehurst, New Jersey; amphibious training at San Diego (Coronado), California, Solomon's Island, Maryland, Little Creek, Virginia, and Ft. Pierce, Florida; anti-aircraft training at Lido Beach, New York, Pacific Beach, Washington, Point Montara, California, Newport, Rhode Island, Shell Beach, Louisiana, and Dam Neck, Virginia; minecraft training at Little Creek; pre-commissioning training at Treasure Island, California; small craft training at San Pedro, California; and, training in mine warfare at the newly established Mine Warfare School at Yorktown, Virginia.<sup>lxxxv</sup> Some specialized training was accommodated at existing installations, while specialized facilities were developed for some kinds of training. Advance base personnel depots were established to provide training to units of men already assembled into functional units. The Navy built additional camps for anti-aircraft and amphibious training. These facilities typically featured temporary construction; however, in some cases specialized training facilities might receive permanent construction if temporary construction would not hold up under intensive use.

As the emergency turned into a declared war, materials shortages grew more acute and temporary construction became standard for both the War and Navy Departments. The War Department created new installations that were almost all temporary buildings, and added new sections of temporary construction to existing installations. Later, the War Department employed

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

table 9

TABLE 9. WWII NAVY TRAINING STATIONS AND BASES

WWII-era Name	Current Name	Location	Date Established
<b>Recruit Training</b>			
Naval Training Station Bainbridge	N/A	MD	1942
Naval Training Station Farragut	N/A	ID	1942
Naval Training Station Great Lakes	Naval Training Center Great Lakes	IL	1911
Naval Training Station Newport	Naval Education and Training Center Newport	RI	1883
Naval Training Station Norfolk	Naval Base Norfolk	VA	1917
Naval Training Station Sampson	N/A	NY	1942
Naval Training Station San Diego	Naval Station San Diego	CA	1917
<b>Specialized Training *</b>			
Advanced Base Personnel Depot San Bruno	N/A	CA	1943
Naval Amphibious Training Base Fort Pierce	N/A	FL	1943
Naval Amphibious Training Base Galveston	N/A	TX	1943
Naval Amphibious Training Base Little Creek	Naval Amphibious Base Little Creek	VA	1942
Naval Amphibious Training Base Morro Bay	N/A	CA	1943
Naval Amphibious Training Base Ocracoke	N/A	NC	1943
Naval Amphibious Training Base Panama City	Panama City Coastal Systems Station	FL	1943
Naval Amphibious Training Base San Diego	Naval Amphibious Base Coronado	CA	1943
Naval Amphibious Training Base Solomon's Island	N/A	MD	1942

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

<b>WWII-era Name</b>	<b>Current Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date Established</b>
Naval Mine Warfare School Yorktown	N/A (Coast Guard)	VA	1918

\* The U.S. Navy conducted specialized and operational training in many places and under various designations during World War II. Other training programs were carried out at other naval facilities, including air stations, operating bases, and shipyards.

Source: United States Navy, Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases in World War II* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1947):261 - 279.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

"theater-of-operations" construction, which consisted of tar paper tacked to thin wooden frames. Nevertheless, some functions at the mobilization camps required permanent structures. For example, perishable subsistence required buildings with masonry walls to ensure cold storage. Ammunition was stored in concrete "igloos" to minimize the dangers of explosion. Water, sewerage, or laundry plants were built using permanent construction. Flammable materials, including packaged petroleum products or paint, were sometimes stored in permanent buildings.<sup>lxxxvi</sup> These support buildings were minor elements of training and operational installments.

Other permanent structures served training functions. Some of these buildings and structures employed unique designs. The 250-foot towers for training airborne units were dramatic examples of permanent training structures. Each tower included four arms that could accommodate an open parachute canopy (Figure 4). Soldiers were placed in the parachute harnesses on the ground and lifted 250 feet off the ground. The descent would simulate a parachute jump.<sup>lxxxvii</sup> Swimming pools, especially those constructed on Navy or Marine Corps training installations, were used for teaching water survival skills more than for recreation.

### **Army Air Forces Installations**

In the years between World War I and World War II, the Army's air arm underwent a period of mixed progress and stagnation. Experience during the First World War had established the utility of military aviation and fostered the conviction among a group of Army officers that future wars would be decided by air power. Moreover, Army aviation profited from steadily improving civilian aircraft technology. Yet the growth of military aviation was limited by the general lack of interest in military affairs during the 1920s and early 1930s. With limited appropriations for all its activities, the Army could not afford to take full advantage of the technological improvements in aviation.

Discord between air and ground officers further complicated the development of Army aviation. Led by Billy Mitchell, numerous air officers believed that future wars would be decided by strategic air warfare. In this view long range bombing would replace ground combat. Consequently, they favored the development of heavy bombers at the expense of smaller aircraft. They further argued that the nation's air component should be independent from the Army, creating a separate Air Force. Mitchell's argumentative style led to a well publicized court-martial that prompted endless inquiries and boards to study the future of Army aviation. Air power advocates received recognition when the Army Air Service was upgraded to the Air Corps in 1926. In 1935, the Air Corps received a further boost with the creation of a General Headquarters for the Army Air Forces. This headquarters was the command element for air units that could be employed as a strategic force. The Chief of the Air Corps continued to supervise the administration and logistical support of Army air units.<sup>lxxxviii</sup>

Air Corps installations reflected the uneven growth of Army aviation. Most of the airfields constructed during World War I were closed after the war. Airfield construction received a boost from the 1935 Wilcox Act, which emphasized construction of airfields along the nation's borders to protect the United States against hostile air attacks.<sup>lxxxix</sup> By the close of the inter-war period, the Air Corps operated slightly more than 20 airfields.<sup>xc</sup>

With the increasing tensions in Europe and Asia, the Air Corps received its share of new appropriations during the late 1930s. The War and Navy Departments developed a series of contingency plans for fighting multiple enemies, known as the "RAINBOW" plans. The final revision, RAINBOW 5, emphasized the role of the Air Corps in frontier air defenses and air power projection.

McChord Field, near Tacoma, Washington is an excellent example of an air field constructed during the late 1930s after the adoption of RAINBOW 5. In 1938, this area was considered the Northwest Frontier and McChord was built to provide air defense for the Puget

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

Sound Navy Yard and the Boeing aircraft plant in Seattle, and medium bomber support to the Navy. Construction at McChord was extensive and designed to be permanent. The airfield housed a mix of pursuit and medium bomber aircraft. Taking advantage of the freedom in site selection given by the Wilcox Act and funding from a generous Congress, the Air Corps built McChord to be a show place of air power.<sup>xci</sup> Contractors built four 350 by 500 ft. steel and concrete hangars, a hospital, power plant, housing, and one of the largest brick barracks in the United States at the time. Although the construction contracts were under Quartermaster Corps control, the Air Corps selected the designs for buildings directly related to aircraft operations.

Other facilities were built around the country to complement the nation's air defense system (Table 10). These air bases, including Elmendorf in Alaska, Hanscom and Westover in Massachusetts, MacDill in Florida, and McGuire in New Jersey, were all built to bolster the defense of the United States.<sup>xcii</sup> Operations bases were only part of the overall network of facilities designed to meet national defense requirements. Like other arms of the military, the Air Corps underwent rapid expansion during the protective mobilization period. Pilots, aircrew, and technicians, both officer and enlisted, required suitable technical instruction; therefore, the Air Corps needed to expand its training facilities.<sup>xciii</sup>

During 1940, the Air Corps surveyed the nation for suitable civilian airports that could be leased for the emergency. Eager to attract defense spending, municipal governments frequently offered to lease airports and adjoining land for one dollar per year. At the same time, the Quartermaster Corps construction division issued contracts to expand existing training facilities at Chanute Air Base, Illinois; Kelly Field, Texas; Lowry Field, Colorado; Maxwell Field, Alabama; and, Randolph Field, Texas. New construction at these fields was a mix of temporary and permanent construction. The expansion of Kelly Field, Texas, included a wide range of construction, from large, reinforced-concrete hangars to tent cities. At Lowry Field, the War Department authorized construction of new buildings, including an 850-man barracks. Construction was incomplete when the Protective Mobilization Plan was announced, and new soldiers were quartered in tents until September 1940. Thereafter, construction at Lowry was primarily temporary. The service members lucky enough to live in the brick barracks called their new home "Buckingham Palace."<sup>xciv</sup> At other locations, the Army eventually resorted to leased hotels for troop housing.<sup>xcv</sup> Figure 5 illustrates the expansion of Air Corps training installations by 1942.

The mobilization program strained the capacity of the Construction Division of the Quartermaster Corps' centralized management techniques. The Corps of Engineers seemed better suited for many construction projects because it used a decentralized management system, with district offices. To expedite construction, Congress gave the Secretary of War permission to shift the responsibility of Air Corps construction to the Corps of Engineers in late 1940. The engineers displayed ingenuity and flexibility in meeting the needs of the Air Corps. Utilizing the methods of large contract management gained from major river and harbor projects, the Corps of Engineers quickly took control of Air Corps construction projects.<sup>xcvi</sup>

The transfer of construction responsibility to the Corps of Engineers produced tension between the engineers and Colonel Frank Kennedy, chief of the Air Corps Buildings and Grounds Division. In 1940 and 1941, Colonel Kennedy, as the Air Corps point of contact to the engineers, set himself up as the air field design expert. Engineer officers complained that Kennedy prepared air field layouts from his office in Washington, D.C., without ever having visited the site, and dabbled in design.<sup>xcvii</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 4

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 5

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.



table 10

**TABLE 10: WORLD WAR II ARMY AIRFIELDS NOW ACTIVE DoD INSTALLATIONS**

<b>Original Name</b>	<b>Current Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date Established</b>
Hurlbert Field	Eglin AFB Auxiliary Field #9	FL	1943
Altus Army Air Field	Altus AFB	OK	1942
Camp Springs Air Base	Andrews AFB	MD	1943
Barksdale Field	Barksdale AFB	LA	1930
Del Valle Airfield	Bergstrom AFB	TX	1942
Blytheville Air Field	Blytheville AFB	AR	1942
Bolling Field	Bolling AFB	DC	1917
Brooks Field	Brooks AFB	TX	1918
Clovis Air Field	Cannon AFB	NM	1942
Tarrant Field	Carswell AFB	TX	1942
Merced Field	Castle AFB	CA	1941
Chanute Field	Chanute AFB	IL	1917
Charleston Field	Charleston AFB	SC	1941
Columbus Field	Columbus AFB	MS	1941
Davis-Monthan Field	Davis-Monthan AFB	AZ	1940
Cobb County Field	Dobbin AFB	GA	1943
Dover Army Air Base	Dover AFB	DE	1941
Abilene Air Base	Dyess AFB	TX	1942
Muroc Army Air Field	Edwards AFB	CA	1933
Eglin Field	Eglin AFB	FL	1935
Mile 26 Satellite Field	Eielson AFB	AK	1943
Rapid City Air Base	Ellsworth AFB	SD	1942
Elmendorf Air Field	Elmendorf AFB	AK	1940
Alexandria Air Base	England AFB	LA	1943
Victorville Air Field	George AFB	CA	1941
San Angelo Flying Field	Goodfellow AFB	TX	1940

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

<b>Original Name</b>	<b>Current Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date Established</b>
Gunter Air Field	Gunter AFB	AL	1940
Bedford Air Field	Hanscom AFB	MA	1942
Hickam Field	Hickam AFB	HI	1935
Alamogordo Air Field	Holloman AFB	NM	1942
Homestead Air Field	Homestead AFB	FL	1942
Biloxi Air Corps School	Keesler AFB	MS	1941
Kelly Field	Kelly AFB	TX	1917
San Antonio Cadet Center	Lackland AFB	TX	1941
Langley Field	Langley AFB	VA	1916
Laughlin Air Field	Laughlin AFB	TX	1942
Lowry Field	Lowry AFB	CO	1937
Litchfield Park Air Base	Luke AFB	AZ	1941
MacDill Field	MacDill AFB	FL	1939
Great Falls Air Field	Malstrom AFB	MT	1942
March Field	March AFB	CA	1918
Mather Field	Mather AFB	CA	1918
Maxwell Field	Maxwell AFB	AL	1918
Yuma Army Air Field	MCAS Yuma	AZ	1941
McChord Field	McChord AFB	WA	1940
Wichita Air Base	McConnell Air Force Base	KS	1942
Fort Dix Air Field	McGuire AFB	NJ	1937
Moody Field	Moody AFB	GA	1941
Mountain Home Air Field	Mountain Home AFB	ID	1942
Myrtle Beach Air Field	Myrtle Beach AFB	SC	1941
Las Vegas Air Field	Nellis AFB	NV	1941
San Bernardino Air Field	Norton AFB	CA	1942
Air Support Command Base	Peterson AFB	CO	1942
Pope Field	Pope AFB	NC	1919
Randolph Field	Randolph AFB	TX	1930
Lubbock Army Air Field	Reese AFB	TX	1941
Napier Army Air Field	Fort Rucker	AL	1940

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

<b>Original Name</b>	<b>Current Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date Established</b>
Scott Field	Scott AFB	IL	1917
Seymore Johnson Field	Seymore Johnson AFB	NC	1942
Shaw Field	Shaw AFB	SC	1941
Shemya Army Air Field	Shemya AFB	AK	1943
Sheppard Field	Sheppard AFB	TX	1941
Fairfield-Suisun Air Base	Travis AFB	CA	1943
Tyndall Field	Tyndall AFB	FL	1941
Enid Army Flying School	Vance AFB	OK	1941
Westover Field	Westover AFB	MA	1939
Wheeler Field	Wheeler AFB	HI	1922
Sedilia Glider Base	Whiteman AFB	MO	1942
Mesa Military Airport	Williams AFB	AZ	1941
Wright Field	Wright-Patterson AFB	OH	1927
Patterson Field	Wright Patterson AFB	OH	1931
Oscoda Army Air Field	Wurtsmith AFB	MI	1924

Source: Robert Mueller, *Air Force Bases: Active Air Force Bases Within the United States of America on 17 September 1982* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1989).

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

By early 1942, however, cooperation between the Air Corps and the Corps of Engineers became the hallmark of construction operations and the Air Corps began to restructure their headquarters for wartime operations. Congress recognized the administrative and operational skills displayed by the Corps of Engineers and, on 16 December 1941, it transferred all construction functions to the Corps of Engineers.<sup>xcviii</sup>

With America's entry into World War II, the Air Corps suddenly assumed a new mission of anti-submarine warfare. German submarines threatened to sink British ships faster than they could be replaced, and the Allies sought a means to counter this threat. In pre-war planning, however, the Air Corps had not envisioned anti-submarine warfare as part of its operations, and therefore lacked a clearly defined doctrine for that type of operation. Nevertheless, since the Navy lacked the necessary land-based aircraft for coastal patrols, the Air Corps assumed this mission until the Navy could acquire the necessary aircraft.<sup>xcix</sup>

The Air Corps worked to develop their aircraft to match the mission at hand and utilized coastal air facilities to their fullest extent. On 17 June 1942, the Air Corps established the 1st Sea-Search Attack Group (1st SSAG) at Langley Field, Virginia.<sup>c</sup> The technical work of the 1st SSAG was vital to the success of the combined Army-Navy anti-submarine warfare campaign. Using devices tested by the Group, including the absolute altimeter, the magnetic anomaly detector, and radio sonic buoys, the Air Corps harassed and destroyed German U-boats both night and day. Anti-submarine squadrons operated from long established bases such as Langley, and from newly built air fields, such as Westover, Massachusetts, and Fort Dix Field (now McGuire AFB), New Jersey.<sup>ci</sup>

As the Air Corps shifted to a war-time footing operational requirements exceeded the capacity of existing bases. New additions to Air Corps facilities were constructed from less critical materials such as timber, masonry, or concrete, preferably timber. At smaller training fields, the standard four runway configuration was changed to two runways. The Air Corps directed that all construction on private land leased for the duration of the war be limited to temporary buildings, including hangars and control towers, except at tactical anti-submarine bases.<sup>cii</sup> The Air Corps Plans and Design Branch designed aircraft hangars based on the criteria that they be easily expandable to accommodate larger aircraft, use the least expensive type of door, have interior shops, and have access from both ends (Figure 6).<sup>ciii</sup>

As early as 1941, the Air Corps planned to introduce a super heavy bomber into its inventory. The B-29 "Superfortress" could travel greater distances and carry heavier loads than any previous bomber. One of the problems associated with the new bomber was construction of runways that could accommodate the planes' heavy loads of up to 140,000 pounds. Existing highway construction theory had limited applicability for such demands, therefore the Corps of Engineers had to develop new construction techniques. Working with civilian engineers, especially experts in soil engineering, the Corps of Engineers pioneered new theories on the ability of soil to withstand pressure, and constructed runways with thicker bases of crushed stone. This research not only allowed the United States to employ the B-29 and later bombers, but it also contributed significantly to the growth of civilian aviation after the war.<sup>civ</sup>

The final blow to Japan came with the use of the atomic bomb in Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945. The specially organized 509th Composite Group delivered the atomic bomb. To prepare for its mission, the Group initiated a program of secret training using B-29 bombers at Wendover Field, Utah, to practice the delivery of the exceptionally heavy load. The success and secrecy of the operation attested to the successful training program.<sup>cv</sup>

From 1938 to 1945, the war cost approximately 350 billion dollars, of which the Air Corps used an estimated 3.2 billion dollars for the construction and leasing of facilities.<sup>cvi</sup> In

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 6

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

cooperation with the Quartermaster Corps Construction Branch, and later the Corps of Engineers, the Air Corps expanded from a handful of facilities in 1939 to a peak of 783 operational facilities by the war's end. Of these 345 were main bases, 116 were sub-bases, and 322 were auxiliary fields.<sup>cvii</sup>

## **Navy and Marine Corps Air Stations**

During the inter-war years, naval aviation occupied an important position, but was decidedly secondary to the Navy's battleships. As late as 1940, a Navy War College study emphasized that 1,200 aircraft were required to carry as much ordnance as one battleship, while downplaying the greater range of carrier-based aviation. The successful Japanese attack upon Pearl Harbor, followed by the critical role of naval aviation in the battles of Coral Sea and Midway, suddenly placed naval aviation at the forefront of the war in the Pacific. The expansion of Navy aviation facilities was commensurate with the growth of the Navy's air arm. In 1939, the Navy operated 11 air stations and 8 reserve bases; by the war's end, the Navy included nearly 80 air stations and numerous satellite fields.<sup>cviii</sup> The Navy divided its aviation program into three types: Navy heavier-than-air (HTA); Navy lighter-than-air (LTA); and, Marine Corps heavier-than-air. The Navy HTA program was further divided into seaplanes and landplanes.

During the 1920s and 1930s, the Navy Department operated relatively few aviation facilities. Pensacola Naval Air Station had been the primary naval aviation training station since 1914. The San Diego Naval Air Station complemented Pensacola in training Navy and Marine Corps aviators. Operating air stations for the Navy and Marine Corps included facilities at Norfolk, Anacostia, and Quantico. Lighter-than-air installations at Lakehurst and Moffett Field completed the Navy's air stations. In keeping with the slow but steady growth of Navy aviation, each of these installations received minor improvements during the pre-war period.<sup>cxix</sup>

During the late 1930s, the Navy began to improve its aviation installations as part of a general improvement program for its shore facilities. Eight new reserve air stations were added at Squantum, Massachusetts; New York, New York; Miami, Florida; Grosse Isle, Michigan; Glenview, Illinois; Minneapolis, Minnesota; St. Louis, Missouri; and, Oakland, California. These bases required minimal construction; buildings were limited to those that housed planes and personnel. Other West Coast air stations at Seattle, Washington; Alameda, California; and San Pedro, California, served as operational bases. As the probability of war with Japan increased, the Navy added to its aviation facilities in the Pacific, most notably at Kaneohe Bay in Hawaii, and Sitka, Alaska. Existing installations also received additional funding.<sup>cx</sup>

With American mobilization in 1940, construction of Navy aviation facilities acquired a new urgency (Table 11). German submarine activity in the Atlantic Ocean prompted the Navy to establish more bases for seaplane patrols of the Atlantic. Stations with landing fields to train carrier pilots were also necessary. New stations built during the mobilization period included installations at Jacksonville and Banana River, Florida; Quonset Point, Rhode Island; Floyd Bennett Field, New York; and, Cape May, New Jersey, plus some smaller fields. The Navy assumed control of British bases in the Caribbean under President Roosevelt's plan to provide the British with 50 destroyers in exchange for rent-free leases on British bases in North and South America. By the end of June 1941, the Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics reported that the Navy owned 13 East Coast stations, 10 Caribbean stations, 6 West Coast stations, 3 Alaskan stations, and 9 Pacific stations.<sup>cxii</sup>

Despite significant increases in the number of air stations, America's entry into the war again required more bases. The Navy established a war time goal of 27,000 thousand aircraft,

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

table 11

**TABLE 11: WORLD WAR II NAVAL AIR STATIONS**

<b>WWII Name</b>	<b>Current Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date Established</b>
Beeville Auxiliary Field	Naval Air Station Beeville	TX	1943
Cecil Auxiliary Field	Naval Air Station Cecil Field	FL	1941
Corry Auxiliary Field	Corry Station	FL	1931
Ellyson Auxiliary Field	N/A	FL	1941
Fallon Auxiliary Field	Naval Air Station Fallon	NV	1943
Floyd Bennett Field	N/A	NY	1940
Lee Field	Naval Air Station Jacksonville	FL	1940
Moffett Field*	Naval Air Station Moffett Field	CA	1931
Naval Air Facility Cold Bay	N/A	AK	1942
Naval Air Field Amchitka	N/A	AK	1943
Naval Air Station Akron	N/A	OH	1930
Naval Air Station Alameda	Naval Air Station Alameda	CA	1940
Naval Air Station Anacostia	Naval Station Anacostia	DC	1918
Naval Air Station Astoria (Tongue Point)	N/A	OR	1942
Naval Air Station Atlanta	N/A	GA	1940
Naval Air Station Atlantic City	N/A	NJ	1942
Naval Air Station Banana River	Patrick AFB	FL	1940
Naval Air Station Barbers Point	Naval Air Station Barbers Point	HI	1942
Naval Air Station Brunswick	N/A	GA	1942
Naval Air Station Brunswick	Naval Air Station Brunswick	ME	1942
Naval Air Station Bunker Hill	Grissom AFB	IN	1942
Naval Air Station Cape May	USCG Recruit Training Center	NJ	1942
Naval Air Station Charleston	Naval Base Charleston	SC	
Naval Air Station Clinton	N/A	OK	1942
Naval Air Station Corpus Christi	Naval Air Station Corpus Christi	TX	1940

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

<b>WWII Name</b>	<b>Current Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date Established</b>
Naval Air Station Daytona Beach	N/A	FL	1942
Naval Air Station DeLand	N/A	FL	1942
Naval Air Station Fort Lauderdale	N/A	FL	1942
Naval Air Station Glenview	Naval Air Station Glenview	IL	1942
Naval Air Station Glynco*	N/A	GA	1943
Naval Air Station Grand Prairie	Naval Air Station Dallas	TX	1940
Naval Air Station Grosse Isle	N/A	MI	1942
Naval Air Station Hitchcock*	N/A	TX	1943
Naval Air Station Houma*	Naval Air Station New Orleans	LA	1943
Naval Air Station Hutchinson	N/A	KS	1942
Naval Air Station Jacksonville	Naval Air Station Jacksonville	FL	1940
Naval Air Station Klamath Falls	N/A	OR	1943
Naval Air Station Kaneohe Bay	MCAS Kaneohe Bay	HI	1939
Naval Air Station Key West	Naval Air Station Key West	FL	1941
Naval Air Station Kingsville	Naval Air Station Kingsville	TX	1943
Naval Air Station Lake City	N/A	FL	1942
Naval Air Station Lakehurst*	Naval Air Warfare Center Lakehurst	NJ	1925
Naval Air Station Los Alamitos	Los Alamitos Reserve Center	CA	1941
Naval Air Station Melbourne	N/A	FL	1942
Naval Air Station Memphis	Naval Air Station Memphis	TN	1942
Naval Air Station Miami	N/A	FL	1940
Naval Air Station Miami	CGAS Operations Locka	FL	1942
Naval Air Station Minneapolis	N/A	MN	1942
Naval Air Station New York	CGAS New York	NY	1941
Naval Air Station New Orleans	Naval Air Station New Orleans	LA	1940
Naval Air Station Norfolk	Naval Air Station Norfolk	VA	1918
Naval Air Station Norman	N/A	OK	1942
Naval Air Station Oakland	N/A	CA	late 1930s (reserve)
Naval Air Station Olathe	NAVAIRRESCEN Olathe	KS	1942

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.



WWII Name	Current Name	Location	Date Established
Naval Air Station Ottumwa	N/A	IA	1942
Naval Air Station Pasco	N/A	WA	1942
Naval Air Station Patuxent River	Naval Air Station Patuxent River	MD	1942
Naval Air Station Pensacola	Naval Air Station Pensacola	FL	1914
Naval Air Station Peru	N/A	IN	1942
Naval Air Station Quonset Point	N/A	RI	1940
Naval Air Station Richmond*	N/A	FL	1943
Naval Air Station St. Louis	N/A	MO	1930s
Naval Air Station San Diego	Naval Air Station North Island	CA	1919
Naval Air Station San Pedro (Reeves Field)	N/A	CA	1938
Naval Air Station Santa Ana*	Marine Corps Air Station Tustin	CA	1942
Naval Air Station Seattle (Sand Point)	N/A	WA	1938
Naval Air Station Sitka	N/A	AK	1939
Naval Air Station South Weymouth*	Naval Air Station South Weymouth	MA	1943
Naval Air Station Squantum	N/A	MA	ca. 1935 (reserve)
Naval Air Station Tillamook*	N/A	OR	1943
Naval Air Station Vero Beach	N/A	FL	1942
Naval Air Station Washington	Naval Station Anacostia	DC	1918
Naval Air Station Weeksville*	CGAS Elizabeth City	NC	1942
Naval Air Station Whidbey Island	Naval Air Station Whidbey Island	WA	1941
Naval Air Station Willow Grove	Naval Air Station Willow Grove	PA	1942
Naval Auxiliary Air Station Oceana	Naval Air Station Oceana	VA	1941
Saufley Auxiliary Field	Naval Training Center Saufley	FL	1942
Whiting Auxiliary Field	Naval Air Station Whiting Field	FL	1942

\* Indicates lighter-than-air (LTA) facilities

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

Source: United States Navy, Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases in World War II* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1947).

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

which required shore facility support, including training stations and bases for anti-submarine patrols.

Because existing reserve stations provided insufficient facilities, the Navy opened new training stations at such locations as Norman, Oklahoma; Memphis, Tennessee; Corpus Christi, Texas; Pasco, Washington; Peru, Indiana; Olathe, Kansas; Hutchinson, Kansas; Clinton, Oklahoma; and, Ottumwa, Iowa. Construction at these installations consisted of temporary buildings to the maximum extent possible, often even constructing temporary wooden hangars.<sup>cxii</sup>

At the outset of the war, Navy aviation consisted of carrier aircraft and seaplanes. The service did not include land-based aircraft suitable for anti-submarine patrols. Consequently, Navy anti-submarine patrols used Catalina seaplanes, despite their operational limitations. For the first years of the war, anti-submarine patrols were a joint effort of the Navy and Army Air Forces, while the Navy rapidly acquired suitable land-based aircraft. In September 1943, the Army Air Forces withdrew from anti-submarine warfare and transferred their radar equipped B-24 bombers to the Navy. The Navy assumed full responsibility for anti-submarine patrols.<sup>cxiii</sup>

The Navy's lighter-than-air (LTA) program was applied in the anti-submarine mission. The Navy had abandoned its huge rigid airships, known as dirigibles, following a series of accidents during the 1930s. Dirigibles were replaced by smaller airships, called blimps, which were less vulnerable to weather and accidents. The ability of blimps to remain aloft for long periods of time at a slow speed seemed to make them ideal platforms for anti-submarine warfare.<sup>cxiv</sup>

At the beginning of the war, the Navy's two lighter-than-air stations, Lakehurst Naval Air Station, New Jersey, and Moffett Naval Air Station, California, were expanded with new hangars to accommodate more blimps. In addition, the Navy constructed new lighter-than-air stations at South Weymouth, Massachusetts; Weeksville, North Carolina; Glynco, Georgia; Richmond, Florida; Houma, Louisiana; Hitchcock, Texas; Santa Ana, California; and, Tillamook, Oregon. The stations at South Weymouth and Weeksville contained steel-frame hangars, which could hold six blimps. All other stations used timber hangars because of steel shortages. Like their steel counterparts, these hangars housed six blimps, making them among the largest timber structures built.<sup>cxv</sup>

In practice, the effectiveness of blimps against submarines was difficult to assess. Critics pointed to the fact that blimps were not credited with sinking a single submarine and complained that their high visibility warned submarines. Naval historian Samuel Elliot Morrison noted that some Navy officers characterized blimps as "worse than useless." Yet supporters of the lighter-than-air program argued that blimps performed an invaluable service by deterring submarine attacks, pointing to the fact that not one ship escorted by blimps was lost to submarines. Assessing the contribution of blimps to anti-submarine operations is complicated by the fact they were not introduced in large numbers until the middle of 1943, after the worst submarine menace had passed. The slow speed of blimps also allowed them to perform search and rescue or mine sweeping operations.<sup>cxvi</sup>

The Marine Corps continued to employ its own aviation in close support of Marine Corps ground forces. The rapid expansion of Marine Corps aviation required a commensurate expansion of its air stations, which were used primarily to train aviators (Table 12). Prior to the war, the Marine Corps maintained air stations at Quantico, Virginia, and Parris Island, South Carolina; these facilities were improved in 1940. In 1941, the Marine Corps initiated construction at a major new facility near Cherry Point, North Carolina. Most of the buildings at Cherry Point were semi-permanent construction, with brick and steel used for the aircraft storehouse. In 1943, the Marine Corps began construction of temporary auxiliary airfields near Cherry Point. In California, the Marine Corps built El Toro, El Centro, and Mojave Air Stations, using wood frame construction.<sup>cxvii</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

table 12

---

**TABLE 12: WORLD WAR II MARINE CORPS AIR STATIONS**


---

<b>WWII Name</b>	<b>Current Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date Established</b>
MCAS Cherry Point	MCAS Cherry Point	NC	1941
MCAS Eagle Mountain Lake	N/A	TX	1942
MCAS Edenton	N/A	NC	1942
MCAS El Centro	Naval Air Station El Centro	CA	1942
MCAS El Toro	MCAS El Toro	CA	1942
MCAS EWA	N/A	HI	1941
MCAS Mojave	N/A	CA	1942
MCAS Quantico	USMC Education and Development Command	VA	1919
MCAS Santa Barbara	N/A	CA	1942
Page Field (Parris Island)	MCRD Parris Island	SC	1919

Source: United States Navy, Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases in World War II* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1947).

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

## Storage and Logistics Functions

Extensive depot systems served both the War and Navy Departments to hold materiel for long term storage, to serve the needs of units within the United States, and to support the movement of materiel overseas. Depots served a variety of purposes, including storage of ammunition, general supplies, communications equipment, and engineering equipment. Both Army and Navy depots can be divided into those depots that stored ammunition or explosives, and those depots that held other supplies. Safety requirements for ammunition storage resulted in distinctive depot plans and building design, which are discussed in Chapter XI.

Unlike ammunition, most military supplies were not hazardous materials and did not require specialized storage facilities or specialized handling. All categories of supplies required storage prior to distribution within the United States or overseas. Both the War and Navy Departments created extensive depot systems to receive, store, and issue supplies exclusive of ammunition. The War Department was also responsible for moving large numbers of troops to and from the front lines through a series of ports of embarkation.

### War Department

War Department logistical policy provided for distribution systems that were maintained by each of the technical branches, in addition to general depots. The Ordnance Department, Quartermaster Corps, and Air Corps operated the largest number of depots, while the Signal Corps, Corps of Engineers, and Chemical Warfare Service operated much smaller logistical systems (Table 13).

The Ordnance Department required an extensive distribution system for non-explosive materiel, because of its responsibility for the procurement and distribution of tanks, artillery, small arms and other weapons, plus the repair parts needed to maintain the weapons. The logistical problems became acute after the Ordnance Department acquired responsibility for all types of motor vehicles. Pre-war contingency plans called for the maximum use of leased civilian warehouses but the design of civilian facilities presented additional problems for the Ordnance Department. Multi-story civilian warehouses were ill-suited for the storage of tanks or heavy equipment. Moreover, the Ordnance Department foresaw the need for long term equipment storage after the end of the emergency. While the War Department headquarters agreed to de-emphasize leasing of civilian facilities, authorizations for construction of general storage ordnance depots were not forthcoming. The Ordnance Department, therefore, built general purpose storage facilities at ammunition depots. □

In 1941, as shipments of combat equipment increased, funding became available for permanent warehouse construction. The Ordnance Department constructed a depot at Ogden, Utah, which contained 40 general ordnance warehouses. In the Southeast, the Ordnance Department expanded the warehouse capacity at Anniston, Alabama, to support increased Army activities in that region. A large warehouse was constructed at Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, for the storage of general ordnance supplies. Thereafter, as shortages of building materials and money increased, the War Department relaxed specifications for warehouse construction. New ordnance warehouses were constructed using temporary, or even theater-of-operations design and located at existing ammunition depots. □

The Quartermaster Corps also faced the problem of storage and transportation of large quantities of supplies. Because nearly all of these supplies were non-explosive, the Quartermaster Corps had greater flexibility in the organization of its depots. Perhaps the most striking difference

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

TABLE 13: WORLD WAR II ARMY DEPOTS (NON-ORDNANCE) PRIVATE

PRIVATE Original Name	Current Name	Location	Date Established	Type of Depot
Fairfield Air Depot	Wright-Patterson AFB	OH	1918	Army Air Forces
Galena Field	Fairchild AFB	WA	1942	Army Air Forces
Middletown Air Depot	N/A	PA	N/A	Army Air Forces
Midwest Air Depot	Tinker AFB	OK	1941	Army Air Forces
Sacramento Air Depot	McClellan AFB	CA	1936	Army Air Forces
Rome Air Depot	Griffiss AFB	NY	1942	Army Air Forces
San Antonio Air Depot	Kelly AFB	TX	1921	Army Air Forces
Robins Field	Robins AFB	GA	1941	Army Air Forces
Ogden Air Depot	Hill AFB	UT	1940	Army Air Forces
Atlanta Army Depot	N/A	GA	1941	Army Service Forces
Belle Mead Army Depot	N/A	NJ	1941	Army Service Forces
Columbus Army Depot	Defense Construction Supply Center	OH	1918	Army Service Forces
Memphis Army Depot	Memphis Defense Depot	TN	1941	Army Service Forces
New Cumberland Army Depot	New Cumberland Army Depot	PA	1918	Army Service Forces
Richmond Army Depot	Defense General Supply Center	VA	1941	Army Service Forces
Salt Lake City Army Depot	N/A	UT	1941	Army Service Forces
San Antonio Army Depot	Fort Sam Houston	TX	1876	Army Service Forces

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

Savannah Army Depot	N/A	GA	unknown	Army Service Forces
Schenectady Army Depot	N/A	NY	1918	Army Service Forces
Seattle Army Depot	N/A	WA	1941	Army Service Forces
Deseret Chemical Warfare Depot	Tooele Army Depot	UT	1942	Chemical Warfare Service
Eastern Chemical Warfare Depot	Edgewood Area, Aberdeen Proving Ground	MD	1940	Chemical Warfare Service
Gulf Chemical Warfare Depot	Redstone Arsenal	AL	1941	Chemical Warfare Service
Northeast Chemical Warfare Depot	N/A	NY	1942	Chemical Warfare Service
Midwest Chemical Warfare Depot	Pine Bluff Arsenal	AR	1941	Chemical Warfare Service
Albany Engineer, Depot	N/A	NY	unknown	Corps of Engineers
Granite City Engineer Depot	N/A	IL	1942	Corps of Engineers
Lathrop Engineer Depot	Sharpe Army Depot	CA	1942	Corps of Engineers
Marion Engineer Depot	N/A	OH	unknown	Corps of Engineers
Pasco Engineer Depot	N/A	WA	unknown	Corps of Engineers
San Bernardino Engineer Depot	N/A	CA	unknown	Corps of Engineers
Sharonville Engineer Depot	N/A	OH	unknown	Corps of Engineers
Alexandria QM Depot (Cameron Station)	N/A	VA	1942	Quartermaster
Boston QM Depot	N/A	MA	1918	Quartermaster
Charlotte QM Depot	N/A	NC	unknown	Quartermaster
Chicago QM Depot	N/A	IL	unknown	Quartermaster
Fort Holabird QM Depot	U.S. Army Intelligence School	MD	1917	Quartermaster
Fort Reno QM Depot	N/A	OK	1874	Quartermaster

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

Fort Worth QM Depot	N/A	TX	1940	Quartermaster
Jeffersonville QM Depot	Jeffersonville Depot Activity	IN	1864	Quartermaster
Jersey City QM Depot	N/A	NJ	unknown	Quartermaster
Kansas City QM Depot	N/A	MO	unknown	Quartermaster
Oakland QM Depot	Oakland Army Base	CA	1941	Quartermaster
Philadelphia QM Depot	N/A	PA	unknown	Quartermaster
Washington QM Depot	N/A	DC	unknown	Quartermaster
Chicago Signal Depot	N/A	IL	unknown	Signal Corps
Dayton Signal Depot	N/A	OH	unknown	Signal Corps
Lexington Signal Depot	Lexington Army Depot	KY	unknown	Signal Corps
Ogden Signal Depot	Defense Depot Ogden	UT	1940	Signal Corps
Philadelphia Signal Depot	N/A	PA	unknown	Signal Corps
San Bernadino Signal Depot	N/A	CA	unknown	Signal Corps
Sacramento Signal Depot	Defense Depot Sacramento	CA	1942	Signal Corps

Source: Risch, Erna, *The Quartermaster Corps: Organization, Supply, and Services* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1953).

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.



between Ordnance and Quartermaster depots was the size of the facilities. Quartermaster depots ranged from 100 to 800 acres, while Ordnance depots could be as large as 20,000 acres.<sup>cxx</sup>

As early as September 1939, the Quartermaster General initiated plans for the expansion of the 12 existing depots. These plans did not achieve real momentum until the protective mobilization efforts of 1940, when the Army made additions to existing depots and constructed new facilities. By December 1941, the Quartermaster Corps increased its covered storage space by 50 per cent over the previous year. Existing storage space proved inadequate once war was declared, and the Quartermaster Corps increased its construction even further. This accelerated construction pace continued until May 1943 when the Army Service Forces terminated all depot construction, except for compelling circumstances.<sup>cxxi</sup>

The design of the Quartermaster depots also reflected the increasing shortage of building materials. During the protective mobilization phase, depots were comprised of single story warehouses with concrete floors and lofty ceilings. Railroad loading platforms spanned one side of the structure, and truck loading doors were located on the opposite building face. Depots constructed after the declaration of war reflected the War Department's temporary construction policies. The Army relied more upon open sheds to provide minimal protection to durable supplies. Commercial warehouses were leased to supplement depots and ease the burden of constructing new warehouse facilities. Yet the advantages of leasing commercial warehouses for general supplies were limited. Often the best warehouses were occupied, or were so geographically dispersed to preclude efficient operations.<sup>cxxii</sup>

Leased commercial facilities were used more widely to store subsistence supplies. During the mobilization phase, the Quartermaster Corps established regional food purchasing centers, which were responsible for supplying food to troops within their region. The Quartermaster General contracted with civilian warehouses to store food prior to distribution. Despite controversies over prices, the system worked reasonably well for non-perishable subsistence, or foodstuffs that did not require refrigeration. The system was less effective for perishable food, and the Army suffered from a failure to construct more than a handful of depot level cold storage facilities. Leased commercial cold storage warehouses were seldom available in the quantities required by the Army. The problem became especially acute in the New York area, which was responsible for supplying the European theater.<sup>cxxiii</sup>

In addition to depots that were dedicated to the Ordnance Department or Quartermaster Corps, the Army Service Forces operated several depots intended for multi-branch use. Ten such depots were operating by December 1941. They were located in Seattle, Washington; Salt Lake City, Utah; San Antonio, Texas; Memphis, Tennessee; Columbus, Ohio; Atlanta and Savannah, Georgia; Richmond, Virginia; Belle Mead, New Jersey; New Cumberland, Pennsylvania; and, Schenectady, New York.<sup>cxxiv</sup> Between April and July 1942, the Army Service Forces directly managed these depots, but that management system became unworkable. Overall responsibility for General Depots was assigned to the Office of the Quartermaster General, which served as the "landlord" for the other branches. The technical services, such as Ordnance Department, Quartermaster Corps, Corps of Engineers, and Signal Corps maintained respective storage areas, as well as their own stock record accounts. The Quartermaster Corps established general policies and assigned warehouse space. At the Atlanta General Depot, the Army Service Forces experimented with standardized and consolidated stock record accounts, but eventually abandoned the effort.<sup>cxxv</sup>

As technical services, the Corps of Engineers, Signal Corps, and Chemical Warfare Service maintained smaller depot systems that combined use of the general depots, leased storage facilities, and specially constructed depots. In addition to assigned space in the general depots, the Signal Corps managed its own depots in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Lexington, Kentucky; Dayton, Ohio; Chicago, Illinois; San Bernardino, California; and, Ogden, Utah. The Corps of Engineers operated similar depots at Albany, New York; Marion and Sharonville, Ohio; Granite City, Illinois; San Bernardino and Lathrop, California; and, Pasco, Washington.<sup>cxxvi</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

The Chemical Warfare Service initially established depots near its principal arsenals at Edgewood, Maryland; Huntsville, Alabama; and, Pine Bluff, Arkansas. These depots were in the planning stages at the time of Pearl Harbor, and were not placed in service until the fall of 1942. Despite these new depots, the Chemical Warfare Service still required more storage facilities. In early 1942, the service constructed the Deseret [sic] Chemical Warfare Depot in Tooele County, Utah. Late in the war, the Chemical Warfare Service acquired the Lake Ontario Ordnance Works in New York as an additional depot. A leased warehouse in Indianapolis for repair parts completed its depot system.<sup>cxxvii</sup>

The Materiel Division of the Army Air Forces maintained the system of separate depots for aviation specific supplies. The Air Corps operated four major supply and maintenance depots in 1939. These depots were located in Middletown, Pennsylvania; San Antonio, Texas; Fairfield, Ohio; and Sacramento, California. The facility in Sacramento, established in 1936, was the newest Air Corps Depot.<sup>cxxviii</sup> All four depots stored aircraft and repair parts, plus performed extensive overhaul of engines and equipment.<sup>cxxix</sup> Robins and Tinker Air Force Bases opened in 1941 under the Protective Mobilization Plan. As in the case of the other Army Air Force depots, these facilities served both supply and maintenance functions, that were housed in buildings whose construction combined both permanent and temporary construction.<sup>cxxx</sup>

The history of the Fairfield and San Antonio Depots illustrates typical changes to existing Air Corps facilities during the World War II era. Fairfield Air Depot, at what is now Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, became a key depot for aircraft and repair parts. The depot was expanded through large scale temporary and permanent construction. Some of the most notable permanent structures included a new engine overhaul building and a new base headquarters building. The civilian work force grew so rapidly that a new housing project, Skyway Park, was built to accommodate the workers. San Antonio Depot, at what is now Kelly Air Force Base, became a huge industrial complex. Workers established production lines to overhaul engines, bombsights, guns, and electrical equipment. Like the Fairfield Depot, it enlarged its work force tremendously, largely through the addition of women war workers.<sup>cxxxi</sup>

Hill Air Force Base, near Ogden, Utah, is an example of an Air Corps depot that began operations during the World War II era. Authorized in 1939, the depot was planned as part of a general expansion in the nation's air component. Construction of the Utah depot began in January 1940. Because the installation originated as part of a permanent expansion program, initial construction consisted of brick and other masonry buildings similar to the Army's building designs of the inter-war years. As the war progressed, temporary buildings were constructed where possible, especially for barracks and administration buildings. Still, some structures required permanent construction because of their function. Examples of permanent construction projects included warehouses, hangars, engine test facilities, and maintenance facilities. The installation contained a new housing complex known as Hillcrest Village.<sup>cxxxii</sup>

Missions of the Ogden depot encompassed both supply and maintenance functions. With the first construction just completed by December 1941, the depot contained only a few empty warehouses and stock record paperwork. After the United States entered the war, activity at the Ogden Depot mushroomed. The depot stored aircraft repair parts and Air Corps-specific equipment for units in the United States and overseas. In January 1942, the depot opened an engine test facility to support the engine rebuilding program. The largest single maintenance project began in February 1943 with the complete overhaul of B-24 "Liberator" bombers. The depot established a production line for rebuilding used aircraft from Europe and the Pacific for active service. By the close of 1943, Ogden Depot was repairing one bomber per day.<sup>cxxxiii</sup>

Another logistical function of the War Department was the transporting of large numbers of troops to the front lines. Army ports of embarkation were located on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts to facilitate the movement of personnel and materiel overseas. These activities combined leased civilian structures and temporary military construction, supplemented by permanent

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

construction only when necessary. For example, at the Hampton Roads Port of Embarkation, the principal piers, wharfs, warehouses, and related facilities for moving non-explosive supplies were leased. Ammunition facilities, however, required permanent construction. To accommodate the mass of transient service personnel, the Army constructed Camp Patrick Henry north of the port, using temporary construction.<sup>cxxxiv</sup>

### Navy Department

Similar to the War Department, the Navy Department developed an extensive system of supply depots for the receipt, storage, and issue of general supplies (Table 14). At the beginning of the war, the Navy Department had only two operating supply depots, which were located in Norfolk and San Diego. Their proximity to the major bases on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts enabled these depots to support to the fleet. The expanded operations of World War II, required rapid expansion of the Navy's supply storage facilities.

In 1940, construction began on two supply depots located near major bases. These facilities were located in Bayonne, New Jersey, and Oakland, California. At the same time, the existing Norfolk and San Diego depots received funding for additional buildings. As the war progressed, the Navy established new supply depots along the coasts, and near the major naval installations. In some cases, such as the New Orleans Depot, civilian warehouses were leased or converted. Other facilities, such as the depot at Newport, Rhode Island, were additions to existing installations.<sup>cxxxv</sup>

In 1941, the Navy initiated a new approach to its distribution system, and began to select depot sites that were not adjacent to a specific port or base. The first such depot was located in Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, and was positioned to provide back-up support to all Navy installations on the East Coast. The Mechanicsburg Depot was sited near the Army's New Cumberland Depot to encourage cooperation between the two services. In 1942, the Navy Department established inland supply depots at Clearfield, Utah, and Spokane, Washington, to service bases along the Pacific Coast. Near Barstow, California, the Navy Department created a storage depot for Marine Corps supplies. The Navy built the Scotia Depot near Schenectady, New York, to complement the Mechanicsburg depot in supporting the East Coast ports.<sup>cxxxvi</sup>

Like other Navy construction projects, the creation of a supply depot system occurred at a time when rapidly changing requirements presented new challenges for orderly development. For example, two weeks after construction began at the Mechanicsburg Depot, the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts requested that the capacity of the depot be doubled. Warehouses were often multi-story buildings (Figure 7), or else masonry and steel single-story buildings. The transportation infrastructure including roads, railroads, and loading docks, was a prerequisite to construction.<sup>cxxxvii</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

table 14

---

**TABLE 14: WORLD WAR II NAVY AND MARINE CORPS GENERAL SUPPLY DEPOTS  
(NON-ORDNANCE)**


---

Original Name	Current Name	Location	Date Established
Marine Corps Supply Depot Barstow	MARCORSUPDEP Barstow	CA	1942
Marine Corps Supply Depot Philadelphia	N/A	PA	1904
Marine Corps Supply Depot San Francisco	N/A	CA	1923
Naval Supply Depot Bayonne	Naval Supply Center Bayonne	NJ	1939
Naval Supply Depot Clearfield	NSD Clearfield	UT	1942
Naval Supply Depot Mechanicsburg	Naval Supply Center Mechanicsburg	PA	1942
Naval Supply Depot New Orleans	NSD New Orleans	LA	1940
Naval Supply Depot Newport	N/A	RI	1942
Naval Supply Depot Norfolk	FISC Norfolk	VA	1917
Naval Supply Depot Oakland	NSD Oakland	CA	1942
Naval Supply Depot San Diego	NSC San Diego	CA	1922
Naval Supply San Pedro	N/A	CA	1942
Naval Supply Depot Scotia	NSD Scotia	NY	1941
Naval Supply Depot Seattle	N/A	WA	1942
Naval Supply Depot Spokane	N/A	WA	1942

Source: United States Navy, Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases in World War II* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1947).

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

## Research, Development, and Testing

More than in previous conflicts, World War II demonstrated the importance of technological superiority. New or improved weapons were a significant advantage. The extent of the research performed during World War II is indicated by the fact that seventy-five per cent of the ordnance equipment used by the Army either was replaced completely or radically improved.<sup>cxviii</sup> The government undertook complex research and development functions in specially designed buildings at installations across the country. The unique requirements of the various research and development projects resulted in a wide range of permanent construction that cannot be characterized easily. Some construction resulted in general laboratories or office buildings, while other properties associated with research, development and testing were the product of specific designs required for the specialized activities performed at the facilities.

Within the War Department, research and development functions were divided among the various departments, principally the Ordnance Department, the Air Corps, and the Signal Corps, as well as smaller programs operated by other branches. The Ordnance Department undertook research on many types of weapons, including aviation weapons, at its proving grounds. Wright Field served as a principal engineering center for the Air Corps. The Army's communication laboratory at Fort Monmouth was the Signal Corps' research and development center.

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, was the Army's only proving ground from 1917 to World War II. Here, Ordnance Department personnel performed acceptance testing for new weapons with approved designs and development testing for new types of weapons. During the inter-war years, a single proving ground was sufficient to meet the Army's needs, but one proving ground could not accommodate the wartime expansion of research and development activity. New proving grounds such as Erie Proving Ground, Ohio; Jefferson Proving Ground, Indiana; and, Southwestern Proving Ground, Arkansas performed acceptance testing of weapons and ammunition.

Aberdeen became the primary center for developmental testing of new weapons and equipment. The Army tested new artillery, tanks, rockets, aerial bombs, trucks, and all types of new weapons at Aberdeen. During the second half of 1944, the Arms and Ammunition Division at Aberdeen completed 1,466 test projects and submitted 183 formal reports. Workers there invented such new weapons as a shoulder launched anti-tank rocket, popularly known as the bazooka.<sup>cxviii</sup> Research required new buildings. A recent survey of Aberdeen Proving Ground identified 34 research facilities and 19 test facilities constructed as permanent buildings at Aberdeen between 1940 and 1945.<sup>cxli</sup>

The Ballistics Research Laboratory at Aberdeen deserves special mention. The laboratory contained the most modern equipment for studying the movement of a projectile both within a gun barrel and while in flight. The three-story, brick R. H. Kent Building, another part of the laboratory, housed two supersonic wind tunnels to study the movement of aerial bombs and artillery shells. Scientists working here refined the design of critical weapons or developed new firing tables. Developing firing tables required extensive mathematical calculations; to simplify the process, scientists produced an elaborate electronic calculating machine. This machine, known as ENIAC, became the forerunner of the modern computer (Figure 8).<sup>cxli</sup>

Since World War I, Fort Monmouth, New Jersey, had been the home of the Signal Corps, and served both training and research purposes. A radio research laboratory existed on the installation, but it was housed in wooden buildings until 1934. In that year, the first brick laboratory building was constructed, which was used for early experiments in radar development. In World War II, the research facilities were expanded with the addition of three more brick buildings in what is known as the "Evans Area," nine miles south of the main post. Here personnel

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 7

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 8

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

developed a wide range of communications and electronic devices for the Army. In January 1946, Signal Corps personnel achieved a scientific milestone by bouncing radar signals off the moon.<sup>cxlii</sup>

Wilbur Wright Field, part of what is now Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, had served as an aeronautical engineering center for the Air Corps since 1927, under the Air Corps Materiel Division. With the reorganizations of the Air Corps during World War II, the Materiel Division was elevated to a separate command, with its responsibilities redefined to focus upon engineering. The Army constructed new facilities at Wright Field; including a massive new wind tunnel, laboratories, and testing facilities (Figure 9). The wind tunnel had a diameter of 20 feet, making it the largest wind tunnel built to that date. During the course of the war, these new testing facilities accelerated the procurement cycle for aircraft. During peacetime years, the Air Corps had followed extensive testing procedures on prototypes before purchasing quantities of an aircraft model. The demands of war necessitated the purchase of new aircraft models as soon as possible. Production orders frequently were written before a prototype was tested. To make this system work, the Air Corps relied heavily upon testing of models in the wind tunnel and testing of components in the laboratories.<sup>cxliii</sup>

Of the smaller research and development programs, the Army's Chemical Warfare Service used the facilities of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Columbia University for most of its basic research. In each case, leased laboratories became temporary government facilities. The Army still required a remote location for testing of chemical munitions, so it acquired an extensive proving ground in the Dugway Valley of Utah.<sup>cxliiv</sup>

The Quartermaster Corps utilized its depots for the research and development that it conducted during the war. Testing was required for the clothing, footwear, tentage, and personal equipment that soldiers used in climates that varied from extremely cold to tropical. After the war, the Quartermaster General concluded that the Quartermaster Corps might have produced better equipment with a facility devoted exclusively to the research and development of Quartermaster equipment. The Army subsequently persuaded Congress to authorize Natick Laboratories in Massachusetts for this type of research.<sup>cxlv</sup>

The Navy Department also maintained an active research and development program during World War II. Its programs covered all aspects of naval development, including ship design, naval ordnance, aviation, and rocket development. Older installations, such as the Communications Laboratory in Anacostia, District of Columbia, or the Naval Proving Ground at Dahlgren, Virginia, were improved. Important new installations were established during the war including the Naval Ordnance Test Station Inyokern (better known as China Lake), White Oak Naval Ordnance Laboratory, and the David Taylor Model Basin.

Prior to World War II, the Naval Proving Ground at Dahlgren devoted most of its attention to proof-firing new guns. Heavy weapons were manufactured at the Naval Gun Factory in Washington, shipped to Dahlgren by barge, and then test fired to establish the gunnery tables. Workers at the installation also performed limited experiments with new weapons and equipment, and played a key role in developing the Norden Bombsight.

With America's entry into the war, activity at Dahlgren expanded to a frantic pace, with a commensurate increase in construction activities. The installation tested heavy ships guns, machine guns, ships armor, ammunition, aviation ordnance, and other equipment (Figure 10). The importance of Dahlgren as a testing ground for the variable time fuze, which consisted of a miniature radar, was particularly noteworthy. Equally important, Dahlgren began new laboratories during the war, beginning with an armor and projectile laboratory in 1941. Thereafter, Dahlgren expanded its laboratory work to include studies of gauges and measurements, aviation ordnance, rocketry, and trajectory calculations. The trajectory calculations resulted in the use of new electronic calculating machines that were the precursors of modern computers.<sup>cxlvi</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.



Since World War I, the Washington Navy Yard contained a Naval Ordnance Laboratory that concentrated upon research on underwater mines. With the expansions of World War II, however, the laboratory soon found its facilities inadequate. The Navy constructed an expanded Naval Ordnance Laboratory in White Oak, Maryland, near Washington D.C. Construction began on the 938 acre tract in early 1944; the fifty permanent structures were scheduled for completion in 1947. The installation contained laboratories, a wind tunnel, and associated facilities. Six of the buildings were designed to study magnetic influence mines, which were underwater mines triggered by a ship's magnetic field. Design specifications required buildings that were entirely free of magnetic properties. The laboratory buildings were constructed using hollow concrete block, instead of red clay tile, which contained iron oxide; copper or bronze was substituted for ferrous metals in the nails, plumbing, and electrical fixtures.<sup>cxlvii</sup>

With its increasing reliance upon rockets and aviation weapons, the Navy sought a testing ground for rocket and aviation ordnance that would provide room for large scale testing. In March 1943, Navy officers found a suitable location at the small village of Inyokern in the middle of the California desert. The village contained a landing field and minimal utilities. A vast expanse of desert, including a dry lake bed known as China Lake, surrounded the village. Navy officers experimented with rockets and aircraft in seclusion, and the excellent flying weather guaranteed that the Navy could conduct tests during most of the year. In November 1943, the Navy began construction at the Naval Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern. The reservation covered a land area approximately the size of Rhode Island.<sup>cxlviii</sup>

Due to the wartime shortages of materials and demands for speed, the station's original plans specified considerable temporary construction. The post-war Navy need for an ordnance test station influenced the modification of this program. The station commander and the officer-in-charge-of-construction decided to emphasize permanent construction. They developed a well planned community in the desert, with space for future expansion. The installation included both laboratory facilities and a complete residential community.<sup>cxlix</sup> At Inyokern, scientists from the Navy and the California Institute of Technology created a first-class research and experimentation facility. In response to requests from combat units, they developed a High Velocity Aircraft Rocket (HVAR), which was commonly known as the "Holy Moses." This weapon proved to be particularly effective at penetrating concrete fortifications. Following the war, the station continued to be a leading center for rocket and missile experimentation.<sup>cl</sup>

The Navy had used a model ship basin in the Washington Navy Yard to test new ship designs since the beginning of the twentieth century. To allow more accurate testing of ships' hulls, Congress authorized an improved model ship basin in 1936. Construction was not completed until the beginning of the World War II era. Located in Carderock, Maryland, just outside Washington, D.C., this facility was named the David W. Taylor Model Basin. The precise experimentation on the resistance of a ship moving through the water required a research facility built to the most exacting specifications. For example, carriages mounted on rails, towed ship models through the basin; specifications required that the 5,000 feet of rail be constructed to a 0.005 inch tolerance in distance from the water in the basin. Achieving such unprecedented accuracy required that the builders adjust their measurements for the curvature of the earth. The engineers and builders met these requirements using a solid rock foundation and innovative construction techniques.<sup>cli</sup>

Other Navy ordnance installations combined research with production functions. For example, the Newport Torpedo Station and the Keyport Torpedo Station, both produced

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 9

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 10

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

or overhauled torpedoes. The facility also tested new models and engineered improvements to existing models.<sup>clii</sup>

## **Medical Facilities**

For both the War and Navy Departments, hospital construction required a balance between wartime material shortages and the desire to provide the best possible medical facilities. Not surprisingly, the Surgeons General of both services advocated permanent or semi-permanent construction, citing fire prevention and anticipated future use. The medical departments' desire for permanent construction met with little support from the Army and Navy leadership, who promoted temporary construction whenever possible.

War Department hospital construction fluctuated between temporary and semi-permanent construction (Table 15). Pre-war plans called for the expansion of existing hospitals, but existing facilities did not easily accommodate expansion. During the protective mobilization phase, the Army constructed hospitals resembling the temporary barracks built during these years. The hospital consisted of one-story wards, connected by extensive corridor systems. Later, the Surgeon General obtained permission to build semi-permanent brick hospitals, but the victory was short-lived. With the entry into the war, the Army Chief of Staff ordered that temporary construction be used for general and station hospitals. The Chief of Staff later imposed even more stringent economy measures on hospital construction, including "theater-of-operations" barracks for hospital personnel. As a further economy measure, the Army leased civilian hotels or other facilities to serve as hospitals.<sup>cliii</sup>

As the war progressed, permanent and semi-permanent construction again became a possibility. By the summer of 1942, many locations suffered from lumber shortages, while brick and tile were available. Moreover, the Veterans Administration argued that Army hospitals should be designed for long-term care of veterans. Consequently, the Army constructed twenty-two semi-permanent general hospitals. Additionally, McGuire Hospital, Virginia, and Vaughan Hospital, Illinois, were designed in cooperation with the Veterans Administration for its use after the war. Twenty-four Army general hospitals, both temporary and permanent, were transferred to the Veterans Administration at the end of the war. Of the Army general hospitals that opened during World War II, 23 were of semi-permanent construction, 11 were converted civilian facilities, 22 were wooden cantonment hospitals, and 4 were masonry cantonment hospitals. Of the wartime semi-permanent general hospitals, only those near Fort Lewis, Fort Carson, and Camp Atterbury were retained in the Army inventory as of 1951.<sup>cliv</sup>

Navy hospital construction consisted of a combination of new facilities and additions to existing hospitals (Table 16). Medical facilities at new training installations, such as Sampson, New York, or Farragut, Idaho, consisted entirely of temporary buildings. Other major wartime hospitals, such as St Albans, New York, or Corona, California, consisted entirely, or predominately, of temporary buildings. Existing hospitals were expanded through either permanent or temporary buildings. As in the case of the War Department, the Navy Department also faced pressure from the Veterans Administration to construct hospitals suitable for long term use. The Navy hospital at Dublin, Georgia, a brick, Colonial Revival style complex, was constructed to be transferred to the Veterans Administration after the war.<sup>clv</sup>

Some of the most noteworthy hospitals associated with World War II, were planned before the war, and opened during the World War II era. Fitzsimons Army Hospital, in Denver, Colorado, operated as a tuberculosis hospital since 1918. In 1938, the Army began construction on a new main building that opened just four days before the attack on Pearl Harbor. Victims of that battle were among some of its first patients. Brooke General Hospital, at Fort Sam Houston, opened

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

table 15

**TABLE 15: WORLD WAR II ARMY GENERAL HOSPITALS**

<b>WWII Name</b>	<b>Current DoD Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date<sup>1</sup></b>
Army and Navy General Hospital	N/A	Hot Springs, AR	1887
Ashburn General Hospital	N/A	McKinney, TX	1943
Ashford General Hospital	N/A	White Sulphur Springs, WV	1942
Barnes General Hospital	N/A	Vancouver, WA	1941
Battey General Hospital	N/A	Rome, GA	1943
Baxter General Hospital	N/A	Spokane, WA	1943
Billings General Hospital	Ft. Benjamin Harrison	Ft. Benjamin Harrison, IN	1941
Birmingham General Hospital	N/A	Van Nuys, CA	1944
Borden General Hospital	N/A	Chickasha, OK	1943
Brooke General Hospital	Ft. Sam Houston	Ft. Sam Houston, TX	1942
Bruns General Hospital	N/A	Santa Fe, NM	1943
Bushnell General Hospital	N/A	Brigham City, UT	1942
Crile General Hospital	N/A	Cleveland, OH	1944
Cushing General Hospital	N/A	Framingham, MA	1944
Darnall General Hospital	N/A	Danville, KY	1942
Deshon General Hospital	N/A	Butler, PA	1942
DeWitt General Hospital	N.A	Auburn, CA	1944
Dibble General Hospital	N/A	Menlo Park, CA	1944
Finney General Hospital	N/A	Thomasville, GA	1943
Fitzsimons General Hospital	Fitzsimons Army Medical Center	Aurora, CO	1918
Fletcher General Hospital	N/A	Cambridge, OH	1943
Foster General Hospital	N/A	Jackson, MS	1943
Gardiner General Hospital	N/A	Chicago, IL	1943
Glennan General Hospital	N/A	Okmulgee, OK	1943

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

WWII Name	Current DoD Name	Location	Date <sup>1</sup>
(POW)			
Halloran General Hospital	N/A	Willowbrook, S.I., NY	1942
Hammond General Hospital	N/A	Modesto, CA	1942
Harmon General Hospital	N/A	Longview, TX	1942
Hoff General Hospital	N/A	Santa Barbara, CA	1941
Kennedy General Hospital	N/A	Memphis, TN	1943
LaGarde General Hospital	N/A	New Orleans, LA	1941
Lawson General Hospital	N/A	Atlanta, GA	1941
Letterman General Hospital	Letterman Army Medical Center	San Francisco, CA	1941
Lovell General Hospital	Ft. Devens	Ft. Devens, MA	1941
Madigan General Hospital	Madigan Army Medical Center	Tacoma, WA	1941
Mason General Hospital	N/A	Brentwood, L.I., NY	1943
Mayo General Hospital	N/A	Galesburg, IL	1944
McCaw General Hospital	N/A	Walla Walla, WA	1943
McCloskey General Hospital	N/A	Temple, TX	1942
McGuire General Hospital	N/A	Richmond, VA	1944
Moore General Hospital	N/A	Swannanoa, NC	1942
Newton D. Baker General Hospital	N/A	Martinsburg, WV	1944
Nichols General Hospital	N/A	Louisville, KY	1942
Northington General Hospital	N/A	Tuscaloosa, AL	1943
Oliver General Hospital	N/A	Augusta, GA	1943
O'Reilly General Hospital	N/A	Springfield, MO	1941
Percy Jones General Hospital	N/A	Battle Creek, MI	1943
POW General Hospital No.2	N/A	Camp Forrest, TN	1944
Rhoads General Hospital	N/A	Utica, NY	1943
Schick General Hospital	N/A	Clinton, IA	1943
Stark General Hospital	N/A	Charleston, SC	1941
Thayer General Hospital	N/A	Nashville, TN	1943
Thomas M. England	N/A	Atlantic City, NJ	1943

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

WWII Name	Current DoD Name	Location	Date <sup>1</sup>
General Hospital			
Tilton General Hospital	Ft. Dix	Ft. Dix, NJ	1941
Torney General Hospital	N/A	Palm Springs, CA	1942
U.S. Army General Hospital, Camp Butner	N/A	Wilkins, NC	1945
U.S. Army General Hospital, Camp Carson	N/A	Colorado Springs, CO	1945
U.S. Army General Hospital, Camp Edwards	N/A	Falmouth, MA	1945
U.S. Army General Hospital, Camp Pickett	Fort Pickett	Blackstone, VA	1945
Valley Forge General Hospital	N/A	Phoenixville, PA	1943
Vaughan General Hospital	N/A	Hines, IL	1944
Wakeman General Hospital	N/A	Camp Atterbury, IN	1944
Walter Reed General Hospital	Walter Reed Army Medical Center	Washington, DC	1909
William Beaumont General Hospital	William Beaumont Army Medical Center	El Paso, TX	1921
Winter General Hospital	N/A	Topeka, KS	1943
Woodrow Wilson General Hospital	N/A	Staunton, VA	1943

<sup>1</sup> Date ready for or received first patient.

Source: Clarence McKittrick Smith, *The Medical Department: Hospitalization and Evacuation, Zone of the Interior* (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Chief of Military History, Department of the Army, 1956): 304-313.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

table 16

**TABLE 16: WORLD WAR II NAVAL HOSPITALS**

<b>WWII Name</b>	<b>Current DoD Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date<sup>1</sup> Established</b>
U.S. Naval Hospital	U.S. Naval Academy Clinic	Annapolis, MD	1907
U.S. Naval Convalescent Hospital <sup>2</sup>	N/A	Asbury Park, NJ	1945
U.S. Naval Convalescent Hospital	N/A	Asheville, NC	1943
U.S. Naval Hospital	N/A	Astoria, OR	1943
U.S. Naval Hospital	N/A	Bainbridge, MD	1942
U.S. Naval Convalescent Hospital	N/A	Banning, CA	1944
U.S. Naval Convalescent Hospital	N/A	Beaumont, CA	1944
Naval Medical Center	Bethesda Naval Medical Center	Bethesda, MD	1939
U.S. Naval Hospital	N/A	Brooklyn, NY	1942
U.S. Naval Convalescent Hospital (Sea Gate)	N/A	Brooklyn, NY	1944
U.S. Naval Hospital	Charleston Naval Base <sup>3</sup>	Charleston, SC	1917
U.S. Naval Hospital	N/A	Chelsea, MA	1823
U.S. Naval Hospital	N/A	Corona, CA	1942
U.S. Naval Hospital	Corpus Christi Naval Hospital	Corpus Christi, TX	1940
U.S. Naval Hospital	N/A	Dublin, GA	1943
U.S. Naval Hospital	N/A	Farragut, ID	1942
U.S. Naval Convalescent Hospital	N/A	Glenwood Springs, CO	1943
U.S. Naval Hospital	Great Lakes Naval Hospital	Great Lakes, IL	1904
U.S. Naval Convalescent Hospital	N/A	Harriman, NY	1942

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.



<b>WWII Name</b>	<b>Current DoD Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date<sup>1</sup> Established</b>
U.S. Naval Hospital	N/A	Houston, TX	1945
U.S. Naval Hospital	Jacksonville Naval Hospital	Jacksonville, FL	1941
U.S. Naval Convalescent Hospital (Sun Valley)	N/A	Ketchum, ID	1943
U.S. Naval Hospital	Key West Naval Regional Medical Clinic	Key West, FL	1941
U.S. Naval Hospital	Long Beach Naval Hospital	Long Beach, CA	1940
U.S. Naval Hospital	Mare Island Naval Shipyard	Mare Island, CA	1854
U.S. Naval Hospital	Memphis Naval Hospital	Memphis, TN	1942
U.S. Naval Hospital (Camp Lejeune)	Camp Lejeune Naval Hospital	New River, NC	1942
U.S. Naval Hospital	N/A	New Orleans, LA	1942
U.S. Naval Hospital	Newport Naval Education and Training Center	Newport, RI	1913
U.S. Naval Hospital (N.O.B.)	Norfolk Naval Base	Norfolk, VA	1942
U.S. Naval Hospital	N/A	Norman, OK	1942
U.S. Naval Hospital	Oakland Naval Medical Center	Oakland, CA	1942
U.S. Naval Hospital (Santa Margarita Ranch)	Camp Pendleton	Oceanside, CA	1942
U.S. Naval Hospital	Parris Island MCRD	Parris Island, SC	1918
U.S. Naval Hospital	Pensacola Naval Hospital	Pensacola, FL	1828
U.S. Naval Hospital	Philadelphia Naval Medical Center	Philadelphia, PA	1935
U.S. Naval Hospital	Portsmouth Naval Shipyard	Portsmouth, NH	1900
U.S. Naval Hospital	Portsmouth Naval Medical Center	Portsmouth, VA	1830
U.S. Naval Hospital	Bremerton Naval Hospital	Puget Sound, WA	1925
U.S. Naval Hospital	Naval Regional Medical Clinic	Quantico, VA	1939
U.S. Naval Hospital	N/A	St. Albans, NY	1942

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

WWII Name	Current DoD Name	Location	Date <sup>1</sup> Established
U.S. Naval Hospital	N/A	Sampson, NY	1942
U.S. Naval Convalescent Hospital (Arrowhead Springs)	N/A	San Bernardino, CA	1944
U.S. Naval Hospital	San Diego Naval Medical Center	San Diego, CA	1922
U.S. Naval Convalescent Hospital	N/A	Santa Cruz, CA	1942
U.S. Naval Hospital	N/A	San Leandro, CA	1942
U.S. Naval Hospital	N/A	Seattle, WA	1942
U.S. Naval Hospital	N/A	Shoemaker, CA	1943
U.S. Naval Convalescent Hospital	N/A	Springfield, MA	1944
U.S. Naval Convalescent Hospital	N/A	Yosemite National Park, CA	1943

<sup>1</sup> The dates listed reflect the dates the hospitals, not necessarily the adjacent naval activities, were established.

<sup>2</sup> In 1945, Convalescent Hospitals were renamed Special Hospitals due their expanded range of functions.

<sup>3</sup> The current DoD name listed in this column reflects, to the greatest extent possible based on available information, the name of the activity currently using the facilities that formerly housed the World War II Naval Hospitals. In some cases, the World War II hospital buildings have been converted to other non-medical uses. For example, at Charleston Naval Base the old hospital buildings house the Commander Naval Base. A new hospital was built nearby.

Source: United States Navy, Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases in*

*World War II* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1947).

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

as a permanent general hospital in September 1942.<sup>clvi</sup> The Bethesda Navy hospital was authorized in the 1939 appropriations act; construction continued through the early war years. The main tower and hospital complex opened in April 1943. In 1942, even before the building was completed, construction began for two additional wards.<sup>clvii</sup> These three general hospitals followed the precedent of recent civilian hospitals and adopted a centralized, multi-story tower design, rather than the one- to three-story, dispersed ward design of earlier and wartime hospitals.

## **Strategic Communications**

Both the War and Navy Departments operated strategic communications systems. Strategic communications systems were those that reached military units stationed throughout the world, not routine installation communications buildings. While both services had extensive overseas communications systems, a small number of specialized communications installations existed within the United States.

Both services relied upon existing civilian communications organizations to the maximum extent feasible. For example, the Army Command and Administrative Network leased the entire communication system of Globe Wireless Corporation, and additional communications facilities near Chicago, New Orleans, Seattle, and Los Angeles. The Navy leased approximately eighty per cent of its telephone lines.<sup>clviii</sup>

Still, the military, especially the Navy, considered some installations with specially designed, high powered communications capabilities necessary. The Navy's oldest communications facility, at Point Loma near San Diego, was improved and expanded during the war to improve communications within the Pacific. Near Washington, D.C., the Navy improved its World War I era transmitting station at Annapolis through the installation of powerful new transmitters. For receiving messages near the nation's capital, the Navy built a communications station at Cheltenham in Prince George's County, Maryland. During its peak operations, the Cheltenham station could receive an average of four hundred million words per month.<sup>clix</sup>

One of the most ambitious construction projects of the war was undertaken on the windward side of the island of Oahu, Hawaii. Here the Navy sought to construct a radio transmitter powerful enough to reach submarines near Australia and Japan. Communications personnel found the desired location in the Haiku valley, where 2,000-foot cliffs rose from the jungle floor. To install transmitters along the cliffs, workers hacked their way through the jungle and scaled the cliffs. By August 1943, the station transmitted its first messages.<sup>clx</sup>

Despite its heavy reliance upon leased commercial facilities, the Army Command and Administrative Network (ACAN) also required specialized installations. The main Army transmitting station was located at Fort Myer, Virginia, and provided access to the White House. The Fort Myer terminal relied upon stations at nearby La Plata, Maryland, and Battery Cove, Virginia. The ACAN also operated stand-by circuits at Seattle, Fort Omaha, Wright Field, and Governors Island. Overseas, the Army maintained an extensive system at such remote locations as Ascension Island or Iceland.<sup>clxi</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

## CHAPTER VI

### INDUSTRIAL PERMANENT CONSTRUCTION

Industrial construction included facilities and installations constructed for the purpose of producing war materiel. Two types of industrial complexes were constructed: heavy industry factories to produce aircraft, tanks, and artillery; and, ammunition production facilities. Industrial production was a critical element of the war effort. While the military preferred to rely upon private contractors for manufacturing its war material, the private sector was unable to perform some processes. Production of materiel such as ammunition, explosives, or weapons required specialized industrial facilities that were not readily available within America's industries.

Many American industries, such as clothing or textile manufacturers, could be converted to wartime production with few or no changes. In some cases, the conversion required more imagination than physical re-tooling. One Connecticut toy producer assembled electric motors for trains; the same motors could be used for military purposes, including in aircraft. A cosmetic case manufacturer adapted his product for use as cases for incendiary munitions.<sup>clxii</sup> In 1938, Congress implemented an innovative program known as educational orders, which consisted of small contracts to familiarize industry with military requirements.<sup>clxiii</sup>

The production of some products required major spatial and engineering changes to the factories. Businesses were reluctant to invest money in facilities for the production of goods that would have a minimal post-war market. Business customarily recovered the cost of capital improvements through price adjustments. The unknown length of the war, with its markets for military products, made it impossible for business to factor the cost of capital improvements into the unit price.

To overcome this obstacle, the federal government explored ways to encourage the involvement of private industry in war production. The government offered an accelerated tax amortization to companies certified by the War or Navy Departments. In August 1940, the government created the Defense Plant Corporation, a federally-sponsored enterprise, similar to the Farm Security Administration. The Defense Plant Corporation loaned money to build new factories, while retaining title to the facility. The factory operator had the option of either repaying the mortgage or allowing the government to take possession of the plant.<sup>clxiv</sup>

Of all the methods used to stimulate industrial construction, the Government-Owned, Contractor-Operated (GOCO) facility has the most relevance to this study. The War and Navy Departments built complete industrial facilities and declared them military installations. The services retained established corporations to operate the facilities to compensate for the military's lack of expertise in industrial production or management. The contractors assumed responsibility for most personnel actions, production schedules, quality control, and other tasks associated with factory operations. In some cases, the contractor also assumed responsibility for the design and construction of the installation. The services assigned a small contingent to represent the interests of the government at each GOCO facility.

#### **Ammunition Production**

Facilities associated with ammunition production accounted for one of the largest categories of World War II permanent construction. These plants cost approximately three billion dollars in capital investment, and operated with annual budgets approaching one billion dollars. Government ammunition plants employed an estimated quarter million workers, and occupied a land area equalling that of New York City, Philadelphia, and Chicago combined.<sup>clxv</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

The GOCO program was exceptionally well suited to the production of ammunition and explosives. Ammunition production required buildings that could not be adapted to civilian use. The chemical processes were such that the production lines could produce only explosives. Building designs were developed to minimize the danger posed by explosions and included masonry walls with weak points to vent an explosion. Facilities occupied extensive tracts of land due to the requirements for dispersed buildings.

The experiences of U.S. corporations during World War I made private industry reluctant to produce ammunition during World War II. Throughout the 1920s and 1930s, critics of the munitions industries charged that private industry made excessive profits from wartime production. Senator Russell Nye was a particularly vocal critic of the role of private manufacturers through some well publicized hearings. Other critics labeled ammunition manufacturers as "merchants of death." As a result, private industries were reluctant to undertake extensive investments in plants and equipment that had no peacetime application, only to be caricatured as "merchants of death."

Government ownership of the production facilities offered an additional advantage from the government's point of view. After the crisis, ordnance facilities could be placed on stand-by status, and be available for future emergencies. If stand-by buildings were available, then the military could enter wartime production without the construction delays experienced in 1940 and 1941.<sup>clxvi</sup>

The critical shortage of ammunition in 1940 made the construction of ammunition plants essential for a credible defense program. Even as Hitler's army was marching through France, the United States lacked sufficient ammunition for a single day's fighting. The War or Navy Department Ordnance facilities produced the minuscule quantities of military ammunition required during peacetime, while commercial chemical companies, especially E. I. DuPont and Hercules Powder Company, manufactured powder for sportsmen. America lacked the necessary military ammunition for any conflict.<sup>clxvii</sup>

The few existing War and Navy Department installations that produced ammunition in small quantities during the inter-war years were invaluable assets in preparing the United States for the massive ammunition production necessary during World War II. Picatinny Arsenal and Indian Head Powder Plant produced military explosives. Frankford Arsenal assembled finished artillery and small arms ammunition. Though they were operated at a reduced rate of production, these installations preserved a knowledge of the special techniques and problems of producing military explosives and ammunition. Although munitions manufacturers still would require considerable training, the United States possessed a base of knowledge.<sup>clxviii</sup>

The War Department divided its ammunition production facilities into Ordnance Works and Ordnance Plants, which were usually GOCOs. Ordnance Works produced ordnance; Ordnance Plants loaded ordnance. The War Department used Ordnance Works to produce high explosives, smokeless powder, ammonia, or the chemical ingredients for explosives. Rounds or powder bags were loaded at Ordnance Plants. The War Department constructed 25 loading and component plants, 21 high-explosive/smokeless powder works, and 12 chemical works.<sup>clxix</sup> Although Gadsden Ordnance Plant manufactured artillery shells, metal components usually were manufactured at contractor-owned facilities.<sup>clxx</sup>

The Navy Department relied upon the War Department for propellants and high explosives beyond the capacity of its powder factory at Indian Head, Maryland. This arrangement was the result of a 1920s agreement that prevented the two departments from competing against each other. The Army agreed to provide the necessary explosive material for both services. The Navy loaded explosives into shells and assembled finished rounds at its ammunition depots, including Crane, McAlester, and Hastings Depots. Other Navy Ordnance activities performed specialized ammunition work. Hingham Depot, Massachusetts, loaded small caliber ammunition, while the Yorktown Mine Depot, Virginia, poured explosives into underwater mines.<sup>clxxi</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

Ammunition facilities were located in the interior of the country, away from the coastlines and borders, to minimize the dangers from enemy air raids. Other requirements for site selection included access to transportation, especially rail lines, and an abundant supply of water. The installations were located in rural areas, to obtain the large tracts of land required. These site selection criteria resulted in the construction of most of the ammunition facilities in the Midwest and Southeast.<sup>clxxii</sup>

Government-owned ammunition facilities were similar in design and construction. Speed of construction and economy in production partially offset the requirements for the substantial masonry and steel construction that normally characterized industrial facilities. The resulting buildings reflected this compromise between permanent and temporary construction; the trend toward expedient, less substantial, building construction became more pronounced as the war progressed.

In August 1940, as the Army contracted for its first ammunition facilities, construction specifications called for facilities comprised entirely of permanent buildings and structures. As the cost of permanent construction became apparent, Army officers sought to contain costs as much as possible. In January 1941, Major General Levin Campbell, then chief of the Ordnance Department Industrial Services, complained about the excessive construction costs to Brehon Somervell, then Chief of the Quartermaster Construction Division. Somervell responded with a directive to reduce costs where possible: "There is no excuse for masonry structures, monumental or otherwise, where a light frame structure will serve the purpose. There is no excuse for the use of expensive materials where less costly ones will serve the purpose for the period of time for which the construction is being provided." This directive did not affect Indiana Ordnance Works, which was close to completion; the design of all other ordnance facilities reflected this new drive towards economy.<sup>clxxiii</sup>

In practice, the requirements for working with large quantities of explosives limited the ability to economize on construction. Although the contract for the Louisiana Ordnance Plant specifically forbade construction of permanent buildings without the prior authorization of the Secretary of War, buildings generally were constructed with concrete floors or asbestos siding.<sup>clxxiv</sup> The Lone Star Ordnance Plant divided its buildings into four categories. Wood frame construction was used for administrative buildings and the hospital. Composite construction, with masonry walls and wood roofs, was used for minor caliber production lines and auxiliary lines. The ammonium nitrate plant, major caliber lines, and inert storage warehouse used steel truss construction, with masonry walls and concrete floors. Explosive storage magazines were constructed from reinforced concrete.<sup>clxxv</sup>

As the war progressed, steel shortages hindered facility construction. Builders used all available methods of construction to minimize the use of steel. Masonry or timber was substituted for steel wherever possible. The Army also saved steel by reducing the amount of steel reinforcement in concrete igloos. This savings was substantial due to the tens of thousands of these magazines built during the war. Early in 1942, the Dupont Corporation suggested that the government could achieve further cost reductions through the use of asbestos siding for process buildings and frame construction for shops and administrative buildings. These suggestions first were implemented in the West Virginia Ordnance Works, and were adopted for the remainder of the war. In April 1942, the War Department decided to subordinate safety considerations to economy measures even further through the construction of a small arms ammunition plant using predominately temporary construction.<sup>clxxvi</sup>

The danger of explosion was addressed in the overall architectural program. The most apparent safety feature was the wide dispersal of buildings on the site, intended to prevent the spread of explosions. For example, the Kingsbury Ordnance Plant occupied 13,454 acres, with buildings connected by railroad lines. Buildings were designed with structurally stronger interior walls than exterior walls, in order to direct an explosion outward. The break room contained an electric cigarette lighter, so that workers could smoke on their breaks without violating rules prohibiting matches. Radford Ordnance Works contained similar features, including stationing the

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

operator of the pressing machine behind a wall so that he or she could observe the operations through a window.<sup>clxxvii</sup>

Regardless of the specific product, all ammunition facilities followed a similar architectural program for support buildings. Each facility contained administrative offices, fire stations, and buildings for security forces. An immense amount of water was required for these operations, therefore, most facilities contained their own water treatment and sewage plants. Where sufficient electricity was not available from local companies, ammunition facilities included their own electrical generating plants. Each installation also contained its own medical buildings, either a dispensary or a hospital. Change and shower houses, of either frame or brick construction, were especially important because they allowed workers to remove toxic chemicals before leaving work.<sup>clxxviii</sup>

Each facility also contained special structures to store explosive materials. High explosives ammunition storage buildings, known in the Army as "igloos," had a concrete floor with an arched, steel-reinforced concrete roof structure. The sides were bermed with earth, so that explosions were directed upwards. Despite efforts to reduce the amount of steel in each structure, igloo construction still consumed a substantial amount of steel. In 1942, the Corbetta Construction Company devised a "beehive" shaped magazine that required less construction material.<sup>clxxix</sup>

Ordnance works produced propellants, high explosives, or the chemical ingredients for explosives. Propellants consisted of the charge that projected a round out of the barrel. Smokeless powder, derived from nitrocellulose, was the most common propellant. High explosives consisted of the charge within the shell that exploded upon impact. Because of its relative stability until detonation, trinitrotoluene, or TNT, was the preferred high explosive. Other explosives consisted of primers, which were sensitive materials used to start an explosion, and boosters, which were charges used to ensure a complete explosion (Figure 11). Anhydrous ammonia was the most common basic ingredient for all explosives. Anhydrous ammonia is the gaseous form of ammonia, and consists of a combination of hydrogen and nitrogen. The chemical was used to produce nitric acid, and the nitrates necessary for explosives.<sup>clxxx</sup>

Once the basic ingredients had been produced, artillery rounds and aerial bombs were assembled at Ordnance Plants for the War Department or Ordnance Depots for the Navy Department. At these facilities the finished rounds or bombs were prepared for use overseas. Most shell filling plants operated several types of production lines, for large or small caliber artillery and for aerial bombs.

The process of shell filling began with melting TNT and pouring it into empty shells. Due to the need to prevent cavitation, or the formation of air pockets during the cooling process, this procedure proved more difficult than most contractors anticipated. After pouring the TNT, a fuze or plug was inserted in the nose of the projectile. The projectile then was painted and labeled

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 11

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.



before the final assembly of the completed round. In most cases, the round was completed by attaching the projectile to a cartridge case that contained a pre-measured quantity of smokeless powder and a primer. For larger caliber ammunition, however, the projectile, propellant, and primer were packaged separately (Figure 12). These processes are discussed in more detail in Chapter VIII.

Metal components for fuzes, with their delicate mechanisms presented special problems to the military. During the inter-war years, workers at Frankford Arsenal had preserved a knowledge of fuze production, but the arsenal lacked the capacity for mass production. The Ordnance Department therefore contracted with private manufactures experienced in precision metal work, such as watch or clock manufacturers. Once the metal components of the fuzes were assembled, the explosive components were loaded at Army ordnance plants. A typical ordnance plant contained smaller loading lines for final assembly of the fuzes with the explosive material. A typical ordnance plant also contained lines for loading explosives into boosters, primers, and percussion elements.<sup>clxxxix</sup>

The Navy followed procedures similar to the Army for final assembly of fuzes. It contracted with Reynolds Corporation to operate a GOCO at Macon, Georgia. Metal parts were produced at privately owned factories. At Macon, workers added explosive material and completed the final assembly of the fuzes, which were shipped to Navy depots.<sup>clxxxii</sup>

Although high explosives constituted the bulk of artillery or bomb ammunition, other types of artillery ammunition included a wide range of special purpose shells. Other types of ammunition included pyrotechnics for illuminating the battlefield, or shells stuffed with propaganda leaflets. Redstone Arsenal acquired the mission of loading shells with chemical munitions. Such chemical munitions included toxic gases to deter Axis use of gases, plus flame and smoke.<sup>clxxxiii</sup>

In practice, the production of artillery ammunition was extremely complicated. Artillery ammunition required the most precise tolerances, especially in distribution or weight. Any cavities in the round created by the cooling of TNT could cause the round to become erratic in flight. Therefore all Ordnance facilities required extensive quality control programs. Changes in demand for specific types of ammunition also required constant adjustments to production lines.<sup>clxxxiv</sup>

Safety and toxicology presented constant challenges in ammunition production. During the first months of the war three explosions killed 83 workers. Later, however, government and industry safety efforts produced an enviable safety record for such a dangerous industry. The chemicals required for munitions production were toxic, even when absorbed through the skin. Workers therefore required protective clothing, with special laundry facilities. Following each shift, workers showered with a special soap that turned violet in the presence of TNT (Figure 13).<sup>clxxxv</sup>

Small arms ammunition for rifles, pistols, and machine guns constituted an entirely different category of ammunition, which was manufactured at War Department Ordnance Plants. The operating process consisted of shaping cartridge cases, shaping the projectile, loading powder and primer into the cartridge case, and attaching the projectile to the cartridge case. A series of machining and heat treating operations shaped brass cups into cartridge cases. A similar series of operations shaped the copper jacket of the projectile, which was then filled with a lead slug or other suitable center. A small quantity of smokeless powder was added to the cartridge as the propellant. The primer consisted of a sensitive explosive, usually mercury fulminate that detonated when struck by a firing pin. The entire assembly was crimped together. Production of small arms ammunition also required strict adherence to Army specifications; yet the requirements for literally billions of rounds forced the producers to produce with extraordinary speed and still meet the quality control requirements.<sup>clxxxvi</sup>

Late in 1941, Brehon Somervell surveyed the progress of munitions construction and its effect upon defense preparations.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

The whole interior of the United States of America has been transformed into a vast network of great munitions factories, the output of which will forever render this country free of dependence upon any other country for the tools of self-defense.

...

Today they are producing TNT and DNT, anhydrous ammonia, smokeless powder, toluol, shell forgings, small arms ammunition, armor-piercing cores for shells, armor plate, chemical warfare material, machine guns, rifles and tanks, while others are loading shells and powder-bags. Yet others have been recently authorized and still others are planned.<sup>clxxxvii</sup>

In the years that followed Somervell's remarks, the United States constructed even more ammunition facilities. By the end of the war, the American ammunition industry had produced 10,958,454 tons of artillery ammunition; 476,312 tons of mortar ammunition; 462,029 tons of grenades, pyrotechnics or mines; 5,989,603 tons of bombs and rockets; and, 38,866,000,000 rounds of small arms ammunition.<sup>clxxxviii</sup>

American soldiers employed the products of the these plants with devastating effectiveness. They placed tons of explosives upon the enemy through artillery and aerial bombardments. In the attack upon Cassino alone, American forces fired nearly 11,000 tons of artillery. Perhaps the effects of the ammunition production program was summarized best by a captured German officer who complained that "You people expend artillery ammunition, but mine expend only the bodies of men."<sup>clxxxix</sup>

## **Artillery and Associated Components**

Both the War and Navy Departments met the need for artillery and associated components utilizing existing facilities, new government-owned factories, and contractors. The combination integrated government technical expertise with mass production capabilities. Artillery, especially large caliber weapons, required special processes. The proper cooling of barrels was particularly important, to strengthen their performance while fired. Other components required extreme precision.

Since 1887, the Army produced heavy artillery, primarily coastal artillery, at Watervliet Arsenal, New York. During the inter-war years, Watervliet was the Army's repository of knowledge on the production of artillery. When the nation began its military expansion in 1940, Watervliet became the primary facility for instructing civilian contractors in artillery production, as factory representatives trained at Watervliet. The Arsenal continued to produce artillery tubes. Perhaps the most important production activity of Watervliet was the 155mm and larger caliber howitzers, which were produced exclusively at Watervliet due to the installation's technical capabilities.<sup>cx</sup>

The arsenal also expanded its facilities with the addition of at least twelve new buildings. In keeping with its expanded missions, Watervliet acquired twenty more acres for the new buildings. One of the these, Building 135, built in 1942-43, was reputed to be the finest cannon factory in the world at the time of its construction. The large 300 by 600 ft building was constructed with a heavy structural steel frame partially clad in brick with large expanses of industrial windows.<sup>cxci</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 12

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 13

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, performed a similar function for artillery carriages, recoil mechanisms, and other components. The arsenal personnel both advised private industry and produced the items. Like almost every other military installation, Rock Island Arsenal reached a hectic pace of activity with America's entry into the war. Work continued on artillery carriages and parts, and expanded to include machine gun production. Buildings to accompany the new activities included an 18-acre ordnance warehouse, new assembly buildings, a forge shop, and a new post headquarters. To conserve steel, these buildings were constructed in concrete to the maximum extent possible.<sup>cxci</sup>

The Washington Navy Yard, site of the Navy's gun factory, could not meet the ordnance requirements of the Navy, despite the addition of new buildings. Instead, Washington Navy Yard personnel provided technical assistance to other weapons producers, both Navy GOCOs and civilian contractors. A Navy historian compared the role of the Navy Gun Factory to that of a manager or executive, delegating routine tasks to other facilities and retaining the most difficult tasks for itself.<sup>cxcii</sup>

In 1940, Congress authorized the Navy Department to create new GOCO facilities to supplement its Gun Factory at the Washington Navy Yard. These facilities included the Center Line Naval Ordnance Plant, Michigan; the Canton Naval Ordnance Plant, Ohio; and, the Louisville Naval Ordnance Plant, Kentucky. Hudson Motor Company operated the Center Line facility, while Westinghouse operated the other two plants. All work was undertaken on a cost plus fixed-fee basis. Working under the direction of the Naval Gun Factory, the Center Line and Canton plants produced limited quantities of weapons and components. In effect, these plants operated as "job shops." One notable exception to this operation was the long term manufacture of 20mm anti-aircraft guns by the Center Line Plant. The Louisville Plant assembled the products of the other two plants.<sup>cxciiv</sup>

Other Navy facilities completed the government-owned gun factories. The General Machinery Corporation operated part of the Charleston Naval Ordnance Plant to produce 3-, 5-, and 6-inch guns. Near the West Coast, the Navy established the Naval Ordnance Plant Pocatello to reline and service heavy guns coming from the Pacific fleet. War demands soon caused the facility to expand to the manufacture and repair all types of naval guns. The Pocatello plant was a government-owned, government-operated installation. Its workers were all civil service employees. A Marine Corps detachment provided security for the plant.<sup>cxciiv</sup>

York Naval Ordnance Plant was an unusual case. It originated as a privately owned facility, producing 40mm "Bofors" anti-aircraft guns. Because the contractor, York Safe and Lock Company, proved unsatisfactory, the government took possession of the plant in January 1944, and the Navy completed condemnation proceedings in May 1944. Thereafter, York was operated as a GOCO under a contract with Blow Knox Corporation to produce 40mm anti-aircraft guns.<sup>cxciiv</sup>

## **Tank Production**

In their pre-war planning process, Army Ordnance officers assumed that the Army's limited need for tanks could be met through contracting to locomotive manufacturers. Railroad equipment required the same heavy steel forgings used in tanks, so locomotive companies appeared a natural choice for this type of work. Nevertheless, the Army had devoted little thought to the problems of tank production. Even when the Army began to place educational orders to defense industries in 1939 and 1940, only two minor contracts were devoted to tank production.<sup>cxciiv</sup>

In large measure, this oversight in planning for tank production can be attributed to attitudes toward armored warfare during the inter-war years. Even though tanks were valuable during World War I, the Army did little to develop a coherent doctrine for employment of tanks after the war. Until 1932, the Infantry developed tank doctrine at its Tank School at Fort Meade. In that year, the Chief of Infantry discontinued the separate school and incorporated tank doctrine in the Infantry School at

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

Fort Benning. An experimental Mechanized Cavalry Brigade at Fort Knox maintained an minimum of interest in armored warfare. In general, the Army did not develop the possibilities of armored warfare after World War I.<sup>cxviii</sup>

With little interest in tanks by the combat arms, the Ordnance Department expended few of its resources on development of new tanks. From 1920 to 1935, the Army produced 16 tanks. Each tank was a separate model built at Rock Island Arsenal. In 1935 and 1936, the Army produced 16 tanks of one design, marking the first time since World War I that more than a single model tank had been manufactured in the United States. The Ordnance Department placed a contract for 329 light tanks with a railroad car company in 1939, marking the first commercial production of tanks since the First World War.<sup>cxix</sup>

German success in armored warfare, highlighted in the sudden defeat of France, changed this situation. The nation needed tanks in greater quantities than locomotive companies could produce. To meet the new demand, the War Department contracted with Chrysler Corporation to build an entirely new factory, which became the Detroit Tank Arsenal. It functioned as a government-owned, contractor-operated installation.

The Chrysler Corporation contract involved a degree of risks for all parties because Chrysler engineers had never even seen, let alone produced, a tank. The engineers visited Rock Island Arsenal and took away an estimated 186 pounds of blueprints for a tank. Based upon these blueprints, the company presented an estimate for the cost of a tank factory to the Army. Before construction of the arsenal began, however, the Army decided that the existing tank design was inadequate and began development of the M3, or General Grant, tank. Wishing to avoid construction delays of the tank arsenal, the government signed a contract with Chrysler before the final design for the M3 tank was complete. Chrysler contracted the factory design to the noted industrial architect Albert Kahn.<sup>cc</sup>

The contract for the Tank Arsenal was signed on 15 August 1940; construction started on 11 September. The cold Michigan winter set in during the middle of the construction process. By the end of January 1941, one-third of the steel frames for the outer factory walls were in place, but the concrete floors were not poured. To accelerate construction, the builders shut off that third of the building and moved a steam locomotive engine into the structure. Steam from the locomotive thawed the ground sufficiently to allow pouring and curing of the concrete floor. Machinery was moved into the completed portion of the building.<sup>cci</sup>

The entire arsenal occupied 113 acres in Warren, Michigan, about four miles north of Detroit. The arsenal had a four story administration building, a separate personnel building, a "figure 8" test track, and a main tank plant building. Tank components were produced elsewhere and the final product was assembled at the tank arsenal.<sup>ccii</sup>

The main tank plant was a one-story; 500 x 1,380 ft structure, featuring numerous bays. At the north end of the plant a receiving bay occupied the entire length of the plant. At the south end, an assembly bay, ran parallel to the receiving bay. Twenty-three manufacturing bays connected the receiving bay to the assembly bay. Materials entered the factory at the receiving bay, to be processed through one of the manufacturing bays. At the assembly bay, the parts came together to form a completed tank.

Each of the bays had a high, steel-truss roof, with butterfly monitors. For maximum lighting during the daytime, glass was used extensively. About 80,000 panes of glass covered ninety-five per cent of the exterior walls. Other aspects of the building reflected the requirements of heavy industry. Reinforced concrete floors and overhead cranes were designed to allow the movement of heavy materials. The open bays provided for maximum flexibility in the layout of production design. Outside railroad spurs ran directly into some of the structures.<sup>cciii</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

While the factory was under construction, Chrysler engineers designed or obtained the necessary machine tools for tank production. One engineer was based outside of Aberdeen Proving Ground, where he could obtain information on the M3 tank then under development. He rushed drawings back to Detroit, or telephoned technical information to Chrysler engineers.<sup>cciv</sup>

By April 1941, the first tank rolled off the assembly line, and production of tanks in large quantities soon followed. In July 1942, the factory converted its production to the new M4, or Sherman Tank (Figure 14). By 1945, the Detroit Tank Arsenal produced 22,234 tanks or about twenty-five per cent of the production within the United States, with locomotive manufacturers accounting for most of the remaining tanks.<sup>ccv</sup>

In 1942, the Army built the Lima Ordnance Depot, outside of Lima, Ohio, to process tanks for overseas shipment. After the tanks were built, they required accessory equipment, such as radios. Because it was impractical to hold the tanks at the factory, the government established the Lima Ordnance Depot as a separate GOCO for the installation of accessory equipment in the tanks.<sup>ccvi</sup>

With the growing importance of the Detroit area to war production, Major General Campbell, then Chief of Ordnance, decided more supervision was needed on location. Consequently, he established the Tank-Automotive Center, which later became the Office of the Chief of Ordnance-Detroit.<sup>ccvii</sup>

## **Chemical Warfare Service Facilities**

The Chemical Warfare Service originated during World War I, when the use of toxic gases caused the U.S. Army to create a specialized branch. The purpose of the branch was to develop methods of protection against enemy chemicals and to employ offensive chemicals. Following the war, the Chemical Warfare Service survived, despite the Army's antipathy towards further use of toxic chemicals. The Chemical Warfare Service was inactive during the inter-war period. The Army closed the production facilities at Edgewood Arsenal, the Army's principal chemical warfare installation.<sup>ccviii</sup>

With the approach of World War II, the Army's interest in chemical warfare revived. United States policy renounced the first use of toxic gases, but retained the right to retaliate if an enemy used gases. To maintain a credible deterrent, the Army required an ability to produce toxic gases. Moreover, preparation for war required large quantities of protective equipment, especially masks. The Chemical Warfare Service also had responsibility for flame and smoke devices; these responsibilities increased throughout the war.<sup>ccix</sup>

Expansion of Chemical Warfare Service production facilities began with improvements to Edgewood Arsenal. At the beginning of the Protective Mobilization period, the Army renovated existing production facilities to produce toxic chemicals. New construction at Edgewood included manufacturing and filling plants, heating plants, sewage systems, and related facilities.<sup>ccx</sup>

The Chemical Warfare Service also built three more arsenals as government-owned, government-operated (GOGO) installations for the production of chemical munitions. Construction started at the first of these new arsenals, at Huntsville, Alabama, on 21 July 1941. Due to a fear of enemy air attack, the Huntsville Arsenal was dispersed into three widely separated production areas. The first two production areas produced toxic chemicals, while the third area produced incendiaries. Later during the war, the Chemical Warfare Service constructed Pine Bluff Arsenal, Arkansas, and Rocky Mountain Arsenal, Colorado. Throughout the course of the war, all three arsenals produced a combination of toxic chemicals, incendiaries, and smoke. The Chemical Warfare Service produced the chemical ingredients, while the Ordnance Department produced the cases.<sup>ccxi</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

For production of protective equipment, the Chemical Warfare Service relied upon GOCOs. Masks required an impregnated charcoal, which was produced at specially designed plants. The first facility for the manufacturing of this particular charcoal was at Zanesville, Ohio; it was followed by more plants at Fostoria, Ohio; Niagara Falls, New York; East St. Louis, Illinois; and, Midland, Michigan.<sup>ccxii</sup>

### **Navy Ordnance Production Facilities**

One of the most effective naval weapons of World War II was the torpedo, a cigar-shaped device that traveled underwater to destroy an enemy ship. Using either a steam or electric engine, a torpedo carried up to 500 pounds of explosives. Various models could be launched by either submarine, aircraft, or surface ship. Torpedoes launched from submarines alone, sank over five million tons of enemy ships and damaged another two and one-half million tons.

Despite the torpedo's effectiveness, fleet personnel chronically complained about the quality and quantity of the weapons. Submariners especially, complained that torpedoes ran too deep, failed to detonate upon contact, or behaved erratically. Moreover, torpedo production methods during the inter-war years had emphasized careful craftsmanship at the expense of quantity production, leaving the Navy poorly prepared to meet the demands of a war with Japan.<sup>ccxiii</sup>

Since its establishment in 1869, the Navy's Torpedo Station near Newport, Rhode Island, had served a dual function of experimental and production work on torpedoes. To meet the increased demands for torpedo production during World War I, the Navy had established a Torpedo Factory in Alexandria, Virginia. The Alexandria facility reverted to an inactive status after the war. The station at Newport remained the Navy's most important installation for work with this weapon. Within the constraints of limited budgets, station personnel experimented with new models, including an electrical propulsion method. They also carefully fabricated new torpedoes to meet the limited needs of a peacetime Navy.<sup>ccxiv</sup>

On the West Coast, the Naval Torpedo Station at Keyport, Washington, complemented the Newport Station. The extensive waters of the Puget Sound provided an ideal testing range for torpedoes. Other workers overhauled and repaired torpedoes at the Keyport Station.<sup>ccxv</sup>

Even before the United States officially entered the war, the Torpedo Stations at Newport and Keyport expanded their capacity. By the end of 1940, the work force at Newport had increased by nearly 1,000 to a total of 4,800. Before the end of the war, the Torpedo Station employed over 12,600 workers, at facilities scattered throughout the Narragansett Bay region. Additional production capacity resulted from the reactivation of the Torpedo Factory in Alexandria, Virginia. The Keyport Station expanded so rapidly that it required a new housing project. By the

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.



figure 14

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

close of the war the Keyport Station increased its work force twelvefold. Soon all three installations were operating three shifts, seven days per week.<sup>ccxvi</sup>

With the inexorably rising demand for torpedoes, the Navy entered into a contract with the American Can Corporation to construct and operate a torpedo plant. The company formed a subsidiary, the Amertorp Corporation, which operated the Forest Park, Illinois Naval Ordnance Plant as a GOCO. To augment its production capability further, the Navy contracted with Pontiac Motor Corporation, International Harvester, and Westinghouse to produce torpedoes. Extensive subcontracting for components completed the Navy's torpedo production efforts. The Torpedo Station at Newport served as the Central Torpedo Office and provided technical assistance to other production sites. These plants completed assembly of torpedoes with the exception of loading explosives. Explosives were loaded at McAlester Depot.<sup>ccxvii</sup>

The Forest Park facility, located in a Chicago suburb and designed by the architectural firm of Albert Kahn, was intended as a permanent facility. The Navy expressed its desire for "a good looking layout without extravagance," and Kahn's firm responded with a complex that combined brick and glass. The glass walls provided a well lighted working environment. The main manufacturing building was T-shaped, with the components assembled at the head of the T. The parts were moved to the main column where they were assembled into the final product.<sup>ccxviii</sup>

The Naval Mine Depot at Yorktown, Virginia, also experienced an increased level of industrial activities during the war, with a concurrent expansion through permanent construction. In December 1941, 21 officers and about 1,000 civilians were assigned to the depot. This figure represented a considerable increase from labor levels during the inter-war years. Depot workers tested and repaired depth charges, underwater mines, torpedoes, and similar pieces of naval ordnance. They also filled underwater munitions with TNT, using melt and pour methods similar to those used in the loading of artillery shells. Workers at the station mixed TNT with RDX, a more powerful explosive, to form Torpex. The new explosive was more powerful than TNT but less dangerous than RDX. They also poured explosives into rockets and aerial weapons. With the increased production activities came a wave of new construction, both permanent and temporary.<sup>ccxix</sup>

The Indianapolis Naval Ordnance Plant performed a specialized, critical function. The plant was a result of discussions between the Navy and Carl Norden Inc. regarding production of the famous Norden Bombsight. Norden agreed in principle to operate a GOCO and created a wholly owned subsidiary, Lukas Harold Corporation, to operate the plant. In July 1940, the Navy signed a contract with Lukas Harold Corporation for construction and operation of a GOCO to produce bombsights. The pace of construction proceeded slowly until the Japanese attack upon Pearl Harbor. The plant was commissioned in May 1942, and produced both Norden bombsights and gunnery fire control instruments. Both the War and Navy Departments used bombsights. In fact, the Norden bombsights was most useful in the high-altitude heavy bombers that the Army Air Forces favored. Of 12,792 bombsights produced at the Indianapolis Naval Ordnance Plant, 11,217 went to the War Department.<sup>ccxx</sup>

The South Charleston Naval Ordnance Plant, West Virginia, began during World War I as a facility for producing ships' armor, the heavy steel plating used to protect warships from enemy guns. The plant remained on stand-by status until 1939, when Carnegie Steel received a contract to rehabilitate a small portion of the plant to again produce ships' armor. As the Navy's ship building program increased, Carnegie received additional contracts to enlarge the plant until the original facility tripled in size. At the same time, the General Machinery Ordnance Corporation received a contract to rehabilitate the northern section of the plant for the production of various naval weapons. During the war, this portion of the plant produced rocket assemblies, gun barrels, torpedo air flasks, and related metal items. Thus the Charleston Plant conducted two different operations, using two contractors.<sup>ccxxi</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

## Aircraft Production and Assembly

Expansion of the American aircraft industry ranks among the more important industrial achievements of World War II. The contrast between the aircraft industry before and after the war is remarkable. In 1939, the private aviation industry, under contract to the Army Air Corps, began production of the first American made aircraft capable of exceeding 400 miles per hour, the P-38. Fewer than 100 of the first generation B-17 heavy bombers were flying.<sup>ccxxii</sup> Within five years, the American aviation industry not only had produced sufficient numbers of aircraft to fight a two-ocean, multi-front war, but also was assisting Allied countries.

To create a military aviation industry, the U.S. government first identified existing aircraft manufacturers with room for expansion at their facilities. Demand for aircraft grew so rapidly that the government financed additions to existing privately-owned plants under the provisions of Defense Plant Cooperation contracts.<sup>ccxxiii</sup>

In 1939, Congress authorized over 34 million dollars for use in placing "educational orders" to private aircraft manufacturers.<sup>ccxxiv</sup> These orders, in effect aircraft sample orders, were intended to provide a learning curve in developing the techniques for rapid aircraft production. By 1940, the need for aircraft was considered so critical that Congress allotted 12.5 billion dollars for military aviation to the pre-war emergency budget.<sup>ccxxv</sup>

Major aviation manufacturers such as Boeing, Lockheed, and Consolidated utilized these funds to construct new facilities that could support around-the-clock manufacturing. These plants required new production buildings, runways, and test facilities, as well as security and defense modifications. The construction of these additional facilities absorbed all land available in the vicinity of the existing plants. Constraints on the ability of existing plants to expand further limited their aircraft production capacity. As a result, the Air Corps could not obtain the quantity of aircraft that it desired.<sup>ccxxvi</sup>

To alleviate the space and scheduling problems, President Roosevelt asked Congress to provide funds for the expansion of the aviation industry. In 1940, Congress passed "An Act to Expedite the Strengthening of the National Defense," which gave the Secretary of War broad powers to boost war equipment production.<sup>ccxxvii</sup>

To improve aircraft production, the War Department built GOCO aircraft plants. Their purpose was to assemble aircraft from components rather than to manufacture aircraft from raw materials. Thus, one of the more important site selection criteria was the proximity of rail lines to the plant site. A major consideration in the construction of GOCO aircraft plants was the need to operate the facility 24-hours a day. Around-the-clock operations required power and water availability that exceeded the capabilities of civilian infrastructure. Consequently, the Army spent over \$75,000.00 in 1942 to build small power plants, install electrical lines, water storage and wells, plumbing, and the necessary support buildings for GOCO aircraft assembly plants.<sup>ccxxviii</sup>

The plant buildings were massive assembly line buildings that fed out to an aircraft ramp. The basic design included a concrete foundation with a steel or wood frame and steel exterior. The assembly buildings were large enough to allow the aircraft to be assembled inside; storage or office space was built along the side walls at the second or third floor levels on a mezzanine.<sup>ccxxix</sup> Due to wartime scarcities of building materials, later plant designs increasingly utilized temporary construction techniques. The Cleveland Aircraft Assembly Plant is an excellent example of assembly plant architecture. Designed and build by the Hunkin, Conkey Construction Company in 1942, the plant was the largest all-timber building at that time.<sup>ccxxx</sup>

By 1945, the American aviation industry had built 231,099 aircraft of all types. Aircraft assembled at GOCOs, including B-29s, C-47s, and B-24s, played a critical role in the war effort. The massive production effort enabled the Eighth Air Force to grow enormously despite its combat losses. GOCO-produced aircraft were used in the European, Mediterranean, and Pacific Theaters.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

American aircraft supplemented the flying stock of Allied air forces under lend lease programs and contributed to the Allied victory.

With the surrender of Japan in August 1945, the United States no longer required an aviation industry mobilized for total war. The major aircraft manufacturing companies made the transition to the civilian market. Although the Air Corps no longer required GOCOs, military planners understood the value of the large buildings and reinforced runways at the retired GOCO plants. The Air Corps identified fields with the greatest potential for conversion to active installations. The Air Corps selected sites in Fort Worth, Texas (Carswell AFB), Oklahoma City, Oklahoma (Tinker AFB), Marietta, Georgia (Dobbins AFB), and Fort Crook, Nebraska (Offutt AFB) as Air Force base sites.<sup>ccxxxii</sup> Over the next several years the industrial buildings on these stations were repaired and modified for continued use by the Air Force as storage areas, hangars, and modification centers.

The Navy Department had maintained an aircraft factory in Philadelphia since 1917. Its purpose was to produce small numbers of new models of aircraft, rather than produce large numbers of existing models. During World War II, the Naval Aircraft Factory performed important work on the Kingfisher, an amphibious patrol plane. The factory also produced new models of carrier catapults and arresting gears. Personnel at the factory also produced drones and pilotless aircraft. Recognizing the potential for pilotless aircraft to carry a warhead, one officer, Commander (later Admiral) D. S. Fahrney began experiments that resulted in the beginnings of the Navy's guided missile program.<sup>ccxxxiii</sup>

## **Social Conditions**

The mobilization of American society during World War II restructured American culture in numerous ways. Large numbers of families and individuals relocated to temporary communities for war-related employment. Women and minorities became more visible in the workforce in an effort to meet wartime labor demands. Wartime shortages, including consumer goods, gasoline, and transportation, altered the lives of the civilian population.

The GOCO factories discussed above were involved closely with these changes, and their development documents an interesting chapter in United States social history. Because many of them were built in rural areas, defense plants spurred boom town economies, with new temporary housing developments. Despite on-site housing, other workers lived at considerable distances from the facilities and faced challenging transportation problems. The working and living conditions of war industry workers affected their productivity, which was a crucial element of the domestic war effort (Figure 15).

### New Workers

One of the most publicized consequences of the wartime economy was the introduction of large numbers of women into previously male-dominated industrial jobs, as illustrated by the popular image of "Rosie the Riveter." Women previously had been employed in manufacturing including light industries such as textiles; nevertheless, large numbers of women as factory workers, especially in heavy industries, was a new wartime experience (Figure 16). At the beginning of the war, approximately 12 million women were in the workforce; the number increased to 18 million by 1945. Although these figures document an increase in the numbers of working women, they also indicate that the majority of working women were in the labor force before the war. For many of these women the war produced a shift from jobs in the service sector and light industry to heavy industrial employment. Other women entered the workforce for the first time, either as a wartime measure or with the expectation of permanent employment.<sup>ccxxxiii</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

Reaction to women factory workers varied with the circumstances. In areas traditionally dominated by male workers, especially shipyards, women encountered hostility towards their presence. The demands for physical strength compounded problems for women in heavy industry. In other jobs, women achieved a greater degree of acceptance in their new roles.<sup>ccxxxiv</sup>

The ammunition industry, which began almost entirely during the war, provided new opportunities to women. Most ordnance facilities employed men during the early phases of mobilization, but the Selective Service and labor shortages resulted in increased employment of women. These women were designated "Women Ordnance Workers," or WOWs. Because the United States had virtually no experienced workers in ammunition production, women were not at a disadvantage with respect to previous training. In a 1942 study, the Women's Bureau of the Labor Department noted that women workers were concentrated in jobs that required finger dexterity and attention to detail, including fuze and booster assembly, or inspection of components. Female workers also dominated powder bag sewing. As labor shortages intensified, however, the types of work available to women increased proportionately. In its official history, the Lone Star Ordnance Plant boasted that " 'FOR MEN ONLY' jobs at Lone Star are now often handled by women only," and illustrated the point with photographs of women performing soldering operations, or handling heavy aerial bombs. Kingsbury Ordnance Plant reported a similar expansion of the roles of its WOWs, even placing some women in stevedore jobs. By the end of the war, forty-five per cent of the workers at Kingsbury were women.<sup>ccxxxv</sup>

Nevertheless, disparities still existed between the treatment of men and women in the industrial workplace. The Women's Bureau Bulletin noted that women consistently received lower wages than men despite the absence of justification for the differential. Because women were considered more susceptible to skin problems, managers were more reluctant to expose them to TNT, which could create skin eruptions. Factory management complained that women would not wear protective covering for their hair.<sup>ccxxxvi</sup>

Women in shipyards experienced far more difficulties than most other female workers. Shipyards long had been a male bastion, and the existence of powerful trade unions further exacerbated the problems of assimilating women into the workforce. Shipyard work demanded physical strength and ability to work at high places. Nevertheless, the scarcity of labor persuaded shipyard managers to hire women, and the prospect of high wages encouraged women to fill available jobs. Shipyards adjusted to the physical strength of women by such expedients as using hoists to move heavy tool boxes, or dividing heavy loads into two or more smaller loads. Kaiser Shipyards, a commercial builder, refined the specialization of tasks, so that new employees could perform one task with a minimum of training.<sup>ccxxxvii</sup>

Even where they avoided hostility, women in shipyards might encounter conduct that would be considered condescending by the standards of the 1990s. One writer described women at Mare Island Shipyard by noting that, "Notwithstanding the rash of humor following in their wake, Mare Island's women workers turned out good work. . . . One slightly confused young thing did spend forty-five minutes trying to drill a hole through a steel bulkhead - the bit was in the chuck

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 15

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 16

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

backwards - but at least she kept right on trying!" No doubt, the writer considered this passage a compliment to the women at Mare Island.<sup>ccxxviii</sup>

African-Americans also entered the labor force in larger numbers and in new fields (Figure 17). Even more than in the case of women, African-Americans faced open hostility in their new jobs. Much of their progress was attributable to insistent demands that African-Americans receive a proportionate share of defense employment. Led by A. Philip Randolph, African-American leaders called upon President Roosevelt to take action against racial discrimination. When Roosevelt evaded meeting with them, Randolph and others began to organize a protest march, proposing to bring 50,000 to 100,000 marchers to Washington, D.C. After a series of negotiations, Roosevelt signed an executive order opening defense employment to all races, and the African-American leaders canceled the march.<sup>ccxxix</sup> The increasing scarcity of labor as the war progressed further eased racial barriers to employment.

In practice, the experience of African-American workers varied depending upon the circumstances. Roosevelt's order, by itself, did not end discrimination, nor did it prohibit segregation in the work place. These problems were managed at a local level. At the Twin Cities Ordnance Plant, a local newspaper boasted that "negroes ate in the same lunch room, sang in the plant chorus, played games, attended dances, and were in fact a part of the plant's organization." At Kingsbury Ordnance Plant, African-Americans first were hired in April 1942, after careful negotiations between management and workers to overcome the local tradition of segregation. Most African-Americans were concentrated in warehousing and detonator lines. The Naval Ordnance Plant at Macon, Georgia, did not hire African-Americans until April 1945, and only after instituting a training program with local vocational schools. Like the other official histories, the Macon history pronounced African-American workers "valuable employees."<sup>ccxi</sup>

The experience of both minority and women workers in World War II was a mixture of progress and frustration. Both groups managed to overcome barriers, yet neither group overcame discriminatory practices in employment. These problems persisted through the remainder of the twentieth century. Perhaps the change was most pronounced for African-American women. In 1940, working African-American women were concentrated in domestic or agricultural jobs. By the close of the war, African-American women were employed in factory, clerical supervisory, and a few professional jobs. Though the preponderance of working African-American women remained domestics, the old pattern of employment was beginning to change.<sup>ccxli</sup>

### Living Conditions and Effects on Local Economies

The living conditions of all workers and their families constituted another important facet of the history of the war manufacturing efforts. War industries created thousands of new jobs, often in regions that were primarily agricultural. Over the course of the war, slightly over 15 million civilians migrated across the United States, usually in search of new jobs. Approximately 60 per cent of these migrants were women.<sup>ccxlii</sup>

As workers moved into the new wartime industries, they required housing and the infrastructure that accompanies a community. With the instant appearance of large numbers of new workers, living conditions varied from tolerable to squalid. War workers rapidly filled boarding houses and available rental rooms. In Marion, Ohio, site of the Scioto Ordnance Plant, workers reported sleeping in shifts, using the same bed. At other places, workers lived in makeshift trailer camps, often assembled with inadequate water supplies and sewerage capacity. Within the vicinity of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, an estimated 2,500 families lived in trailer camps during August 1942.<sup>ccxliii</sup>

The government and plant operators took steps to alleviate housing shortages. In October 1940, Congress passed the Lanham Act, which authorized public housing in areas with defense industries. Later, President Roosevelt established the Federal Public Housing Authority to

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.



coordinate defense housing. By the end of the war, the Federal Public Housing Authority managed the construction of over 700,000 housing units, principally near defense industries. These houses were designed to provide acceptable housing, but little more. Standards established in local building codes could be waived.<sup>ccxliiv</sup> At many facilities, employers sponsored housing for their employees. Radford Ordnance Works, Virginia, sponsored three housing projects, and built seven bunk houses for single employees.<sup>ccxliiv</sup>

Although housing conditions improved, workers at these installations were forced to adjust to conditions different from their previous experience. Workers found themselves living in new communities, frequently separated from their families, and living among strangers. Although the Lanham Act also authorized funding of day care for children of working mothers, adequate child care was seldom available. The war disrupted the lives of defense workers as well as soldiers.<sup>ccxlivi</sup>

Local residents in areas of the new facilities also felt the disruptive impact of the war. Ordnance facilities required large tracts of level land, with good access to water and transportation routes. These same characteristics defined prime agricultural land, thus the government often selected productive farm land owned by families for several generations as sites for new industrial facilities. Although most farmers sold their land for a negotiated price, the federal government's power to initiate condemnation proceedings placed pressure on the farmers to settle. Resentment against the Army was particularly strong at Weldon Springs Ordnance Plant, Missouri, and Letterkenny Ordnance Depot, Pennsylvania.<sup>ccxlvii</sup>

Ill will among displaced land owners was aggravated if the community perceived that the facility was unnecessary. In February 1942, the government announced construction of Gopher Ordnance Works in Rosemount, Minnesota, and acquired 84 farms. Believing that the price offered by the government was too low, most farmers refused to sell their land. The government initiated condemnation proceedings. Although the farmers eventually won substantial price increases in court, the government took possession of the land pending resolution of the court decision. Construction began once the government secured title to the land. Along with the ever present trailer parks, the Gopher Ordnance Works brought money into the local economy. In April 1943, construction stopped, and the War Department placed the installation on stand-by status. In the second half of 1944, the Army attempted to re-activate the plant, and it produced some smokeless powder in 1945, but former land owners complained that this powder probably never made it to Europe or Asia. One aggrieved farmer complained: "The thing that really galls all of us people that were ordered out . . . is the fact that they never really needed the plant. . . . It was a waste. They did manufacture some powder, but if any of it was actually used in the war effort I don't know of it."<sup>ccxlviii</sup>

## Conclusion

Having made their enormous contribution to the Allied victory, War and Navy Department industrial facilities, faced an uncertain future at the war's end. The nation no longer needed the ammunition and other materiel produced at the industrial facilities. Yet the recent experience in preparing a production base for World War II demonstrated the need for preserving at least some facilities for future emergencies. The deteriorating relations with the Soviet Union further accentuated the need for preserving an ability to manufacture ordnance when necessary. Consequently, the services decided to preserve a portion of the World War II industrial base. Some facilities were closed with the end of the war, and transferred to the War Assets Administration for final disposition. Others, especially those in operation before the war, remained

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 17

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

active installations, although now operating at a slower pace. As preparation for future conflicts, the services placed other facilities in a "stand-by" status. The government hired contractors to preserve the buildings and equipment, and to provide security for the vacant installations. The Department of Defense partially reopened a few installations for the Korean or Vietnam conflicts, but the industrial facilities never resumed their wartime pace of operations.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

## CHAPTER VII

### SPECIAL CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS:

#### THE PENTAGON AND THE MANHATTAN PROJECT

Within the scope of military permanent construction during World War II, two special projects merit discussion. The first such project was the construction of the mammoth five-sided office building called the Pentagon. The military also constructed the facilities to produce and test the atomic bombs, which ended the war and began the age of nuclear warfare.

##### The Pentagon

At the opening of World War II, the War Department shared its headquarters with the Navy Department at the Munitions Building, located on Constitution Avenue in the District of Columbia. Even if the War Department had use of the entire building, the Munitions Building was not large enough to hold all of the War Department agencies. To accommodate the overflow, Army personnel were scattered in leased office space throughout Washington, D.C. Staff officers lost valuable time trying to coordinate with other staff officers. Visitors to the War Department often traveled from building to building looking for the correct agency.<sup>ccxlix</sup>

Brigadier General Brehon Somervell, then the Chief of the Quartermaster Construction Division, proposed to remedy this situation by building a single office building, large enough to house the entire War Department headquarters. On Thursday, 17 July 1941, he summoned two architects to his office and directed them to prepare plans by the following Monday for an office building that would house 40,000 workers. The architects hardly had begun working when the plans were changed. The War Department decided to locate its new office building at Arlington Farms, Virginia, near Arlington Cemetery and Fort Myer. To fit into the existing road network, the new office building was to have a five sided design, from which the building derived its name, the Pentagon.<sup>cccl</sup>

At a time when military construction was consuming a substantial portion of skilled labor, materials, and money, Congress was reluctant to approve a large new office building. Somervell successfully argued, however, that the new office would enable the War Department to operate more efficiently. Moreover it would save the government money by reducing the amount of leased office space and allowing the Navy Department to have full use of the Munitions Building.<sup>cccli</sup>

Congress approved the funding in August 1941, but President Roosevelt insisted upon changing the location to three-quarters of a mile east of the intended site, and expressed his preference for a building approximately half the size that Somervell contemplated. Somervell immediately initiated construction at the site that Roosevelt wanted, while architects prepared the final plans the building. The plans kept the five-sided configuration and large size. When Somervell presented the final plans to the President in October, construction of the foundation was already well under way. President Roosevelt relented and approved Somervell's plans.<sup>ccclii</sup>

Construction of the Pentagon continued through January 1943, though portions of the building were in use as office space by April 1942. At the peak of construction, the project employed over 13,000 workers. The architects made every effort to conserve scarce materials. Steel saving measures included concrete ramps instead of elevators and concrete drainage pipes. The use of concrete instead of steel required approximately 410,000 cubic yards of concrete. Sand and gravel for the building were dredged from the Potomac River. The dredging of the river created a lagoon that allowed barge traffic to deliver materials to the construction site, and later became a scenic attraction for the building.<sup>cccliii</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

Today, the Pentagon's distinctive architecture makes it a capital area landmark. It consists of five, concentric, pentagonal rings, with a spacious courtyard at the center. Ten corridors radiate from the center of the building, connecting the rings. The Pentagon served as the War Department headquarters until 1947, when it became headquarters for the newly-created Department of Defense. Today it remains the headquarters for the Defense Department and its subordinate offices.<sup>ccliv</sup>

## **The Manhattan Project and the Atomic Bomb**

The use of the atomic bomb against the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945 terminated World War II and initiated the age of nuclear warfare. In large measure, this new weapon resulted from the efforts of American scientists, who advanced nuclear physics under the stress of wartime conditions. The atomic bomb was also the product of the construction work of the Corps of Engineers. Working at an accelerated pace, the Army engineers constructed the physical plant for obtaining fissionable material.

The construction efforts in support of the atomic bomb were concentrated at three locations. At Oak Ridge (or Clinton), Tennessee, and at Hanford, Washington, the Army built enormous plants that provided the raw materials for the atomic bomb. At Los Alamos, New Mexico, the Army provided a home for a community of scientists who assembled the first nuclear weapons.

American physicists long had recognized the theoretical possibility of creating nuclear weapons through the fission of uranium isotopes. In 1939, Albert Einstein wrote to President Roosevelt on the potential of atomic energy, causing Roosevelt to establish an Advisory Committee on Uranium to study the subject. In January 1940, the War and Navy Departments first funded university research on nuclear energy. A wartime Office of Scientific Research and Development (ORSRD) further accelerated government interest in the possibility of nuclear weapons. By the beginning of 1942, the probability for success of the production and application of the weapons justified full scale military participation.<sup>cclv</sup>

On 17 June 1942, work on the atomic bomb advanced significantly when the Corps of Engineers established the Manhattan Engineering District, under the command of then Colonel James C. Marshall. The district was unique in that it did not have geographical boundaries, rather it had responsibility for all construction efforts related to the atomic bomb. The name, derived from the District's headquarters in New York, sounded as if it were in keeping with other district names.<sup>cclvi</sup> To provide additional direction to the project, the Army assigned Colonel (later Major General) Leslie Groves as the overall director.<sup>cclvii</sup>

The essential problem confronting the Corps of Engineers was to construct facilities that would separate fissionable uranium isotopes from non-fissionable isotopes. Uranium naturally exists as a metal, in which its three most common isotopes are indistinguishable. About 99.28 per cent of the metal is an isotope known as U-238, while .71 per cent of the metal is an isotope known as U-235. The third isotope, U-234 exists only in trace quantities. The isotopes are integrated physically and chemically identical. The only differences is the atomic weight or mass. Of these isotopes, only U-235 is fissionable. The problem was to separate the small quantity of U-235 from the U-238.<sup>cclviii</sup> Another method of producing fissionable material was to create the element plutonium. Although normally not fissionable, U-238 could be converted to plutonium when bombarded with neutrons.<sup>cclix</sup>

Although scientists believed that separating the isotopes was theoretically possible, it had never been accomplished in the quantities necessary to produce an atomic bomb. The Army therefore faced the challenge of constructing the facilities to separate isotopes, without the knowledge that their efforts would work. Standard practice was to build pilot plants before building large production plants, but the wartime haste precluded such steps. In some cases, construction

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

on the facilities began before the physicists had resolved the technical questions. In hopes of improving the odds of success, the Army simultaneously tried two methods of uranium separation, plus the pile method of plutonium production.

One of the earliest processes to be used was the electromagnetic method. This technique relied upon the theory that particles of uranium gas could be accelerated in a magnetic field, and separated by atomic weight. To apply this theory, the Army retained the engineering firm of Stone & Webster to construct an electromagnet separation plant, known as the Y-12 plant, at Oak Ridge, Tennessee. The Army selected Tennessee Eastman, a subsidiary of Eastman Kodak, to operate the Y-12 plant.<sup>cclx</sup>

Construction of the Y-12 plant was an enormous and difficult undertaking. For construction of the magnets, the Army borrowed 15,000 tons of silver from the Treasury Department. The entire plant required 38 million board feet of lumber. Lacking the experience of pilot plants, the builders encountered unexpected problems, such as 14-ton vacuum tanks popping out of place in response to the influence of the electromagnets. More serious problems developed from rust and corrosion in the pipes. Despite these obstacles, the Y-12 plant was operational by the fall of 1944. The final uranium separation operation became a two-step process. An Alpha plant made the first isotope separation, and a Beta plant refined the product of the Alpha plant into a weapons-grade uranium.<sup>cclxi</sup>

Another method of isotope separation was the gaseous diffusion method, which operated on the theory that the difference in atomic weight would cause the lighter isotopes to pass through a membrane more readily than the heavier isotopes. Although also located in Oak Ridge, different contractors constructed the gaseous diffusion plant. The M. W. Kellogg Company was the builder and Union Carbide was the operator. The gaseous diffusion facility was designated the K-25 plant.<sup>cclxii</sup>

The gaseous diffusion method existed only in theory at the time that construction began. As the builders were digging the foundations, scientists were trying to find a suitable membrane for the process. The main process building for gaseous diffusion was the single largest building within the entire Manhattan project; it was a four-story, U-shaped structure, measuring more than a mile from end to end. When the K-25 plant did become operational, it could not produce a grade of U-235 pure enough for an atomic bomb. The product went to the Beta tract of the electromagnetic plant for further processing.<sup>cclxiii</sup>

In addition to uranium separation operations the Army attempted to produce plutonium. Conversion of U-238 into plutonium required bombardment of the uranium with neutrons. The Italian physicist Enrico Fermi had demonstrated that a sufficient concentration of radioactive material could create a self-sustaining reaction that would transform the uranium into plutonium. The uranium would be enriched while in a pile, and therefore the production of plutonium was known as the pile method.<sup>cclxiv</sup>

Both the Oak Ridge and the Hanford sites were important to the development of the pile method. At Oak Ridge, the Army constructed the Clinton Semi-works, whose purpose was to provide experimental data for full-scale plutonium production facilities. At Hanford, the Army created the full-scale plutonium facilities, which were designed, built, and operated by DuPont Corporation.<sup>cclxv</sup>

Both the Oak Ridge and the Hanford facilities involved an enormous construction effort. In fact, construction costs accounted for 90 per cent of the money expended on the atomic bomb. In addition to the process buildings for isotope separation, each facility required buildings for chemical separation of the uranium, administration buildings, power and utility buildings, and assorted supporting structures. Equally important, the Army constructed family housing for the civilian work force at Hanford and Oak Ridge. During World War II, Oak Ridge became the fifth largest city in Tennessee, and Hanford rivaled Walla Walla, Washington, in population size.<sup>cclxvi</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

Construction work at these two sites consumed an immense amount of resources, both men and materials. The Clinton and Hanford Works alone used 360 million board feet of lumber, 1.2 million cubic yards of concrete, and 75 thousand tons of structural steel. At a time when construction workers were scarce, Clinton employed 47,000 laborers; Hanford, 45,000 laborers.<sup>cclxvii</sup>

A smaller part of the Manhattan project construction consisted of a secret community at Los Alamos, New Mexico. It began with the acquisition of the Los Alamos Ranch School for Boys and quickly expanded into a community of over 7,000 residents. The site was intended to provide an isolated home for scientists, government employees, and their families while they completed experimental work on the atomic bomb and assembled the final product. In his haste to build a plant, Groves directed strict economy methods for construction. The result was unrest among the families, especially because of the poor quality of drinking water. In time, improvements to the site, and the excitement of near completion of the project eased the discord among the residents.<sup>cclxviii</sup>

In July 1945, scientists at Los Alamos witnessed the fruition of their work with the testing of the world's first nuclear explosion. On 6 August, a single atom bomb destroyed the Japanese city of Hiroshima, with the subsequent bombing of Nagasaki three days later. Stunned by the new weapon, the Japanese government surrendered on 14 August 1945.

An official Army history has estimated that under peacetime conditions the development of the electromagnetic plant at Oak Ridge would have required ten to fifteen years. The Army easily might have spent a generation trying to achieve what workers at the Manhattan project performed during the war. In large measure this success can be attributed to the crash construction programs at Oak Ridge and Hanford, where military personnel, scientists, and civilian contractors hurriedly built facilities for the development of the atomic bomb. Their efforts led General Leslie Groves to describe the Manhattan project as the "most exacting construction job of the entire war."<sup>cclxix</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

## CHAPTER VIII

### EXPLOSIVES

#### Department of Ordnance Works

The swift construction of facilities for explosives production was one of the more impressive feats achieved by American industry during World War II. In the summer of 1940, the United States possessed a minimal number of facilities to manufacture explosives. By the end of the war, American superiority in ammunition produced a devastating effect upon the Axis nations. To manufacture explosives, the War Department constructed a series of ordnance works throughout the mid-western United States (Table 17).<sup>cclxx</sup> According to the terms of a pre-war agreement, the War Department was responsible for providing common explosives to the Navy. The purpose of this agreement was to avoid the counter-productive competition between the services that had occurred during World War I. The Navy still maintained its smokeless powder plant at Indian Head and purchased other explosives directly from contractors.<sup>cclxxi</sup>

At the beginning of the war, the nation's only military facilities for the production of explosives were Picatinny Arsenal in Dover, New Jersey, and the Naval Powder Factory in Indian Head, Maryland. Both facilities retained a working knowledge of the art of explosive production through the inter-war period, and were indispensable to the production mobilization effort of World War II. Operating at their maximum capacity, however, these facilities could not produce more than a tiny fraction of the materiel required for the war. To meet the shortfall, the War Department constructed ordnance works and assigned management of the facilities to private contractors. These installations were termed Government-Owned, Contractor-Operated facilities, or GOCOs. In the area of ammunition production, these GOCOs were divided into ordnance works, which produced explosives or their basic ingredients, and ordnance plants, which loaded ammunition or otherwise produced the final product.

Explosives were divided into two categories: propellants and high explosives. Propellants were comparatively slow burning materials used to force the round out of the gun barrel, or to act as a rocket motor. Smokeless powder, or nitrocellulose, remains the most common propellant. High explosives, which exploded with greater force, were used to fill artillery shells or aerial bombs.

Both propellants and high explosives share common chemical characteristics. They combine a nitrate with a form of a hydrocarbon. The result is a mixture of nitrogen, oxygen, hydrogen, and carbon in a single, somewhat unstable molecule. Once the explosion process begins, the molecule breaks down, and the components immediately reassemble to form free nitrogen, water, and carbon dioxide or carbon monoxide. Because all of the elements are located within a single molecule, the process occurs with extraordinary speed. In fact, the effects of explosives are derived more from the speed of the process, rather than the total amount of energy released.<sup>cclxxii</sup>

Production of World War II explosives began with anhydrous ammonia, a gaseous combination of hydrogen and nitrogen. Anhydrous refers to ammonia gas not dissolved in water. The production of anhydrous ammonia began with the extraction of nitrogen from the atmosphere and the production of hydrogen by mixing steam with coke or natural gas. Prior to World War II, ammonia was derived principally from coal and coke production, but to meet the wartime needs production shifted to the use of natural gas.<sup>cclxxiii</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.



table 17

**TABLE 17: WORLD WAR II EXPLOSIVES AND RAW INGREDIENTS ORDNANCE WORKS**

WWII Name	Current Name	Location	Date Established
<b>Product: Ammonia</b>			
Buckeye Ordnance Works	N/A	OH	May 1943
Cactus Ordnance Works	N/A	TX	Aug 1943
Dixie Ordnance Works	N/A	LA	July 1941
Jayhawk Ordnance Works	N/A	KS	Sep 1941
Missouri Ordnance Works	N/A	MO	Nov 1942
Morgantown Ordnance Works	N/A	WV	Nov 1940
Ohio Ordnance Works	N/A	OH	Feb 1941
Ozark Ordnance Works	N/A	AR	Oct 1941
<b>Product: Ammonium Picrate</b>			
Maumelle Ordnance Works	N/A	AR	July 1941
New York Ordnance Works	N/A	NY	Mar 1942
<b>Product: Formaldehyde Hexamine</b>			
Cherokee Ordnance Works	N/A	PA	Oct 1942
<b>Product: High Explosives</b>			
Kankakee Ordnance Works	Joliet AAP	IL	Sep 1941
Kentucky Ordnance Works	N/A	KY	Dec 1942
Keystone Ordnance Works	N/A	PA	Dec 1941
Lake Ontario Ordnance Works	N/A	NY	Dec 1941
Longhorn Ordnance Works	Longhorn AAP	TX	Dec 1941
Naval Powder Factory, Indian Head	Indian Head Naval Surface Warfare Center	MD	1890; 1900
Pennsylvania Ordnance Works	N/A	PA	Jan 1942
Picatinny Arsenal	Picatinny Arsenal	NJ	1880; 1919
Plum Brook Ordnance Works	N/A	OH	Dec 1940

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

<b>WWII Name</b>	<b>Current Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date Established</b>
Volunteer Ordnance Works	Volunteer AAP	TN	Aug 1941
Weldon Spring Ordnance Works	N/A	MO	Dec 1941
West Virginia Ordnance Works	N/A	WV	Jan 1942
<b>Product: Magnesium Powder</b>			
Pilgrim Ordnance Works	N/A	MA	Mar 1942
<b>Product: Oleum</b>			
East Tennessee Ordnance Works	N/A	TN	Oct 1941
<b>Product: Propellants</b>			
Alabama Ordnance Works	N/A	AL	May 1941
Badger Ordnance Works	Badger AAP	WI	Jan 1943
Gopher Ordnance Works	N/A	MN	June 1942
Indiana Ordnance Works	Indiana AAP	IN	Aug 1940
Oklahoma Ordnance Works	N/A	OK	Sep 1941
Sunflower Ordnance Works	Sunflower AAP	KS	Mar 1942
<b>Product: Propellants and High Explosives</b>			
Chicksaw Ordnance Works	N/A	TN	Feb 1942
Radford Ordnance Works	Radford AAP	VA	Aug 1940
<b>Product: RDX</b>			
Holston Ordnance Works	Holston AAP	TN	Feb 1942
Wabash River Ordnance Works	Newport AAP	IN	Dec 1941
<b>Product: Toluene</b>			
Baytown Ordnance Works	N/A	TX	Sep 1941

Source: Lenore Fine and Jesse A. Remington, *The Corps of Engineers: Construction in the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972), 309-335.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

## Propellants

The process for producing smokeless powder remained essentially unchanged since the first smokeless powder was produced during the 1890s (Figure 18). The process combined a cellulose compound, usually cotton or wood pulp, with a nitrate and refined mixture. First, cotton linters or wood pulp were cleaned to remove dirt and impurities. The cellulose then was soaked in a bath of nitric acid to create nitrocellulose. Workers boiled the mixture in water to remove excess acid. The mixture was purified further by alternate baths in boiling water and cold water, with sodium carbonate added to the bath. Once the mixture was purified, the water was removed by pressing and adding alcohol to accelerate the drying process. The addition of ether changed the mixture into a paste-like substance, which could be shaped into blocks or ribbons to be cut into grains when dry.<sup>cclxxiv</sup>

Grains of smokeless powder were not necessarily a fine powder. These grains were large enough to contain holes called perforations, and were classified as multi-perforated, single perforated, or solid. The purpose of these perforations was to adjust the burning rate, which depended upon the amount of exposed surface in a grain. During the burning process, the exposed surface of a solid grain diminished so that the combustion rate also decreased. By contrast, the exposed surface of a multi-perforated grain increased when burned, resulting in an increased combustion rate. Single perforated grains maintained a steady rate of combustion (Figure 19).<sup>cclxxv</sup>

Although the basic process remained essentially unchanged during the World War II era, minor modifications either expanded the production capability or improved the quality of the powder. For example, the War Department recognized that the nation possessed an insufficient number of flat presses to produce the necessary quantities of powder, and experimented with rolling presses. Rolling presses operating at such facilities as Radford Ordnance Works allowed the United States to produce the necessary quantities of smokeless powder.<sup>cclxxvi</sup> Hercules Powder Company also developed a continuous filter method of washing nitrocellulose, which proved to be more efficient than the previous method of decanting the settled mixture.<sup>cclxxvii</sup>

Flashless powder also was developed during this period. The explosion of smokeless powder produced a residue of hydrogen and carbon monoxide. Both gases burned once exposed to air, creating a bright flash that could blind gunners at night and identify their position. The flash could be reduced by adding inorganic salts to the powder, which lowered the temperature of the explosion, thus reducing the flash.<sup>cclxxviii</sup>

Another development was the increased use of double base propellants, which combined nitrocellulose and nitroglycerine. This combination produced more energy than a single base powder and was used primarily for rocket motors and mortar ammunition. Rockets were used in significant numbers for the first time since the Napoleonic Wars, and ranged in size from the shoulder-fired "bazooka" to large aircraft weapons. Each rocket contained a solid double-base propellant known as the motor. Mortar shells contained sheets of double base powder to provide energy for the round.<sup>cclxxix</sup>

Initially the War Department made double base propellants using a solvent to shape the grain into the desired form. The use of solvents proved impractical for large grains because the grain became distorted during the drying process. The War Department followed the Navy's lead in casting the grains using a combination of heat and pressure to create what was termed a solventless double base propellant. Radford Ordnance Works became the War Department's leading producer of double base powders.<sup>cclxxx</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

**figure 18**

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

**figure 19**

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

## High Explosives

High explosives constituted the second major category of military explosives. They reacted with far greater speed than propellants, thus producing a more violent effect. While the reaction time for smokeless powder could be measured in hundredths of a second, the reaction time for TNT could be measured in thousandths or millionths of a second.

Trinitrotoluene, or TNT, was the preferred high explosive during World War II. Other substances produced greater explosive effect, but TNT offered significant advantages for military application. It was stable in storage and could withstand the shock of being fired from an artillery shell. The latter consideration minimized the danger of a premature explosion while a round was inside the barrel. TNT also had a comparative low melting temperature of 81 degrees centigrade. This characteristic allowed the explosive to be melted and poured into artillery shells or aerial bombs.<sup>cclxxxix</sup>

The basic ingredients of TNT are nitric acid and a hydrocarbon called toluene. During World War I, toluene was produced as a by-product of coke ovens, but following that conflict the War Department feared that the process produced too limited a quantity of toluene for military purposes. During the 1920s and 1930s, the War Department and Standard Oil Corporation experimented with the production of small quantities of toluene from petroleum. In 1940, the War Department contracted with Standard Oil and its affiliate, Humble Oil, to construct a toluene plant in Baytown, Texas. By October 1942, the Baytown Ordnance works was producing 65 million gallons of toluene per year, compared with less than 9 million gallons total toluene production during all of World War I.<sup>cclxxxii</sup>

An important advancement in the TNT production process came almost by accident. While on a trip to Canada, an Ordnance Corps officer made an unscheduled visit to small TNT plant near Montreal. He discovered that the Canadians were adding toluene to acid, rather than the American practice of adding acid to toluene. The new process nearly tripled American TNT production.<sup>cclxxxiii</sup>

Operations at the Volunteer Ordnance Works, in Chattanooga, Tennessee, provide a typical example of TNT production. The process began with the creation of acids. The nitric acid process began by burning ammonia against a platinum catalyst, and mixing the product with water in a descending tower. At the same time, sulphur was burned and the sulphur oxides were mixed with water to produce sulfuric acid. The two acids were mixed or strengthened, as required, in a series of mixing towers and gravity-fed pipes.<sup>cclxxxiv</sup>

The next step was the nitrating of the toluene, which occurred in three stages, mono-nitrating, di-nitrating, and tri-nitrating. As the toluene became more highly nitrated with each step, the process required a stronger acid. The process began with the blending of nitric acid and toluene in the "mono-house," where workers agitated and heated the mixture in large vats. The mixture was moved to the bi-nitrating house, where a similar operation took place. Tri-nitrating was the most difficult and time consuming process. As a result, typical production lines contained two tri-nitrating houses, and only one mono- or di-nitrating house.<sup>cclxxxv</sup>

In the next step, the mix was purified by washing in sellite or a sodium sulphite solution, which absorbed impurities. A heating process removed any remaining water and the TNT cooled to a crystalline form. After testing to ensure that the TNT met government specifications, the crystals were boxed and shipped to an Ordnance Plant for loading into bombs or shells (Figure 20).<sup>cclxxxvi</sup>

By mixing TNT with ammonium nitrate, the Army could increase the quantity of explosives. The mixture produced an explosive substance called amatol, which was almost as powerful as TNT, but required less toluene. At the Louisiana Ordnance Plant, ammonium nitrate was produced on site, and added to the TNT before the mixture was loaded into shells. Production specifications required that within eight hours of its manufacture, ammonium nitrate be mixed with the TNT and loaded into shells.<sup>cclxxxvii</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

Although the ability of TNT to withstand shocks without premature explosion made it highly desirable for most military purposes, the Navy sought a more powerful explosive for its torpedoes. Torpex, a mixture of TNT and RDX, met the Navy's requirements. RDX is an extremely powerful explosive that was not usable because of its sensitivity to shock. Mixing RDX with TNT reduces the sensitivity sufficiently to allow its use in torpedoes. Torpex is 50 per cent more powerful than TNT. The Navy first used Torpex in its submarine torpedoes, but later it was used for torpedo airplanes. The increased sensitivity of Torpex presented a danger to the pilot, but "the Chief of Naval Operations declared that the casualty rate for torpedo planes was already extremely high, and that the added damage potential of Torpex justified the increased hazard of this bullet sensitive material." In accordance with the existing agreements between the Navy and War Departments, the War Department produced RDX for the Navy at its Wabash and Holston Ordnance Works.<sup>cclxxxviii</sup>

Although TNT and RDX were the most common high explosives, others were used. Ammonium picrate, or explosive D, was used in antitank rounds because of its ability to withstand shock without accidental detonation. Its high melting temperature and short shelf life, however, limited its military usefulness.<sup>cclxxxix</sup> Tetryl was used as a booster to complete the explosion of TNT.

### **Production Facilities**

The ordnance works that stretched across the interior of the country shared similar features, regardless of whether they manufactured propellants or high explosives. Each installation contained distinct administrative, storage, and production areas. Most, but not all, ordnance works also contained their own power and water systems. In addition to office space, the administrative areas contained fire stations, guard stations, medical facilities, and shower houses. The latter were important because the toxic chemicals required workers to shower after each shift. Storage areas normally contained widely dispersed igloo-type magazines for holding explosives, with rail facilities to move heavy material. Production areas typically consisted of multiple lines, each consisting of several buildings. For safety's sake, buildings were separated from each other. Despite the steadily increasing pressure for economy in construction, the demands of the industrial process and safety prevented the use of temporary constructed for the buildings in the production areas.<sup>ccxc</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 20

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.



## CHAPTER IX

### ASSEMBLY OF LARGE AMMUNITION

#### Development of Ammunition Assembly Plants

War Department Ordnance Plants (Table 18) and Navy Ammunition Depots (see Table 21 in Chapter XI) assembled artillery ammunition and aerial bombs in unprecedented quantities for World War II. The success of these facilities was apparent in the ability of the Allied forces to overcome the Axis powers through superior firepower. These achievements were noteworthy in light of the fact that the United States had only a nominal ammunition production capability at the beginning of the war.

The process of preparing artillery rounds or bombs appeared simple. Metal shells were shipped from commercial manufacturers to an Army Ordnance Plant or Navy Ammunition Depot. The hollow shells were filled with TNT or other explosive, painted, and labeled. Most artillery rounds then were attached to a brass casing that contained a propellant and primer. Fuzes were placed in the shells for small caliber ammunition, or metal plugs were installed in the nose of medium or large caliber shells.

In practice, however, large ammunition assembly required considerable skill and effort. The potential for disastrous TNT explosions necessitated stringent safety measures. Assembly of artillery rounds demanded adherence to precise specifications to ensure that the round would fly accurately. TNT contracted as it cooled inside the shell, so special attention was required to ensure an even distribution of weight. Moreover, the variety of ammunition produced required flexibility in shifting production lines.

The many types of ammunition could easily bewilder a casual observer. Ammunition can be divided into categories based upon its purpose. Anti-aircraft guns usually used smaller ammunition, such as 20mm, 37mm, or 40mm, but could also fire up to 90mm rounds. Anti-tank guns fired 37mm, 57mm, 75mm, 76mm, and 90mm rounds, while tanks used 75mm or 76mm guns. Field artillery howitzers ranged in size from 75mm to 240mm, although the 105mm and 155mm were the most common sizes. Guns might fire high explosive rounds, armor piercing rounds, tracer rounds, incendiary rounds, or illumination rounds.<sup>ccxcii</sup> An ordnance plant also might assemble mortar rounds, bombs, or rockets. The likelihood of sudden changes in demands for a particular round, caused by changes in the tactical situation, precluded orderly production planning and scheduling.<sup>ccxciii</sup>

#### Projectiles

Loading of a projectile began with the fabrication of a shell. The shell of an artillery round is the hollow steel component that carries an explosive to the enemy. With the exception of Gadsden Ordnance Plant, government facilities did not produce shells; instead, they procured shells from private facilities. The shells were transformed into finished ammunition at ordnance plants.<sup>ccxciii</sup>

Filling shells with explosives, or the bursting charge, was one of the most difficult, and important, tasks. TNT could be melted and poured into a shell because of its comparatively low melting temperature. During the inter-war years, Picatinny Arsenal, in Dover, New Jersey, had

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

table 18

**TABLE 18: WORLD WAR II LARGE AMMUNITION ASSEMBLY PLANTS**

<b>WWII Name</b>	<b>Current Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date Established</b>
Bluebonnet Ordnance Plant	N/A	TX	Feb 1942
Cornhusker Ordnance Plant	Cornhusker AAP	NE	Nov 1942
Elwood Ordnance Plant	Joliet AAP	IL	Sep 1940
Gadsden Ordnance Plant	N/A	AL	Dec 1941
Green River Ordnance Plant	N/A	IL	Jan 1942
Gulf Ordnance Plant	N/A	MS	Apr 1942
Illinois Ordnance Plant	N/A	IL	Aug 1941
Iowa Ordnance Plant	Iowa AAP	IO	Apr 1941
Kansas Ordnance Plant	Kansas AAP	KS	Apr 1942
Kingsbury Ordnance Plant	N/A	IN	Nov 1940
Lone Star Ordnance Plant	Lone Star AAP	TX	July 1941
Louisiana Ordnance Plant	N/A	LA	July 1941
Nebraska Ordnance Plant	N/A	NE	Dec 1941
Pantex Ordnance Plant	N/A	TX	Mar 1942
Ravenna Ordnance Plant	Ravenna AAP	OH	Aug 1940
Picatinny Arsenal	Picatinny Arsenal	NJ	1880
Wolf Creek Ordnance Plant	Milan AAP	TN	Dec 1940

Source: Lenore Fine and Jesse A. Remington, *The Corps of Engineers: Construction in the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972), 309-335.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

performed this function for the Army. Working under peacetime conditions, the Arsenal felt no pressure to modernize the operations. Each shell was loaded by pouring molten TNT from a rubber bucket. After the TNT had cooled, additional layers of TNT were added to fill the cavities caused by the cooling (Figure 21).

As the new GOCOs focused their attention upon meeting the wartime demands for ammunition, the plant operators were not satisfied with the slow methods used by Picatinny Arsenal. As experienced factory managers within the civilian economy, they were familiar with mechanized equipment to perform filling operations. Upon assuming responsibility for operation of the Kansas Ordnance Plant, officials from Johns-Manville confidently predicted that modern production methods quickly would improve the efficiency of operations.<sup>ccxciv</sup>

The temperamental nature of TNT proved more challenging than contractors first imagined. Lumps or bubbles in the liquid TNT could create an uneven distribution of weight as the explosive solidified. The majority of plants used hot water jackets to keep the TNT just above the melting temperature, so that it could be poured into a load of shells. Kansas Ordnance used a wheeled cart that elevated the TNT above the shells and allowed for easier pouring. Illinois Ordnance Plant, operated by Sherwin Williams Inc., developed a volumetric pouring machine that allowed the operator to pour a pre-measured amount of TNT into the shell.<sup>ccxcv</sup>

Cavitation of the TNT during the cooling process created another major problem in the production of shells. As the mixture cooled and contracted, cavities were created near the center of the nose. Early in the war, the cavities were filled with more TNT. Yet the deep cavity provided space for a booster, to accelerate the explosion. To be useful, however, the cavity must be absolutely conical, and the TNT cooled in an irregular pattern. The Kansas Ordnance Plant solved this problem by inserting a steam-heated probe into the mouth of the shell. The probe created a smooth cavity inside the round that met military requirements. Soon all other loading operations copied this invention.<sup>ccxcvi</sup>

To conserve TNT, especially during the early years of the war, the explosive was mixed with ammonium nitrate to form amatol. Amatol was almost as powerful as TNT, but could be produced in larger quantities. As the War Department's ability to produce TNT increased, the use of amatol diminished.<sup>ccxcvii</sup>

Ammonium picrate, otherwise known as explosive D, was used for armor piercing munitions, such as anti-tank weapons. Its ability to withstand shock and friction without accidental impact made it well suited for such uses. Unlike TNT, however, it could not be melted. Therefore, it was loaded into shell with an hydraulic press, in a process known as press loading.<sup>ccxcviii</sup>

The process of loading bombs was similar to that for loading artillery shells. Melted TNT was poured into the bomb shells and allowed to cool. The cavities then were filled. Most ordnance plants could load either bombs or artillery shells. Cornhusker Ordnance Plant, operated by Quaker Oats, specialized in loading aerial bombs.<sup>ccxcix</sup>

A fuze, a device to initiate the explosion, was installed after the shell was filled with explosives. Fuzes were intricate devices, containing up to 100 parts, often with tolerances of one thousandths of an inch. Each fuze contained a sensitive explosive, such as mercury fulminate, and a mechanism to initiate the explosion. The mechanism could either detonate upon impact, or at a specific time. Some impact fuzes contained a device to delay the explosion for a second or less, which could be useful in anti-tank rounds or rounds intended to penetrate fortifications. Toward the close of the war, the Navy developed a variable time, or proximity, fuze, which contained a miniature radar to initiate the explosion within range of the target. This revolutionary new fuze was used in anti-aircraft weapons and to ensure airbursts for field artillery.

The War Department contracted with private companies for the metal fuze components. Watch and clock producers were considered especially suited for this work. Workers at Army

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

ordnance plants completed the final assembly of the fuze, including loading of the explosives. The Navy assembled its fuzes at the Macon Naval Ordnance Plant, another GOCO.<sup>ccc</sup>

Detonation of the fuze set off a process called the explosive trains. By itself the fuze could not cause the TNT to explode due to TNT's high shock tolerance. Therefore a moderately sensitive explosive, called the booster, was installed between the fuze and the TNT. The fuze ignited the booster, which in turn ignited the TNT. Tetryl was the most common booster.

After explosives and fuzes were loaded into the shell, each projectile required painting and labeling. Labeling entailed painting for daytime identification of the round and punched markings, so that a gunner could identify a round using his fingers. Each shell also was weighed, and sorted by weight zone. The weight zone was marked on the round to assist the gunners.<sup>ccci</sup>

## **Propellants**

Filling and preparing shells was half the work of an ordnance plant. The plant also prepared the propellant, usually smokeless powder, used to launch rounds towards their targets. The process involved either joining the shell to a brass or steel cartridge case, or else preparing bags of powder. The task also required the preparation of the primer for initiating the explosion.

The particular job varied with the type of round, which could be fixed, semi-fixed, or separate loading. Each classification designated how the cartridge case was attached to the shell. Fixed rounds, used in small caliber ammunition, relied upon a cartridge case firmly crimped to the shell. In a semi-fixed round, common for medium caliber artillery, the case and shell were separable. Large caliber ammunition was too heavy to combine the shell and the propellant. The shell was loaded separately from the propellant. The propellants were loaded in silk bags. Semi-fixed and separate loading ammunition had the advantage of allowing the gunners to adjust the charge by changing the number of powder bags.<sup>cccii</sup>

Fixed ammunition offered the advantages of rapid loading, and was most common in small caliber ammunition, such as anti-aircraft or anti-tank rounds. First, the smokeless powder was poured into the case. Then, a primer was placed at the base of the case, which ignited the propellant. The primer consisted of a sensitive material, usually mercury fulminate, which in turn ignited a charge of black powder, causing the smokeless powder to burn. For waterproofing, the primer would be covered with a wax coating. The shell then was placed in the case, and crimped to hold it in place until firing.

Semi-fixed ammunition, used for medium caliber field artillery, resembled fixed ammunition in most respects. However, the projectile was not crimped to the case. The powder was loaded in bags and placed into the shells. This arrangement allowed the gunner to adjust the number of bags within the charge just before firing.<sup>ccciii</sup>

Separate loading ammunition, used for 155mm and larger rounds, worked by placing the projectile, the propellant, and the primer into the artillery piece separately. These rounds were so heavy that lifting the projectile alone was a challenge to the gunners. Combining the projectile and propellant would have been excessively cumbersome. Bag loading plants prepared bags of smokeless powder for separate loading ammunition. The bags were cut and sewn, and filled with a measured amount of smokeless powder.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 21

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

## Production Facilities

The above summary provides only brief description of the many processes involved in ammunition production. Each task in the process involved multiple hand labor operations that were often tedious. Quality control required extraordinary efforts by all personnel. Workers checked measurements and looked for improper cooling of TNT to meet the strictest specifications for dimensions, weight, and balance.

Indeed, quality control was perhaps the most important concern of ammunition assembly operation. The Ordnance Department selected a sample from each lot for acceptance testing. Failure of the lot to meet the government specifications required costly reworking. Managers tried to prevent such occurrences through inspections throughout the process.

Lone Star Ordnance Plant, near Texarkana, Texas, illustrated a typical arrangement for an Ordnance Plant. The facility contained five loading lines for shells and bombs, plus eight auxiliary lines for fuzes, boosters, primers, and detonators. To support these production lines, an administrative area, storage area, railroad system, and the requisite water, steam, and other utilities were included. The 105mm loading line provided a typical example of a World War II era organization for loading line layout. Its buildings were:

E-1	Inert Storage	E-14	Fuze Service
E-2	Receiving and Painting	E-15	Assembly & Shipping
E-3	Paint & Oil	E-16	Inert Storage
E-4	Melt load	E-17	Propellant Charge
E-5	TNT Screening	E-18	Smokeless Powder
E-6	Ammonium Nitrate Service Magazine	E-19	Primer Service
E-7	TNT Service Magazine	E-20	Change House
E-8	Tools & Equipment	E-21	Change House
E-9	Cooling Building	E-22	Vacuum Pump House
E-10	Ammonium Nitrate Service Magazine	E-23	Vacuum Pump House
E-11	Booster Service	E-24	Vacuum Pump House
E-12	Drilling & Booster	E-25	Heater House
E-13	Booster Equipment		

Other ordnance plants varied to some degree in the number and types of buildings. Yet, overall the similarities of each plant were greater than the differences.<sup>ccciiv</sup>

Considering the practically non-existent state of ammunition production at the beginning of 1940, the quantity of ammunition produced during World War II is impressive. The War Department alone produced over 625 million minor caliber rounds, 239 million medium caliber rounds, 23 million major caliber rounds, over 4 million tons of bombs, plus mortar rounds, grenades and mines. This ammunition could be placed in a train that would stretch from Boston to the west coast. This vast quantity of firepower overwhelmed the Axis Powers.<sup>cccv</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

## CHAPTER X

### SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION

Of all the materiel shortages at the beginning of World War II, the shortage of small arms ammunition posed a greater threat to the national security than other ordnance shortages. This category of ammunition included rounds up to .50 caliber, and was required for rifles, carbines, pistols, and machine guns, including aircraft and anti-aircraft weapons. The United States not only lacked a supply of small arms ammunition, but it also lacked the capability to manufacture ammunition.

Following World War I, the Army's stockpile of small arms ammunition was used for training. The consumption of training ammunition and the deterioration of ammunition in storage resulted in dwindling supplies of ammunition. The Army's only facility for small arms ammunition production was Frankford Arsenal near Philadelphia. The United States did possess a sports ammunition industry, but the differences between sports and military ammunition prevented the conversion of civilian industry to military use.<sup>cccvi</sup>

To remedy this situation, the Ordnance Department authorized construction of Government-Owned, Contractor-Operated (GOCO) small arms ammunition plants in the summer of 1940 (Table 19). The first wave of construction consisted of small-arms plants in Lake City, Missouri; St. Louis, Missouri; and, Denver, Colorado. These plants resembled other Army ordnance-related construction during the mobilization period, with one important difference. Facilities for the production of small arms ammunition received the highest priority for construction material, A-1-A. These facilities were the only Army ordnance activity to receive such a priority.<sup>cccvii</sup>

More construction soon followed. In the spring of 1941, the Ordnance Department authorized a second wave of plant construction, including the Utah, Twin Cities, and Des Moines Ordnance Plants. After Pearl Harbor, the War Department built new plants, expanded existing facilities, and converted selected civilian factories to ammunition production.<sup>cccviii</sup>

All of these new plants faced the same challenges in producing massive quantities of ammunition, while still meeting the Army's quality control requirements. A small arms round consisted of a brass cartridge case, a projectile, the powder, and a primer. The production process began with shaping the case and projectile, which were both metal components. Then the propellant and primer were added before crimping the assembly together. Although the process was reasonably simple in theory, the requirements for precise specifications and the demands for billions of rounds complicated the production process.

Manufacture of the cartridge case began with a small brass cup. The brass was shaped into a cartridge case through a series of "draws," and other shaping operations. During the shaping process, the brass was annealed, or heat treated, to remove the metal stresses caused by the reshaping. Between each annealing operation, the brass was pickled, or treated in acid, to remove oxides created by the heat, and washed to remove the acid (Figure 22).<sup>cccix</sup>

The procedures for fabricating the projectile were similar to the process for shaping the cartridge case. Each projectile had a copper jacket that was shaped through a series of operations that resembled the production of the cartridge. Again, the process required meticulous attention to exacting measurements. A lead core then was inserted into the jacket.<sup>cccx</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

table 19

---

**TABLE 19: WORLD WAR II SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION PLANTS**


---

WWII Name	Current Name	Location	Date Established
Alleghany Ordnance Plant	N/A	MD	May 1942
Denver Ordnance Plant	N/A	CO	December 1940
Des Moines Ordnance Plant	N/A	IA	July 1941
Eau Claire Ordnance Plant	N/A	WI	August 1942
Evansville Ordnance Plant	N/A	IN	March 1942
Frankford Arsenal	N/A	PA	1830
Kings Mills Plant	N/A	OH	Jan 1942
Lake City Ordnance Plant	Lake City AAP	MO	November 1940
Lowell Ordnance Plant	N/A	MA	November 1942
Milwaukee Ordnance Plant	N/A	WI	August 1942
St. Louis Ordnance Plant	St. Louis AAP	MO	December 1940
Springfield Arsenal	N/A	MA	1794
Twin Cities Ordnance Plant	Twin Cities AAP	MN	July 1941
Utah Ordnance Plant	N/A	UT	September 1941

Source: Lenore Fine and Jesse A. Remington, *The Corps of Engineers: Construction in the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972), 309-335.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.



figure 22

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 23

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

Smokeless powder and primer were added to complete the round. The primer was a sensitive explosive, usually mercury fulminate, which was designed to initiate the explosion when struck by a firing pin. Primer was added to the base of the cartridge case and waterproofed with a varnish. A small quantity of smokeless powder was poured into the cartridge case. Finally, the projectile was crimped to the cartridge case.<sup>cccxi</sup>

Most ammunition used during World War II consisted of a lead core with a copper jacket known as ball ammunition. Other types of specialized ammunition were also produced in smaller quantities. Armor piercing, or "AP" rounds, contained a hardened steel core instead of the lead core. Tracer rounds contained an illuminating powder, which enabled the gunner to observe the path of the bullet. Incendiary rounds contained a chemical compound that ignited upon impact.<sup>cccxi</sup>

As in the case with all ammunition production, quality control was a major consideration. To avoid malfunctioning weapons, the Ordnance Department imposed exact specifications for external dimensions, weight, etc., which were verified by more than fifty inspections during the production process. After delivery of a lot to the government, an ordnance inspector selected a few rounds from the lot for inspection. The final examination included test firing or disassembly of a few rounds from each lot. Failure of a round to meet the specifications could result in the rejection of the entire lot. To prevent such an event, companies stationed inspectors at critical locations to examine parts as they moved through the production process.<sup>cccxi</sup>

The machines used to produce small arms ammunition were designed at Frankford Arsenal during the inter-war years. Each machine typically performed a single, repetitive operation. One operator manned each machine (Figure 23).

An article in the December 1942 issue of *Architectural Forum* provides insight into the design and construction of small arms ammunition plants. In the design process, architects analyzed the spatial requirements for each stage of the manufacturing process to develop flow charts. The building plan was developed from these flow diagrams. Wherever possible, existing plans were used to decrease the design time, and to expedite construction. Work began almost immediately after the drawings were complete, and proceeded as rapidly as possible.

Building design reflected the functional requirements for ammunition production. Shortages of steel forced builders to employ alternative materials, including masonry, glass, and wood frame. The danger of explosion and fear of sabotage prompted the design of buildings containing reinforced masonry at the base wherever possible. Areas that contained smokeless powder required extra air filters to remove explosive dust from the atmosphere and air humidifiers to minimize static electricity. The most noticeable feature of these small arms plants was their size. The St. Louis plant, for example, covered 300 acres and employed 40,000 men and women.<sup>cccxi</sup>

As was the case with artillery ammunition, the American capability to exceed the production of its enemies in small arms ammunition provided a crucial advantage on the battlefield. The ammunition produced at small arms plants was used by infantry units, in aircraft machine guns, in anti-aircraft machine guns, in tanks, and in virtually all other combat operations.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

## CHAPTER XI

### AMMUNITION DEPOTS

Finished ammunition required safe storage prior to shipment overseas. For this purpose, the Army and Navy acquired vast tracts of land, throughout the United States. Safety considerations for storage of large quantities of explosives required special design features, including permanent construction facilities.

#### **Ammunition Depot Design**

The design of ammunition depots was influenced strongly by the disastrous 1926 explosion at the Navy's Lake Denmark Ammunition Depot in New Jersey. A severe thunderstorm sparked a fire that caused an explosion in a temporary ammunition storehouse. The building was not designed for explosives, and was overloaded. The explosion spread to nearby magazines. The resulting series of explosions not only demolished Lake Denmark, but it also severely damaged the Army's Picatinny Arsenal and several nearby towns. Investigations following this disaster resulted in recommendations for strict limitations on the quantity of explosives stored in one structure and for increased distances between storage buildings.<sup>cccxv</sup>

In 1928, in response to the Lake Denmark disaster, both services adopted a new type of high explosive magazine. The new design called for a low-scale, earth-bermed, concrete structure. The sides were semi-circular so that the weakest structural point was the roof. The design directed the force of an explosion upwards, rather than toward adjacent magazines. The top was covered with earth and grass. An elaborate set of lightning rods and steel reinforcing rods were added as lightning protection. These magazines generally were 26 feet wide, 13 feet high, and from 40 to 80 feet long (Figure 24).<sup>cccxi</sup> The Army called the new magazine structures "igloos," while the Navy continued to call them "high explosives magazines."

As an additional design feature to prevent the spread of explosions, ammunition magazines were dispersed widely. Igloos were grouped in blocks of 100, with a minimum distance of 1,400 feet between blocks. Within each block, magazines were separated by at least 400 feet. The distance between each structure in the design of ordnance depots required considerable acreage. Six Army Ordnance Department depots contained more than 20,000 acres. To connect the various magazines, each depot normally had extensive road and railroad networks.<sup>cccxvii</sup>

Despite its acknowledged superiority for holding explosive munitions, igloo construction consumed an excessive quantity of steel, a critical war material. Between 1942 and 1943, engineers proposed an alternate design to reduce the amount of steel used for magazines. The design consisted of a circular, dome-shaped magazine, which they termed a "beehive." The new design proved to be equal to the igloo in structural strength, but required less steel, copper, and other vital materials.<sup>cccxviii</sup> Development of the beehive design, however, came after most ordnance depots had already been completed, and therefore had little effect upon ammunition storage during the war.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

## **Ammunition Depot Facilities**

The War Department used its ammunition depots for long term storage, to support military activities in a geographic area within the continental United States, and to hold ammunition prior to overseas shipment. As a result, depots were dispersed across the United States (Table 20). Some depots were located near ordnance plants, where they could provide long term storage, with minimum transportation cost from the point of manufacture. In the early phases of the war, when most ammunition requirements were associated with training activities, the wide geographic distribution of depots worked well. As the burden of supporting committed forces increased throughout the war, the workload of depots near ports increased. Depots within the coastal regions acquired the additional mission of providing back-up support the port depots.<sup>cccix</sup>

Army depots along the Atlantic, Gulf, or Pacific Coasts, such as Letterkenny, Pennsylvania; Seneca, New York; San Jacinto, Texas; Umatilla, Oregon; or, Sierra, California were used to hold ammunition prior to its final shipment overseas. Other depots, such as Milan, Tennessee; Red River, Texas; or, Portage (Ravenna), Ohio, were located near ordnance plants to hold the ammunition immediately after its production. The dry climate of western depots, such as Fort Wingate, New Mexico, or Tooele, Utah, enhanced their suitability for long term storage.<sup>cccxx</sup>

Like most other World War II construction projects, Ordnance Department depot construction followed a time sequence (Figure 25). During the mobilization period, the War Department either expanded or initiated construction at Anniston, Alabama; Umatilla, Oregon; Portage, Ohio; Fort Wingate, New Mexico; Milan, Tennessee; Seneca, New York; San Jacinto, Texas; and Red River, Texas depots. These depots, collectively called the "A" program, featured permanent construction ammunition "igloos," inert warehouses, and administrative buildings. As the war progressed, the demand for depots increased, but shortages of building materials also increased. To meet the wartime requirements, the Ordnance Department undertook a program for "B" depots. Igloos at these depots were permanent structures, but the other buildings were temporary. At some depots, the Army used a "theater-of-operations" type construction, which was designed as less permanent than the temporary buildings. Although the Ordnance Department provided the requirements, the Quartermaster Corps or the Corps of Engineers completed the actual construction.<sup>cccxxi</sup>

Naval ammunition depots performed both industrial production and storage functions. The Navy Department used depots to load explosives into the ammunition and to assemble complete rounds. These depots also supported command functions (Table 21).

At the close of World War I, the Navy had eight coastal depots located near Navy yards or bases. The Hingham Depot was located near the Boston Navy Yard, while the Iona and Lake Denmark Depots serviced the New York Navy Yard. Fort Mifflin Depot and St. Juliens Creek Depot supported the Philadelphia and Norfolk regions, respectively. A mine depot at Yorktown, Virginia, provided a specialized operation in the loading and storage of underwater mines. On the Pacific coast, ammunition depots at Mare Island and Ostrich Bay on Puget Sound completed the coastal depots. In 1930, the Navy constructed a large inland depot at Hawthorne, Nevada, to reduce congestion at other depots and to meet modern specifications for explosive storage.<sup>cccxxii</sup>

As the United States entered the protective mobilization phase, the Navy Department achieved its goal of constructing an inland ammunition depot east of the Mississippi. In June 1940, the government announced its intention to build a new depot in southwestern Indiana, which was named the Crane Ammunition Depot. Construction began in November of that year. By the official dedication on 1 December 1941, only a small percentage of the buildings were complete. When completed in 1942, the depot contained 1770 magazines, 1084 of which were designed for high explosives. It also contained 332 miles of road and 195 miles of railroad.<sup>cccxxiii</sup>

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

FIGURE 24

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 25

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

table 20

**TABLE 20: WORLD WAR II ARMY ORDNANCE DEPOTS**

<b>Original Name</b>	<b>Current Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date Established</b>
Anniston Ordnance Depot	Anniston Army Depot	AL	1941
Benecia Ordnance Depot	N/A	CA	1851
Black Hills Ordnance Depot	N/A	SD	1942
Blue Grass Ordnance Depot	Lexington-Blue Grass Army Depot	KY	1941
Charleston Ordnance Depot	N/A	SC	1916
Curtis Bay Ordnance Depot	N/A	MD	1918
Delaware Ordnance Depot	N/A	NJ	1918
Letterkenny Ordnance Depot	Letterkenny Army Depot	PA	1942
Milan Ordnance Depot	Milan AAP	TN	1941
Nansemond Ordnance Depot	N/A	VA	1918
Navajo Ordnance Depot	Navajo Army Depot	AZ	1942
Ogden Ordnance Depot	Ogden Defense Depot	UT	1920
Portage Ordnance Depot	Ravenna AAP	OH	1940
Pueblo Ordnance Depot	Pueblo Army Depot	CO	1942
Raritan Arsenal	N/A	NJ	1918
Red River Ordnance Depot	Red River Army Depot	TX	1941
San Jacinto Ordnance Depot	N/A	TX	N/A
Savanna Ordnance Depot	Savanna Army Depot Activity	IL	1917
Seneca Ordnance Depot	Seneca Army Depot	NY	1941
Sierra Ordnance Depot	Sierra Army Depot	CA	1942
Sioux Ordnance Depot	Sioux Army Depot	NE	1942
Tooele Ordnance Depot	Tooele Army Depot	UT	1942
Umatilla Ordnance Depot	Umatilla Army Depot	OR	1942
Ft. Wingate Ordnance Depot	Fort Wingate Army Depot	NM	1940*

\* Date ordnance depot established; Fort Wingate predates ordnance depot.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.



Source: Lenore Fine and Jesse A. Remington, *The Corps of Engineers: Construction in the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972), 309-335.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

table 21

**TABLE 21: WORLD WAR II NAVY AMMUNITION DEPOTS**

<b>WWII Name</b>	<b>Current Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date Established</b>
Charleston Naval Ammunition Depot	Naval Base Charleston	SC	1941
Crane Ammunition Depot	Naval Weapons Support Center Crane	IN	1941
Earle Ammunition Depot	N/A	NJ	1943
Fallbrook Ammunition Depot	Fallbrook Annex of NWS Seal Beach	CA	1942
Fort Mifflin Ammunition Depot	N/A	PA	1897
Hastings Ammunition Depot	Hastings NG	NE	1942
Hawthorne Ammunition Depot	Hawthorne AAP	NV	1930
Hingham Ammunition Depot	Naval Ammunition Depot Hingham	MA	1903
Iona Island Ammunition Depot	N/A	NY	1900
Lake Denmark Ammunition Depot	part of Picatinny Arsenal	NJ	1892
Mare Island Ammunition Depot	Naval Ammunition Depot Mare Island	CA	1853
McAlester Ammunition Depot	McAlester AAP	OK	1942
New Orleans Ammunition Depot	N/A	LA	1941
Ostrich Bay Ammunition Depot	Naval Ammunition Depot Puget Sound	WA	1891
Port Chicago Magazine	N/A	CA	1942
St. Juliens Creek Ammunition Depot	Naval Ammunition Depot St. Juliens Creek	VA	1897
Seal Beach Navy Depot	Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach	CA	1944
Yorktown Mine Depot	Naval Weapons Station Yorktown	VA	1918

Source: United States Navy, Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases in World War II* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1947).

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

As the war progressed, the Navy established two additional inland ammunition depots. Hastings, Nebraska, and McAlester, Oklahoma, were selected as depot sites in the summer of 1942 due to their location near major railroad lines. The design and functions of these depots was nearly identical. Both installations contained storage magazines, and facilities for loading shells and bombs.<sup>cccxxiv</sup>

Along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, the Navy followed established practices for expanding existing installations while creating new depots as warranted. An example of expansion is provided by Hingham Depot, in Massachusetts. The Hingham Depot relied on lighters, or smaller boats, for transportation of materiel to the Boston Navy Yard. As the workload increased, the Navy used more lighters, with a corresponding increase in wharfs and elevators. At the same time, Hingham's railroad and motor transport facilities were increased. At St. Juliens Creek, near Norfolk, the Navy built new magazines, barracks, and related facilities, to support its distribution and its loading missions.<sup>cccxxv</sup>

Even upgraded and expanded depots could not meet wartime demands. Consequently the Navy established new ammunition depots at New Orleans, Louisiana; Sandy Hook, New Jersey; and, Charleston, South Carolina on the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts. The depot at Sandy Hook, named the Earle Naval Ammunition Depot, became a major shipping point for both Army and Navy ammunition to the European theater. On the Pacific Coast, the Navy built new depots at Fallbrook and Seal Beach, California, and acquired Indian Island in the Puget Sound for additional ammunition storage.<sup>cccxxvi</sup>

The Navy redeveloped an ammunition depot at Port Chicago in 1942 from an abandoned shipyard on the San Francisco Bay. Designated a permanent installation, Port Chicago was selected for its isolated location which minimized potential damage to civilian communities in the event of an explosion. Despite these precautions, Port Chicago was the site of one of the worst ammunition disasters of the war. In July 1944, an ammunition ship exploded, killing over 300 sailors and damaging the port and nearby civilian communities. The stevedores at Port Chicago, who were African-American sailors, believed that they had been assigned exceptionally hazardous duty because of their race and refused to load ammunition ships. In a controversial series of courts-martial, the government dishonorably discharged fifty sailors and sentenced them to extended prison sentences; 208 sailors received shorter prison sentences and bad conduct discharges. After the war, the Navy reduced the sentences.<sup>cccxxvii</sup>

As a part of the Army and Navy ordnance systems, ordnance depots played an essential role in the distribution of ammunition. Their functional design, with rows of similar structures separated by large distances, provided an important safety feature to the ordnance systems. With the Lake Denmark disaster in mind, the War and Navy Departments carefully ensured that future depots would avoid similar accidents.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

## CHAPTER XII

### MODERN INDUSTRIAL ARCHITECTURE AND THE RISE OF THE WORLD WAR II INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

As the United States moved closer to involvement in World War II during the late 1930s, the necessity to increase the military's supply of weaponry and ammunition became apparent. Between the two world wars, the United States Army maintained few ordnance production facilities. The Frankford Arsenal in Philadelphia was the only existing small arms production plant during the 1920s and 1930s.<sup>cccxxviii</sup> By 1936, Army planners realized that U.S involvement in a global war would require both large-scale arms manufacturing in existing plants, and the construction of new facilities to supplement commercial manufacturers. Between 1939 and 1942, the U.S. military devoted a large percentage of its construction program to industrial production facilities, including heavy industry factories used to produce aircraft, tanks, and heavy artillery; and ammunition production facilities. Modern architectural theory, technology of building materials, and the production process influenced the design of the modern factory building. In addition to theoretical and technological developments, economic and time constraints imposed by the global emergency of the late 1930s and early 1940s played an equally significant role in the development of the World War II industrial building.

#### **European Roots of the 1930s Industrial Building**

Industrial factory designs emerged in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries that greatly influenced modern architecture. The industrial building symbolized man's new partnership with the machine. During the first decade of the twentieth century, architects and builders in both Europe and the United States created the first truly modern factories, dedicated to mechanized industry and the utilization of modern building materials. European architects consciously developed architectural theories that reflected their interpretation of the spirit of the modern age.<sup>cccxxix</sup> Communities of architects, artists, and craftsmen established as forums for progressive designers, flourished throughout Europe at this time.

In 1908, Peter Behrens, emerging from one such progressive community, the Deutsche Werkbund, designed the AEG Turbine Factory in Berlin. Behrens's factory was constructed of reinforced concrete and steel, both of which were expressed on the exterior of the building. Though the factory lacks traditional ornamentation, the regularity of its composition establishes a design rhythm on the facade of the building. The turbine factory achieves a sense of monumentality while simultaneously abandoning historicism.<sup>cccxxx</sup> It has been described frequently as a temple to industrial power and one of the earliest expressions of the spirit of the modern age.

In 1910 Behrens' pupil, Walter Gropius, designed the Fagus Factory in Alfeld, Germany, which effectively established the International Modern style with its rhythmic proportions and glass curtain wall.<sup>cccxxxi</sup> Gropius's use of a structural steel frame and glass curtain wall is one of the earliest examples of a building with an exposed supporting skeleton. The industrial work of both Behrens and Gropius illustrates the conscious development in Europe of the factory building type as a symbol of modern industry and of technology. The early work of these architects established the basis from which both the twentieth century industrial complex and the Modern stylistic movement emerged.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

## American Roots of the 1930s Industrial Building

Industrial architecture in the United States during the first decades of the twentieth century developed primarily from the practical and economic directives of the businesses they served, rather than from the theories of architects consciously pursuing an architectural identity for the modern age.<sup>cccxxii</sup> Industrial buildings in the United States were built to serve industry, and consequently often lay outside of the academic and cultural centers of the country. Most were designed by engineers rather than architects. The designers of these buildings became interpreters of the practical, operational, and economic needs of the building and the industry. Architects and engineers replaced the conscious pursuit of the creation of "style" with the attempt to use the machine and its processes to create architectural form.<sup>cccxxiii</sup>

Like European architects, American designers exploited the modern building materials of steel and reinforced concrete. In the United States, however, the materials were chosen solely because of their suitability to house modern industry. Concrete buildings are solid, resistant to sway, and capable of supporting heavy floor loads. One of the principal examples of early twentieth century industrial construction is the daylight factory. In this example, the building incorporates large areas of glass set between concrete slab floors.<sup>cccxxiv</sup> The reinforced concrete frame replaced load-bearing walls. Walls no longer needed to support the building were opened with large banks of windows that provided natural light. Reinforced concrete frames could span enormous spaces, providing uninterrupted interiors for industrial processes under one roof.

European architects noted the prominence of the daylight factory in the industrial buildings of the United States. Innovative European architects in the 1930s and 1940s studied the practical use of reinforced concrete, glass, and steel in the daylight factory, as well as the aesthetic qualities of regularity and order inherent in its form.<sup>cccxxv</sup> During the first quarter of the twentieth century, many European architects sought to develop designs that expressed the modern, machine-oriented era and rejected historicist architectural allusions. In the early twentieth-century American factory, these designers recognized the roots of such a style, and adapted its principles to their practices.

In 1932, Henry Russell Hitchcock and Philip Johnson served as curators for an exhibit of current architecture at the Museum of Modern Art in New York City. They called the exhibit the International Style. Hitchcock and Johnson displayed the work of five architects, from whose work they distilled three dominating characteristics: 1) Volume was expressed rather than mass; 2) Regularity of form was emphasized over symmetry; and, 3) Applied decoration was abandoned completely.<sup>cccxxvi</sup> The architectural characteristics of the International Style eventually dominated much of European and American building for a large part of the twentieth century. Though adapted to all building types, the features of the International Style are especially suited to industrial construction. The industrial complex of the late 1930s displays many characteristics of the International Style, linking it to both early twentieth century European theory as well as to the functionalism inherent in American industrial architecture from two decades earlier.<sup>cccxxvii</sup>

By the late 1930s, the most common form of the factory adopted by American architects and engineers was an architectural descendent of both European and American theory and practice. The form of this factory can be traced to the Fagus Factory at Alfeld designed by Gropius in 1910. From the exposed frame and glass wall of the Gropius factory evolved buildings including the van Nelle tobacco factory in Rotterdam, designed by Brinkmann and van der Vlucht in 1927.<sup>cccxxviii</sup> The van Nelle factory displayed continuous horizontal bands of windows across the facade of the building, divided by continuous horizontal concrete floor slabs. The form of the 1930s American industrial building, with its cubic proportions and emphasis on horizontality, evolved, in part, through this lineage.

The more important influence on the form of the 1930s industrial building was the American predisposition toward efficiency rather than tradition.<sup>cccxxix</sup> The primary purpose of the industrial building was to house the manufacturing process efficiently. The architect studied the manufacturing process in order to generate the form of the building. The designer drew a flow

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

diagram of the industry that included the movement of both materials and workers within the factory. The industry's production line was the most important element considered by the architect.<sup>cccxi</sup> The production line included the route travelled by materials from the point that they entered the plant as raw materials, to their exit as finished products. The requirements of the production line determined the form of the building.

Both multi-story and single-story factories appeared throughout the first half of the century, depending on the manufacturing process housed in the building. Manufacturers often chose to build multi-storied factories in areas with high land costs or limited construction sites. In addition, multi-story factories best accommodated light industry with lighter floor loads. In cases where gravity assisted the production process, or where materials progressed from one level down to another level, multi-story factories offered the most efficient solution.<sup>cccxi</sup> Architects and manufacturers chose single-story factory buildings for heavy industry that required extremely high floor loads.<sup>cccxiii</sup> Single-story factories with vast interior spaces divided by only one or two rows of support piers were better suited to the expansive, increasingly mechanized assembly lines of modern production. Single-story facilities also were preferable for industries anticipating expansion, because these buildings more easily accommodated layout changes and the reconfiguration of heavy machinery.<sup>cccxiii</sup>

By the end of the first decade of the twentieth century, architects designing industrial complexes almost exclusively worked with reinforced concrete or steel. Both materials had advantages. Though reinforced concrete was used frequently for both single- and multi-story buildings, the material was used most successfully in the design of the multi-story factory. The use of reinforced concrete structural systems provided a degree of safety impossible before the twentieth century. Concrete is fireproof and extremely solid. Factories built with a reinforced concrete frame appeared almost monolithic, and were resistant to the vibration and sway created by mechanized industry.<sup>cccxiv</sup> The reinforced concrete structural frame enabled architects to abandon traditional load-bearing walls and create vast spans of glass wall that provided plentiful natural light.<sup>cccxlv</sup>

By the 1930s, designers usually chose a steel frame to support a single-story factory. If a standardized arrangement of bays could accommodate the manufacturing process, steel structural bays were fabricated off-site. These pre-fabricated frames reduced construction time and eased the construction process.<sup>cccxvi</sup> Steel offered several advantages. Steel frames could withstand greater stresses than wood frames. Steel support piers occupied less interior space than reinforced concrete piers. These factors enabled architects to use steel structural systems to enclose immense and complex manufacturing operations within expansive, simple, and direct plans. Finally, a factory composed of the orderly arrangement of steel frame bays could be expanded, modified, or disassembled easily.<sup>cccxvii</sup>

### **Characteristics of the 1930s Industrial Building**

By the 1930s, with the development of the modern assembly line and heavy mechanized production, the single-story, steel-framed factory became the most industry-efficient type of factory constructed in the United States. This type of factory dominated the industrial landscape during the late 1930s and possessed several distinctive characteristics. Though the design of the buildings rarely displayed conscious symmetry, steel-frame structural systems resulted in a regularity in the spacing of bays that often imbued a sense of dignity in the facade of the building.<sup>cccxviii</sup> This regularity is one characteristic of the International Style. The steel frame also freed the walls from supporting the building. Non load-bearing walls therefore could be composed of glass, or clad with brick, stucco, or metal veneer. The 1930s factory could enclose enormous amounts of space, often creating an almost monumental interior work environment.<sup>cccxlix</sup>

The functional arrangements of architectural features frequently emphasized horizontality on the exterior of the building. Bands of windows set above horizontal bases clad in brick or stucco

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

provided a regularity and quiet procession to the factory facade. Flat roofs with plain cornices added to this horizontal order. The emphasis on horizontality is another characteristic of the International Style. The light needs of the industry housed within the building often dictated the roof shape. When natural light was desirable on the interior of the factory, one of three basic types of roofs, the sawtooth, butterfly, or monitor roof, provided large amounts of overhead natural light.<sup>cccl</sup> Consequently, the factory often displayed an unusual, animated roof line. Designers chose a flat roof, often with a plain eave treatment, if artificial illumination and strip windows could provide sufficient light to the interior.

For the most part, the 1930s industrial building lacked decoration, illustrating the third characteristic of the International Style. The horizontal rhythm of the continuous run of bays, the strip windows, and extended eaves supplanted the traditional decorative vocabulary.<sup>cccli</sup> In the industrial building of the 1930s, efficiency of design replaced the desire or need to follow historicism.

### **Influence of Albert Kahn**

The most powerful influence in the development of the late 1930s industrial building was the architect Albert Kahn. The organization of his office and the buildings he designed became the standard by which the majority of World War II industrial complexes were built. Kahn was born in 1869 in Rhauen, Germany. In 1880, Kahn's father moved the family to Detroit, where he hoped they might find a more prosperous future. At the age of sixteen, Kahn took a job as an office boy in the architectural office of Mason and Rice in Detroit. As a child, Kahn had dreamed of becoming an artist; he became a draftsman at Mason and Rice and studied architecture in the firm's library.<sup>ccclii</sup>

Kahn received no formal architectural education, but in 1891 won a scholarship for a year's study in Europe. In Italy, he met and travelled with the architect Henry Bacon, who later designed the Lincoln Memorial in Washington. Kahn, with two other architects, left Mason and Rice in 1896. The three young architects formed an independent firm. Kahn's early work for both Mason and Rice and his own partnership reflected the historical tradition observed during his European travels.<sup>cccliii</sup> By 1902, Kahn had left the partnership and was working alone. In 1903, his brother Julius joined him as chief engineer. At this time, Kahn slowly began to receive industrial commissions. His career coincided with the emergence of the auto industry, which created a demand for factories. While many of his contemporaries refused industrial commissions, Kahn enthusiastically accepted the challenge, and over the next four decades was a major influence on modern American industrial architecture.<sup>cccliv</sup>

In many ways, the organization and structure of Kahn's firm was as important in the creation of the industrial building as Kahn was individually. Kahn became a master of organizing work to achieve maximum efficiency.<sup>ccclv</sup> His office structure was atypical of contemporary architectural firms. Kahn viewed his position as one of coordinating information among his staff and clients. He regarded his practice as a collaboration of equals, referring to himself as the "conductor of the symphony."<sup>ccclvi</sup> He arrived at concept for a particular building by bringing together experts from different fields, including the client. Therefore skilled technicians became involved as generators of the design concept, rather than solely as its executors.

Kahn learned about handling and organizing information from the industries that he served, specifically the auto industry. He divided his firm into two divisions, the Technical and the Executive. Each division contained several subdivisions.<sup>ccclvii</sup> Individual projects began with round-table meetings attended by Kahn, the client, and leaders of the relevant divisions and subdivisions of the firm. Extensive discussion generated elaborate flow charts that outlined the design of the industrial complex, as well as detailed design and construction processes.<sup>ccclviii</sup> Meticulous organizational procedures enabled the leaders of various departments to monitor closely the design process throughout its development, thus reducing the number of time-consuming mistakes. Kahn created a process in which mammoth industrial complexes could be designed and built with great

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

speed. This speed and organization enabled Albert Kahn's practice to flourish during World War II, when the need for modern industrial complexes grew dramatically.

Two of Kahn's early industrial plants were significant precursors of the industrial factory of the late 1930s and World War II periods. In 1906, Kahn designed the George N. Pierce Plant in Buffalo, New York. The plant was a complex of eight buildings, one administrative and seven production buildings, used for the manufacture of the Pierce Great Arrow Automobile. Most of the seven production buildings were single-story structures of various heights, supported by reinforced concrete frames, and lit by different forms of roof lighting. Concrete structural bays defined the exteriors and interiors of each of the buildings. The plan of this industrial complex became the model for factory design during the next several decades.<sup>ccclix</sup> The industrial flow-chart developed for production of the automobile generated the design of the complex. The position of each of the buildings within the complex was determined by the factory's flow of work. Rail lines connected the separate buildings. Most of the production operations were located within single-story buildings, with monitor and sawtooth roofs evenly distributing natural light throughout the building. Kahn was able, therefore, to increase the length and width of the interiors of the plant as needed without worry over the light source, in order to accommodate the industrial process. This type of manufacturing complex proved remarkably well suited to modern production techniques.<sup>ccclx</sup>

The second of Kahn's most influential early works is the Ford River Rouge Plant, built outside Detroit in 1918. With the auto industry's adoption of the assembly line came the predominance of the single story factory. Though the Pierce plant included some single-story industrial buildings, the River Rouge plant was composed of a series of single-story buildings of uniform height, and marked a major industrial client's commitment to single story construction.<sup>ccclxi</sup> The plant housed a large and complex manufacturing process within a simple and economical plan of modular mechanical systems and conveyors. River Rouge also marks Kahn's commitment to steel frame construction. Before 1914, Kahn worked almost exclusively in concrete. With the adoption of the mechanized assembly line by the auto industry and the resulting predominance of the single-story factory, steel frame construction became the most practical design alternative.<sup>ccclxii</sup> By utilizing prefabricated steel frames, Kahn was able to construct the plant with remarkable speed. The River Rouge Plant received critical acclaim and wide publicity.

## **World War II Military Industrial Facilities**

As war engulfed Europe, the U. S. government realized that if the United States became involved in the conflict, it would need to increase rapidly its supply of weaponry, especially ammunition. In 1940, the United States lacked sufficient ammunition for a single day's fighting.<sup>ccclxiii</sup> Many American peacetime industries converted to military production without trouble, but the nature of ordnance production required the construction of entirely new facilities, with little potential for civilian use after the war. To meet the need for ordnance production, the U.S. government built industrial facilities, declared them to be military installations, and hired private corporations to run them. These Government-Owned, Contractor-Operated (GOCO) facilities comprised the majority of World War II period permanent industrial construction.

Both the planning of most GOCOs and the administration of the design process followed work patterns established by Albert Kahn. The impending war with Europe and Japan in the late 1930s created a state of emergency in the United States, and speed consequently became the most important requirement in the design process. Kahn's approach to design had proved fast and efficient before the war, and was adopted without hesitation by many designers during the emergency. During this period, many architects and engineers collaborated in order to achieve almost miraculous construction goals.

The two most prolific architect and engineering firms during the World War II period were Albert Kahn and Associates, and Smith, Hinchman, and Grylls of Detroit. From December 1939 to December 1942, Albert Kahn received over \$200 million in government commissions.<sup>ccclxiv</sup> During

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**

Other properties supported the primary installation mission.



the same period, Smith, Hinchman, and Grylls received almost \$500 million in government contracts, accumulated a staff of 1,200, and built numerous industrial complexes containing over 1,000 buildings.<sup>ccclxv</sup> When dealing with numbers so great and with short time spans, standardization became the means by which these firms achieved such dramatic results. In 1941, Albert Kahn wrote that these years were "no time for philosophizing, waiting for inspiration...A prompt and direct solution of practical problems dealing with housing machines and manufacturing processes is demanded. Simplicity of design and construction is imperative."<sup>ccclxvi</sup> Architects reproduced and repeated designs where possible making alterations only to accommodate individual site or manufacturing constraints.

The military emphasized efficiency and economy of construction in the industrial design process. In January 1941, Brehon Somervell, then Chief of Quartermaster Construction, issued a memorandum to the field, stating, "There is no excuse for the use of expensive materials where less costly ones will serve the purpose for the period of time for which the construction is being provided."<sup>ccclxvii</sup> A growing shortage of materials eventually dictated a shift from steel and concrete construction to wood-frame construction.

With the exception of munitions storage and loading complexes, the design of small arms production facilities generally followed the model of the 1930s single-story factory discussed earlier. Designers adapted the characteristics of this type of factory to suit the needs of a wartime facility. For the most part, heavy industrial complexes produced planes, tanks, armaments, and machine tools. Albert Kahn established five guidelines for the adaptation of the industrial factory to a wartime industry:

- 1) Must permit ultra-rapid construction if the plant is to serve its purpose;
- 2) Must, as a factory building, meet the requirements of the industry it serves;
- 3) Must provide for safety of plant and process if attacked;
- 4) Must provide for the safety of workers under air attack particularly; and
- 5) Must be practicable in view of today's labor and materials market.<sup>ccclxviii</sup>

Guideline (1) resulted from the need to provide support to the fighting forces as rapidly as possible. Guideline (2) addressed the nature of the industry, which directed the form of the building. Because the manufacturing process for heavy industries implemented the use of the assembly line and could be contained under one roof, the single-story, steel frame factory provided the most space-efficient alternative. Facilities were planned and constructed so that plant expansion could occur without interruption to the manufacturing process.<sup>ccclxix</sup>

Modifications to the 1930s factory design were implemented that addressed guidelines (3) and (4). For example, architects designed windowless manufacturing facilities to protect buildings from night air raids. To protect both manufacturing equipment and factory workers from high-explosive bombing, non-load-bearing walls were built independently of the steel framework of the factory. A bombing attack would destroy the walls of the building without extensively damaging its structural system.<sup>ccclxx</sup> For the most part, however, industrial facilities that housed heavy wartime industry followed design patterns established for factories during the 1930s.

Style was not a consideration in the design of the World War II industrial building. During this period, economy of time, materials, and funds required the elimination of everything but the utilitarian. In observing this requirement however, Kahn wrote that "there lies an element which itself makes for attractive external effect...the structural element of the industrial building automatically makes for impressive results. External beauty as such is never achieved by application of useless decoration, but rather by good planning, grouping, massing, and proportion."<sup>ccclxxi</sup> The World War II industrial complex exemplifies one of the most extreme examples of American functionalist architecture, and displays a beauty in the relationship and order of its different structural elements.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

The munitions GOCO complex encompassed a wide array of munitions production, from relatively stable small arms ammunition production, to the more volatile processes of loading and storing munitions. Like heavy industry facilities, munitions complexes relied on the design principles of the 1930s prototype factory when possible. This design was altered, however, to accommodate specific production needs. A small arms ammunition production facility, for example, had a relatively low degree of danger involved in the production process. This type of facility, therefore, could follow the basic steel frame, single-story factory design. Munitions facilities that dealt with more volatile explosives adopted planning principles to suit the needs of the specific production process. Two facilities provide examples of these broad planning and design patterns.

The Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant, located in New Brighton, Minnesota, was constructed in 1941 as a production facility for small arms ammunition. Smith, Hinchman, and Grylls received the design contract for the facility. Its design was based on the recently completed small arms ammunition plant in Lake City, Missouri, which Smith, Hinchman, and Grylls designed as a model for future manufacturing installations.<sup>ccclxxii</sup>

The Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant initially contained five manufacturing buildings, which were the largest facilities on the installation.<sup>ccclxxiii</sup> The initial manufacturing buildings were low-lying, expansive buildings constructed of brick, steel, and concrete. Building 103, a .50 Caliber Shop, illustrates the features of a typical small arms manufacturing building (Figure 26). It exhibits a clean-cut profile, with an emphasis on horizontal lines. The nature of the specific production process required a two-story building. The design of Building 103 is based on the mechanized production process, however, and exhibits many of the prototypical features of the modern single-story factory. Smith, Hinchman, and Grylls developed the design of the building by examining closely the manufacturing process and the machines employed:

A carefully prepared template for each machine is cut out of cardboard and these are then assembled into plans of departments...colored strips...indicate the movement of materials from one bank of machines to another. Ultimately these department units are assembled to form the entire production unit housed in the manufacturing building...As the machine layout becomes more definitely established the template plans begin to take the outline of actual buildings.<sup>ccclxxiv</sup>

Building 103 has a steel-frame structural system, with non-load-bearing exterior walls clad with brick.<sup>ccclxxv</sup> The steel framing system, comprised of exterior and interior supports, enabled the building to enclose a vast amount of space. Window arrangement is predominantly horizontal, varying from narrow bands to wide ranges of strip windows with steel framed industrial sashes. The building's flat, steel, extended roof and low-lying monitors also emphasize the horizontal lines of the composition (Figure 27). The only instance of consciously applied decoration occurs on the entry facade of the building. The architects have incorporated an abstracted reference to a classical portico and colonnade in the square brick piers separating the individual entries (Figure 28). The remainder of the building relies upon the regularity of the window and cornice lines to provide a pleasing aesthetic quality to the building.<sup>ccclxxvi</sup>

Safety requirements also influenced the design of the manufacturing building. The high masonry walls shielded workers from splinters and shrapnel in the event of attack. In most areas of the building, windows sat at a point immediately below the roof line. In the case of an explosion on the production line, these windows were designed to blow out and relieve pressure inside the building.<sup>ccclxxvii</sup> Because some production tasks were more hazardous than others, the building was divided into a complex system of wings. This plan neatly separated the most volatile areas of the building from the more stable areas, while containing the entire manufacturing process under one roof.<sup>ccclxxviii</sup>

In January 1942, the government authorized the expansion of the ordnance plant, which doubled the size of the original installation. Smith, Hinchman, and Grylls again carried out the contract. Because of material shortages, building designs incorporated wood-frame structural

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

systems rather than steel and concrete systems. The new buildings housed similar manufacturing processes with the same production capacity as the original plant buildings, but were built to serve as temporary structures.<sup>ccclxxxix</sup>

Ammunition facilities built to house more volatile production processes adopted a different approach to industrial design. These facilities consisted primarily of installations used for the loading and storage of heavy artillery, and the manufacture of explosives. McAlester Army Ammunition Plant provides a useful example, because its seven original production plants remain relatively unmodified.

In 1942, the Navy established a depot used for both loading and storage near McAlester, Oklahoma. The Army has operated the plant since 1977. The materials handled at McAlester were highly sensitive and the risks involved in production were significantly higher than at small arms ammunition plants such as Twin Cities AAP. For this reason, the production process required separate, detached buildings.<sup>ccclxxx</sup> This separation reduced the chances of the entire plant igniting if an explosion occurred in one of the buildings. The design of individual buildings varied according to the processes housed within the buildings. Because each stage of the production line was contained within a separate building, individual buildings were often quite small. The Major Caliber loading plant at McAlester AAP sits on roughly 150 acres of land, and consists of about 30 individual buildings. The buildings of primary importance included two explosive loading facilities, ignition and fill buildings, a bag filling building, and a sifting building. The explosive loading facilities enclosed the largest amounts of space, roughly 16,000 square feet, and were over twice the size of the other plant facilities (Figure 29).<sup>ccclxxxi</sup> Because highly sensitive explosives passed through each of the buildings during the loading process, each building was designed to withstand powerful explosions. A steel-frame structural system with brick splinter walls supported the large loading facilities. The other significant buildings in the complex had steel or concrete structural systems with walls clad in concrete or brick. Doors were located at frequent intervals, providing easy escape. Second story escape chutes descended from some of the more sensitive buildings (Figure 30). For the most part, manufacturing facilities built to load and store highly volatile explosives displayed utilitarian architectural characteristics. Architects designed these facilities to contain dangerous manufacturing processes in as safe and efficient a manner as possible.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 26

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 27

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 28

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 29

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 30

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.



The architectural significance of this type of munitions complex lies not in the design of the individual building, but in the planning of each component within the manufacturing process. The plan of the manufacturing plant at such an installation is in many ways a macrocosm of the production line. Because the production process cannot be contained safely under one roof, each step in the manufacturing process must be isolated from the next, and contained within an individual building. Railroad lines linked the buildings, transporting materials from one stage in the production process to the next. Replacing conveyor belts, covered sidewalks also linked buildings, allowing munitions to be carted from building to building (Figure 31). In addition to rail lines and covered sidewalks, a network of tunnels often provided additional links among buildings.

Though highly explosive munitions facilities could not follow the most current production theory by developing the form of the factory around the circuit of the assembly line, architects adapted the theory to suit the requirements of these facilities. The prototypical planning concept remains at installations such as McAlester, where the assembly line expanded in order to isolate each step of the manufacturing process. Here, the assembly line appears outside of the building, in the form of rail lines and covered sidewalks, and the buildings themselves become analogous to stations within the manufacturing process.

## **Conclusion**

During World War II, the United States military created two broad types of permanent industrial construction. These included heavy industry factories that produced planes, tanks, and heavy artillery; and ammunition production and loading facilities. Architects and engineers relied on the form of the 1930s factory for the design of the World War II industrial complex. This architectural building type evolved from both American and European early twentieth-century industrial construction. The evolution of factory design was influenced by new construction technologies as well as changing architectural theories. Perhaps the greatest influence on the design of the 1930s factory and industrial complex was the development of the manufacturing process. The industry production line, which included the route of the product from its entry as raw material to its exit as finished product, dictated the form of the building. Wherever possible, architects relied on precedents established in the 1930s, specifically modular steel-frame, single-story construction, for the design of the World War II industrial complex. Heavy industry military production facilities were housed in factories similar in design to the factories that housed automobile production a decade earlier. The form of the more volatile ammunitions loading facilities, which for reasons of safety could not be housed within a single building, still relied on the production line to generate the plan of the entire complex. Under the military's supervision, architect/engineering collaborative firms designed and built enormous war-related industrial complexes in remarkably short periods of time during the late 1930s and early 1940s. The success of these ventures was due to standards established in the efficient design of the modern American factory.

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

figure 31

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

## PART II

# APPLICATION OF THE HISTORIC CONTEXT

**Boldface denotes properties essential to the mission of the installation type.**  
Other properties supported the primary installation mission.

## CHAPTER XIII

### IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES

#### Background

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, 80 Stat. 915, 16 U.S.C. 470, as amended, established the National Register of Historic Places as the official list of properties significant in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture. The National Register includes properties that merit preservation and is an important planning tool that continually is updated to represent the many facets of American history. The National Register is maintained by the Secretary of the Interior, and administered by the National Park Service. The Department of the Interior has developed regulations defining the procedures for listing properties in the National Register (36 CFR Part 60).

Federal agencies are required to consider the effects of their undertakings on properties that are eligible for listing in the National Register under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended. In order to assess effects of actions, Federal agencies are required to identify and evaluate properties to determine their eligibility for inclusion in the National Register. The Secretary of the Interior has developed standards and guidelines for both identification and evaluation.

#### Identification

Historic properties must be located, or *identified*, in order to be included in the planning process. The Secretary of the Interior's *Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation* (48 FR 44716) define the Standards for Identification (Table 22). Identification activities include developing a research design, conducting archival research and field survey, and analyzing the results. The research design describes the objectives and methodology of the

identification activities. The approach to identifying historic properties depends upon the goals of the survey and the information available.

**TABLE 22: SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS FOR IDENTIFICATION**

**STANDARD I:** Identification of Historic Properties is Undertaken to the Degree Required to Make Decisions

**STANDARD II:** Results of Identification are Integrated into the Preservation Planning Process

**STANDARD III:** Identification Activities Include Explicit Procedures for Record-Keeping and Information Distribution

## Objectives

The objectives of the identification activity will determine the appropriate methodology. Identification of historic properties may be undertaken to:

- *Update existing survey information*

The identification of historic properties is an on-going process. Existing inventories of an installation's historic properties may not include properties associated with World War II, which recently have become older than 50 years.

- *Gather information for the planning of a particular project*

A federal undertaking may be planned in an area that has not been surveyed previously for historic properties. The area that potentially will be affected by a federal undertaking must be surveyed for historic properties in order to determine if the proposed undertaking may affect any historic properties.

- *Develop a comprehensive management plan*

Comprehensive survey of an installation, command, or activity's historic properties may be undertaken in order to incorporate the information into the planning process.

Thus, the identification of historic properties may be limited to a single property or to a discrete area, or may encompass an entire installation or command. The research design for the identification activities should indicate clearly the objectives of the effort to identify historic properties.

## Methodology

Once the objectives of the identification activities are determined, the appropriate methodology can be selected. A research design to identify properties associated with World War II permanent construction should outline means of identifying all properties constructed between 1940 and 1945, and those constructed prior to the 1940 that were utilized during the war. The methodology also should be designed to determine the property's original type of construction, historical functions, and historical relationship to the site and to surrounding properties. Determining the property's original function and type of construction are crucial to assessing its historic significance within the historic context of World War II permanent construction and to assessing its integrity.

Archival research and field survey are the two primary means of identifying historic properties. Archival research provides information on what was constructed, why it was constructed, and where it was constructed. Primary sources include historic maps, historic photographs, completion reports, and original construction drawings. These materials are located in a wide variety of repositories: installation real property offices; installation, command, or service-wide history offices; and the National Archives. Secondary sources include installation or

activity histories, standard histories of the World War II domestic war effort, and previous cultural resource studies.

*The Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Identification* distinguish two categories of survey: reconnaissance and intensive.<sup>ccclxxxii</sup> Reconnaissance surveys, also called windshield surveys, provide general information about the location, distribution, and characteristics of properties. The purpose of intensive surveys is to document all historic properties within a given area in sufficient detail to allow their eligibility for listing in the National Register to be assessed. Reconnaissance surveys can be used to establish the boundaries of an area that needs intensive survey. Current installation maps and real property lists, with building numbers and dates of construction, are necessary prior to conducting a field survey. These documents assist in identifying the properties that should be surveyed and in recording their location. Documentation of the survey provides a written record of the survey. Survey documentation includes maps indicating the boundaries of the area surveyed and the location of properties identified during the survey, survey forms, photographs of surveyed properties, and a survey report. The survey report should describe the survey objectives, methodology, and results.

### Evaluation

Once properties are identified, their historic significance can be evaluated. The Secretary of the Interior's *Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation* (48 FR 44716) define the Standards for Evaluation (Table 23). The accepted criteria used to evaluate historic properties are the National Register Criteria for Evaluation (36 CFR Part 60.4).

<b>STANDARD I:</b>	Evaluation of the Significance of Historic Properties Uses Established Criteria
<b>STANDARD II:</b>	Evaluation of Significance Applies the Criteria Within Historic Contexts
<b>STANDARD III:</b>	Evaluation Results in a List or Inventory of Significant Properties That Is Consulted in Assigning Registration and Treatment Priorities
<b>STANDARD IV:</b>	Evaluation Results Are Made Available to the Public

National Register Criteria for Evaluation

The National Register Criteria for Evaluation (36 CFR Part 60.4) were developed to assist in the evaluation of properties eligible for inclusion in the National Register (Table 24). The

<b>TABLE 24. NATIONAL REGISTER CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION</b>	
	The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:
A.	That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
B.	That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
C.	That 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.	That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

National Park Service has published guidance for applying the criteria in *National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* (National Park Service 1991). To qualify for the National Register, a property must be associated with an important historic context and retain historic integrity.

## National Register Categories of Historic Properties

The National Register includes real property of several different categories. The following definitions for the categories of historic properties considered for listing in the National Register are taken from National Register Bulletin 15.<sup>ccclxxxiii</sup> Examples of World War II permanent construction are provided to illustrate these categories:

- ***Building:*** A building, such as a house, barn, church, hotel, or similar construction, is created principally to shelter any form of human activity. "Building" also may refer to an historically and functionally related complex, such as a courthouse and jail or a house and barn.

Examples: administration building, barracks, factory, hangar, hospital, warehouse

- ***Structure:*** The term "structure" is used for constructions erected for purposes other than creating human shelter.

Examples: ammunition storage igloo, coastal fortification battery, dry dock, hammerhead crane, training tower, wind tunnel

Aircraft, ships, and mechanized vehicles also are categorized as structures. These types of properties are not included within the World War II Permanent Construction Historic Context.

- ***Object:*** The term "object" is used for resources, other than buildings and structures, that are primarily artistic in nature or are relatively small in scale and simply constructed. Although it may be, by nature or design, movable, an object is associated with a specific setting or environment.

Examples: boundary marker, monument, sculpture

Few examples of this property category are associated with the World War II Permanent Construction Historic Context.

- ***Site:*** A site is the location of a significant event, a prehistoric or historic occupation or activity, or a building or structure, whether standing, ruined, or vanished, where the location itself possesses historic, cultural, or archeological value regardless of the value of any existing structure.

Examples: battlefield; ruins of a building or structure; testing site

Shipwrecks are examples of sites. This type of property is not included within the World War II Permanent Construction Historic Context.

- ***District:*** A district is a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, buildings, structures, or objects united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development.

Examples: airfield, housing area, ordnance plant, ordnance works, shipyard, arsenal

## Evaluating Properties Within Historic Contexts



Historic contexts are organizational frameworks that assist in interpreting the broad patterns or trends of history by grouping information related to shared theme, geographic area, and time period. Historic contexts provide the framework for the application of the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and the foundation for decisions about the comparative significance of properties. The significance of a property is best evaluated within the property's historic context.

The National Park Service offers guidelines in assessing the significance of a property within its historic context:<sup>cclxxxiv</sup>

1. Identify the historic context represented by the property;
2. Determine how the theme of the context is significant in local, state, or national history;
3. Determine what property types represent the context;
4. Determine how the property illustrates an important aspect of the history; and,
5. Determine if the property retains the physical features necessary to convey its significance.

#### Issues Related to Evaluating Properties Using the World War II Permanent Construction Historic Context

Historic District vs. Individual Eligibility. While World War II permanent construction, as a class of resources, may be significant, not every structure built during World War II is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The framework established by the historic context for World War II permanent construction focuses on the mission of the installation in assessing its significance, as well as the significance of its component resources. This is appropriate due to the nature of construction during the war since the military used standardized buildings as well as standardized installation layouts, particularly for industrial plants.

In general, World War II permanent construction first should be evaluated as potential districts. Many World War II installations were designed with interrelated component parts that functioned in concert to fulfill the purpose of the installation. Districts also may include properties built prior to 1940 that were used during World War II.

Defining the boundaries of historic districts may not be as simple as defining the boundaries of a single site, building, or installation. A district is a definable geographic area characterized by shared relationships among the properties within the district. Other points to note about the delineation of district boundaries include:

- A district may include features that lack individual distinction, if the district as a whole entity is significant;
- A district may contain properties that do not contribute to the district's significance;
- District boundaries are based on the historical and physical associations among the properties, which do not necessarily coincide with current installation boundaries or activity jurisdictions; and,

- A district usually consists of a contiguous area, but may consist of two or more separate areas if the space between the areas is not related to the significance of the district and visual continuity is not a factor in the significance.<sup>ccclxxxv</sup>

For properties to be individually eligible for listing in the National Register within the context of permanent World War II construction, they should (1) clearly and explicitly reflect the important mission of the installation; (2) be regarded as emblematic of the installation or of an aspect of the World War II military mission; or, (3) represent particularly significant examples of a type or method of construction or the important work of a significant architect. Infrastructure and support buildings typically are not individually eligible unless they were: (1) the site of a particular event; (2) directly associated with a significant individual; or (3) of exceptional note as an example of architectural or engineering design.

Comparing Related Properties. During the process of evaluating a property's significance, the property usually is compared with other examples of the property type that illustrate the selected historic context. This is not necessary if (1) the property is the only surviving example of a property type that is important within the historic context or (2) the property distinctly has the characteristics necessary to represent the context.<sup>ccclxxxvi</sup> In other cases, the property must be evaluated against other similar properties to determine its significance. For example, the World War II industrial area of a shipyard should be compared historically and physically with other shipyards to determine if it contains the components of a World War II shipyard and to assess its wartime role in relation to the other shipyards and its level of integrity.

Properties Significant Within More Than One Historic Context. Properties may possess significance within multiple historic contexts. For instance, properties at Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey, may possess significance within the context of the development of black powder manufacturing during the early twentieth century, as well as within the context of World War II munitions production, though the buildings pre-date the war. In another example, testing facilities at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, and Naval Weapons Center China Lake, California, may be significant within the context of World War II permanent construction, and also may possess significance within the context of the Cold War. Though a property may be significant within more than one historic context, significance within one context is sufficient for the property to meet the National Register Criteria for Evaluation.

Military installations should be evaluated holistically, with attention to their interrelated historical associations over time. When evaluating the significance of a military property, the period of significance should be defined based on the range of important associations over time. In a district, buildings may illustrate various dates of construction, architectural designs, and historical associations; the historic context(s) should be defined broadly enough to encompass all of the aspects the district's significance. A single property also may be associated with several periods of history. When evaluating the significance of property during World War II, the potential for significance within other or broader historic contexts should not be overlooked.

Levels of Significance. The National Register Criteria for Evaluation define three levels of significance: local, state, and national. The level of significance is based on the selection of geographic area, one of the three components of the framework of a historic context.<sup>ccclxxxvii</sup>

Local historic contexts are related to the history of a town, city, county, or region. A property may be an example of a property type found in several places, but in a local historic context the significance of a property is assessed in terms of its importance to the local area. World War II installations often had a profound effect on the local economy and work force and may represent significant events in the community or regional history. In terms of local historic contexts, a military installation should be evaluated based on the importance of its role or contribution to the locality. In many cases, World War II installations were located in response to national military strategic objectives, such as site defensibility or combat readiness. In most instances, a military

installation operated as a self-contained entity with little interaction with the surrounding community. The importance of a military installation within a local context should be assessed on a site-specific basis.

State historic contexts are applied when a property represents an important aspect of state history. Examples of properties significant within a statewide historic context are not necessarily located in every part of the state, but are important to the history of the state as a whole. State Historic Preservation Offices have developed historic contexts relevant to state and local history. The construction and operation of World War II permanent military facilities may have affected strongly a state's economy, labor force, and development. A military installation should be evaluated based on the importance of its role or contribution to defined state historic contexts. The location of World War II installations corresponded to national military strategic objectives, but most states had at least one military installation in operation during World War II. However, this assessment will need to be made on a site-specific basis.

National historic contexts are related to aspects of history that affected the nation as a whole. A property that illustrates an aspect of national history should be evaluated within a national context. World War II permanent construction was undertaken on behalf of the domestic war effort. The effort was a national program directed to meet national defense needs, and thus represents an aspect of the history of the United States as a whole. The national context is recommended as the appropriate context for assessing military architecture and engineering constructed during World War II.

The distinction between properties that are related to a national context and those that are nationally significant should be noted. Nationally-significant properties illustrate the broad patterns of U.S. history, possess exceptional value or quality, and retain a high degree of integrity. Nationally-significant properties are eligible for designation as National Historic Landmarks. The National Historic Landmark Criteria for Evaluation (36 CFR Part 65) are more stringent than the National Register Criteria and are discussed in the following pages.

### Applying the National Register Criteria for Evaluation

**Criterion A: Association with Events.** The first criterion of the National Register recognizes properties associated with events important in the broad patterns of United States history. These events can be of two types: (1) specific events or (2) patterns of events that occurred over time. World War II was a crucial event in U.S. history. The American involvement in the war was composed of a complex series of political, military, diplomatic, economic, scientific, and industrial events and programs that affected the lives of millions. While World War II was, in a dramatic understatement, an "event that made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history" (36 CFR Part 60.4[a]), not all military property constructed during World War II is necessarily significant within the historic context of World War II. For a property to meet Criterion A, the property must have an important and specific association with the event.<sup>cclxxviii</sup>

The World War II permanent construction historic context provides the context for a major portion of the construction related to the war effort. To determine if a property is significant within the World War II permanent construction historic context, under Criterion A:

1. Determine the nature of the property, including date of construction, type of construction, and function(s) during World War II;
2. Determine if the property is associated **specifically** with the World War II permanent construction historic context; and,
3. Evaluate the property's history to determine whether it is associated with the historic context in an **important** way.<sup>cclxxxix</sup>

Properties can represent the World War II permanent construction historic context in many ways. They can be associated with important, specific events, such as the Japanese invasion of Alaska, or the December 7, 1941 bombing of Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. They also can be associated with important patterns of events that affected the overall course of the war, such as: the war in the Pacific; the war in the Atlantic, Europe, and Africa; the development of the ordnance industry and production of military ordnance; the U.S. atomic program; military mobilization and training; research and development of important new technologies; or, the home front economy and labor force.

Criterion B: Association with People. Properties may be listed in the National Register of Historic Places for their association with the lives of significant persons. The individual in question must have made contributions to history that can be specifically documented and that were important within a historic context. This criterion is applicable to only a small portion of World War II construction. The World War II Permanent Construction Historic Context concentrates on the events and on the design and construction associated with the Second World War, rather than on individuals. However, background research on a particular installation or building may indicate that it was associated with an individual who made an important contribution to the war effort. For additional guidance on assessing properties under Criterion B, refer to *National Register Bulletin 32: Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Properties Associated with Significant Persons* (National Park Service).

To determine if a property is significant within the World War II permanent construction historic context, under Criterion B:

1. Determine the importance of the individual;
2. Determine the length and nature of the person's association with the property;
3. Determine if the person is individually significant within the historic context;
4. Determine if the property is associated with the time period during which the individual made significant contributions to history; and,
5. Compare the property to other properties associated with the individual to determine if the property in question best represents the individual's most significant contributions.<sup>cccxc</sup>

The only properties currently listed in the National Register for their associations with individuals in the context of World War II are the Pentagon and the Headquarters, Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet building at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. The CINCPAC Fleet Headquarters Building was nominated to the National Register because of its association with Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, who was appointed Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet shortly after the Japanese surprise attack on Pearl Harbor. Admiral Nimitz commanded U.S. forces in the Central and North Pacific areas from 1942 to 1945. The headquarters building is the property most closely associated with Admiral Nimitz's leadership of the Pacific Fleet during World War II. The Pentagon is associated with the careers of several significant military figures. Generally, properties associated with a significant individual will be represented by a single building or structure, not an entire installation. It then becomes essential to identify the property best associated with that individual.

Criterion C: Design/Construction. To be eligible for listing in the National Register under Criterion C, properties must meet at least one of the following four requirements: (1) embody distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction; (2) represent the work of a master; (3) possess high artistic value; or, (4) represent a significant and distinguishable entity

whose components may lack individual distinction. World War II permanent construction is most likely to be eligible under the first or fourth of these requirements.

National Register Bulletin 15 defines "distinctive characteristics" as "the physical features or traits that commonly recur" in properties; "type, period, or method of construction" is defined as "the way certain properties are related to one another by cultural tradition or function, by dates of construction or style, or by choice or availability of materials and technology". Properties are eligible for listing in the National Register if they are important examples, within a historic context, of design and construction of a particular time.<sup>cccxc</sup> This facet of Criterion C can apply to buildings, structures, objects, or districts.

"Significant and distinguishable entities" refers to historic properties that contain a collection of components that may lack individual distinction but form a significant and distinguishable whole. This portion of Criterion C applies only to districts. World War II installations were composed of component parts that often were interrelated physically, functionally, and aesthetically.

To determine if a property is significant within the World War II permanent construction historic context as an important example of the distinctive characteristics of World War II permanent construction or as a significant and distinguishable district of World War II permanent construction:

1. Determine the nature of the property, including date of construction, type of construction, historic appearance, and function(s) during World War II;
2. Determine if the property is associated **specifically** with the World War II permanent construction historic context;
3. Determine the **distinctive** characteristics of the property type represented by the property in question;
4. Compare the property with the other examples of the property type and determine if it possesses the **distinctive** characteristics of World War II permanent construction; and,
5. Evaluate the property's design and construction to determine if it is an **important** example of World War II permanent construction.

In a few cases, the other portions of Criterion C may apply to World War II permanent construction. "Work of a master" refers to examples of the work of an architect or craftsman of generally recognized greatness. To be eligible under this portion of Criterion C, the property "must express a particular phase in the development of the master's career, an aspect of his or her work, or a particular idea or theme in his or her craft." All properties designed by famous architects are not necessarily eligible. The property must be examined in the context of the architect's other work.<sup>cccxcii</sup> During World War II, architects known for their industrial designs, notably Albert Kahn, designed ordnance production facilities on behalf of the federal government. These properties may be eligible as representative of the development of an architect's industrial design philosophy, if it can be demonstrated that the designs significantly contributed to the development of the modern factory and production line.

The final facet of Criterion C, refers to properties of "high artistic value." A property is eligible for listing in the National Register for its high artistic values "if it so fully articulates a particular concept of design that it expresses an aesthetic ideal." The property must represent the particular aesthetic ideal more clearly than other similar properties to qualify as an exemplar of high artistic values.<sup>cccxciii</sup> This aspect of Criterion C seldom applies to World War II military construction, since mobilization and war time construction were characterized primarily by concern for low cost and rapid construction, with little concern for aesthetic ideals.

Criterion D: Information Potential. Properties may be listed in the National Register if they have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. Two requirements must be met for a property to meet Criterion D: (1) the property must have, or have had, information to contribute to the understanding of history or prehistory; and, (2) the information must be considered important. This criterion generally applies to archeological sites. In a few cases, it can apply to buildings, structures, and objects, if the property itself is the principal source of information and the information is important. For example, a building that displays a unique structural system or unusual use of materials and where the building itself is the main source of information, i.e. no construction drawings or other historical records document the property, might be considered under Criterion D. In another example, a structure associated with an important technological development about which little other information has survived might be considered under Criterion D. Properties significant within the World War II permanent construction historic context rarely will be eligible for the National Register under Criterion D.

### Integrity

National Register Aspects of Integrity. To meet the National Register Criteria for Evaluation, a property, in addition to possessing significance within a historic context, must have integrity. Integrity is the ability of a property to convey its significance through the retention of the property's essential physical characteristics from its period of significance. The National Register Criteria for Evaluation list seven aspects of integrity (Table 25). A property eligible for the National Register must possess several of these aspects of integrity. The assessment of a property's integrity is rooted in its significance. The reasons why a property is important should be established first, then the qualities necessary to convey that significance can be identified.

National Register Bulletin 15 describes the following steps in assessing historical integrity:

1. Determine the essential physical features that must be present for a property to represent its significance;

<b>TABLE 25. NATIONAL REGISTER ASPECTS OF INTEGRITY</b>	
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Location is the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred.
<b>DESIGN:</b>	Design is the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property.
<b>SETTING:</b>	Setting is the physical environment of a historic property.
<b>MATERIALS:</b>	Materials are the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property.
<b>WORKMANSHIP:</b>	Workmanship is the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory.
<b>FEELING:</b>	Feeling is a property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time.
<b>ASSOCIATION:</b>	Association is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.

2. Determine whether the essential physical features are sufficiently visible to convey their significance;
3. Compare the property with similar properties if the physical features necessary to convey the significance are not well-defined; and,
4. Determine, based on the property's significance, which aspects of integrity are particularly important to the property in question and if they are intact.<sup>cccxciv</sup>

For properties significant for their associations with World War II to be eligible for the National Register, they must retain the key physical features associated with the World War II mission of the relevant property type. Properties significant for their design and construction must retain the physical features that are the essential elements of the aspect of World War II

construction that the property represents. In cases of active military installations, buildings are more likely to have been modified to extend their useful life. These changes may include replacing historic materials with modern building materials and, in the case of production facilities, upgrading industrial equipment. These integrity issues will be critical in the evaluation process of the significance of resources.

To qualify for listing as an historic district, the majority of the properties in the district associated with World War II significance must possess integrity and sufficient number must remain from the period of significance to represent the significance. In a district associated with World War II and composed primarily of World War II resources, the majority of the individual components that comprise the district's historic character must possess sufficient individual integrity to represent the period of significance. In addition, the relationships among the districts components, i.e., massing, arrangement of buildings, and installation plan, must be substantially unchanged since the period of significance.<sup>cccxv</sup> In addition, the relationships among the district's components, i.e., massing, arrangement of buildings, and installation plan, must be substantially unchanged since the period of significance. A critical part of evaluating the integrity of a district should include an assessment of whether later building campaigns have disrupted the World War II plan or obscured the interrelationships between the World War II buildings. In the case of where the World War II resources are part of a broader period of significance, assessment of integrity using this standard may be less of an issue.

#### Integrity Issues Related to World War II Construction

Re-categorization of Temporary Construction as Permanent or Semi-Permanent. Over the last fifty years, DoD has modified buildings originally constructed according to temporary mobilization plans to the extent that the buildings have been reclassified in current real property records as permanent or semi-permanent construction. For the purposes of evaluating National Register eligibility based on associations with World War II, buildings originally built as temporary should be evaluated within the historic context developed for World War II temporary buildings. Thus, their integrity is measured appropriately against the essential physical features of World War II temporary construction. Temporary buildings modified to such an extent that they are no longer classified as temporary are unlikely to retain sufficient integrity to convey their significance.

Continued Use Over Time. Buildings that predate World War II were used during and after World War II. The military also continued to use many World War II buildings after the war. Properties may have been modified to such an extent that they no longer possess integrity from their original period of construction, but may retain integrity from their use after the modifications. In other cases, the building may retain sufficient integrity from each phase of construction to represent its various associations over time. Installations may have both distinct and interrelated areas that represent various phases of development. The standards of integrity should be defined according to the significance of the property; a property significant for its associations with various events or trends will necessarily reflect various phases of construction.

Industrial, Scientific, and Technical Facilities. The government continues to use World War II facilities for industrial, scientific, or technical purposes. The continuing operation of highly technical facilities may, in some cases, have compromised the integrity of the facilities by requiring the removal or redesign of elements of the property that were essential to conveying its significance within the World War II period. However, the upgraded elements may themselves be significant within the context of post-war or Cold War technological developments.

#### Criteria Considerations

Some kinds of properties are excluded from consideration for National Register eligibility: religious properties; moved properties; graves and birthplaces; cemeteries; reconstructed



properties; commemorative properties; and, properties less than fifty years old. Properties that fall within one of these categories can be eligible for the National Register if they meet the Criteria Considerations (36 CFR Part 60.4). The Criteria Considerations describe specific circumstances under which properties normally excluded from the National Register may be considered eligible. The Criteria Considerations do not replace the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. Properties that usually are excluded from the National Register must meet the relevant Criterion Consideration and meet one or more of the Criteria for Evaluation and possess integrity. The Criteria Considerations are summarized below, with particular attention to their application to World War II permanent construction.

Religious Properties. A religious property is eligible if it derives its primary significance from architectural or artistic distinction or historical importance. This Criterion Consideration applies to properties constructed by religious institutions, owned by religious institutions, or used for religious purposes now or during their period of significance. This Criterion Consideration affects military chapels. Chapels must possess historic significance or architectural distinction to be eligible for inclusion in the National Register. A chapel that is part of a district does not need to meet this Criterion Consideration; it can be listed as a contributing building within the historic district without demonstrating that it meets the Criterion Consideration.

Moved Properties. A property removed from its original or historically significant location can be eligible if it is significant primarily for architectural value or it is the surviving property most importantly associated with an historic person or event. These exceptions rarely apply to moved properties associated with World War II. Properties that are by their nature movable, such as cranes, ships, or railroad cars, do not need to meet this Criterion Consideration.

Graves and Birthplaces. Birthplaces and graves of historical figures of outstanding importance are eligible if the person is of outstanding importance and if there are no other appropriate sites or buildings directly associated with his productive life. This Criterion Consideration is not relevant to World War II construction.

Cemeteries. A cemetery is eligible if it derives its primary significance from graves of persons of transcendent importance, from age, from distinctive design features, or from association with historic events. All cemeteries nominated for inclusion in the National Register under Criteria A, B, or C must meet this Criterion Consideration. Some installations active during World War II contain national cemeteries.

Reconstructed Properties. A reconstructed property is eligible when it is accurately executed in a suitable environment and presented in a dignified manner as part of a restoration master plan *and* when no other building or structure with the same associations has survived. This Criterion Consideration is not relevant to World War II construction.

Commemorative Properties. A property primarily commemorative in intent can be eligible if design, age, tradition, or symbolic value has invested it with its own exceptional significance. Commemorative properties are not associated directly with significant events or persons, but are built as memorials to the past that reflect the values of the time of the memorial's construction. Therefore, memorials built in honor of events or people associated with World War II must possess significance for their own value, not for importance of the event or person memorialized.

Properties Less than Fifty Years Old. A property achieving significance within the past fifty years is eligible if it is of *exceptional importance* (emphasis in the original). Properties less than fifty years old normally are excluded from the National Register to allow time to develop sufficient historical perspective. Since most permanent construction associated with World War II was built during the initial years of the protective mobilization and the first years of declared war, most properties related to the World War II permanent construction historic context reached the fifty-year mark several years ago. The properties constructed during the last years of the war also have reached the fifty-year mark. Properties whose construction began over fifty years ago, but were not

completed until a few years after the fifty year mark do not need to meet this Criterion Consideration. An historic district may contain a few properties newer than fifty years without meeting the Criterion Consideration if the district is mostly composed of properties older than fifty years and the period of significance is at least fifty years past.<sup>cccxcvi</sup>

### National Historic Landmarks

Some properties of outstanding importance merit designation as National Historic Landmarks. National Historic Landmarks are properties of national significance that meet a distinct set of criteria, known as the National Historic Landmarks Criteria for Evaluation (36 CFR Part 65) (Table 26). The process for evaluating National Landmarks is similar to the process for evaluating National Register properties: the category of property is defined; the properties are evaluated within historic contexts; the significance of the property is assessed according to the established criteria; and, the property's integrity is evaluated.

The National Park Service completed a theme study of World War II properties associated with the war in the Pacific. That study identified several National Historic Landmarks in Alaska and Hawaii and on the West Coast. The National Park Service has identified other nationally-significant themes related to World War II: War in Europe, Africa, and the Atlantic, 1939 - 1945; Politics and Diplomacy during the War; and, the Home Front.<sup>cccxcvii</sup>

**TABLE 26. NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARKS CRITERIA**

The quality of national significance is ascribed to districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess exceptional value or quality in illustrating or interpreting the heritage of the United States in history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture and that possess a high degree of integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and:

- That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to, and are identified with, or that outstandingly represent, the broad national patterns of United States history and from which an understanding and appreciation of those patterns may be gained; or

- That are associated importantly with the lives of persons nationally significant in the history of the United States; or

- That represent some great idea or ideal of the American people; or

- That embody the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type specimen exceptionally valuable for a study of a period, style or method of construction, or that represent a significant, distinctive and exceptional entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

- That are composed of integral parts of the environment not sufficiently significant by reason of historical association or artistic merit to warrant individual recognition but collectively compose an entity of exceptional historical or artistic significance, or outstandingly commemorate or illustrate a way of life or culture; or

- That have yielded or may be likely to yield information of major scientific importance by revealing new cultures, or by shedding light upon periods of occupation over large areas of the United States. Such sites are those which have yielded, or which may reasonably be expected to yield, data affecting theories, concepts, and ideas to a major degree.



## CHAPTER XIV

### APPLICATION OF THE EVALUATION METHODOLOGY TO WORLD WAR II

#### PERMANENT CONSTRUCTION

This section of the report provides a methodology to evaluate the National Register eligibility of World War II permanent construction. World War II construction is categorized by the mission of the installation during the war. The major types of installations are listed along with specific descriptions of their significance, eligibility requirements, and examples. Lists of components that comprise each installation type are contained in Tables 2, 3, and 4 in Chapter II. These tables provide general guidance in assessing which components were critical to the installation's mission and which components serve as support buildings.

#### **World War II Properties Previously Listed in the National Register**

Some military properties documented as associated with World War II already are listed in the National Register of Historic Places. These National Register properties include several properties associated with war in the Pacific, properties associated with the Manhattan Project, and other properties representing various facets of the war. Several of the properties listed, such as the Charlestown Navy Yard, are sites with long histories of military use; though the Second World War is included in these properties' periods of significance, most of the buildings at these facilities pre-date the war. The major component of World War II permanent construction, industrial facilities, are not well represented in the National Register, since most of these sites have recently turn fifty years old and are only now being assessed and evaluated using National Register criteria. The Springfield Armory in Massachusetts, an old-line ordnance facility that was the U.S. Army's pilot production center for small arms ammunition, is the only property associated with World War II ordnance production listed in the National Register; few of the buildings and structures at the Springfield Armory were constructed specifically for World War II. Table 27 includes those properties listed in the National Register as of 1993. Additional military properties associated with World War II and listed in the National Register of Historic Places since 1993 appear in Appendix IV. Other properties may have been determined eligible for inclusion in the National Register, but not officially listed.

#### **Evaluation Methodology**

To evaluate World War II facilities, whether an entire installation or a single building, within the context of World War II permanent construction, the following information about the property is needed:

- (1) location;
- (2) date constructed;
- (3) type of construction, e.g. permanent, semi-permanent or temporary, as classified during World War II;
- (4) World War II installation type; and,
- (5) World War II function of the particular buildings or structures.

table 27

**TABLE 27. MILITARY PROPERTIES WITH DOCUMENTED ASSOCIATION WITH WORLD WAR II LISTED  
IN THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES, WITH NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARKS NOTED (AS OF 1993)**

<b>Property Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Area(s) of Significance</b>	<b>Period of Significance*</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Classification</b>
Sitka Naval Operating Base and U.S. Army Coastal Defense**	Sitka, Alaska	Military	1939 - 1943	A	District
Kodiak Naval Operating Base and Forts Greely and Abercrombie**	Kodiak, Alaska	Military	1941 - 1944	A	Site
Ladd Field**	Ft. Wainwright, Alaska	Military	1942 - 1945	A	District
Japanese Occupation Site**	Kiska Island, Alaska	Military	1942 - 1945	A	Site
Cape Field at Fort Glenn (Umnak Island)	Umnak Island, Alaska	Military	1942 - 1945	A	District
Dutch Harbor Naval Operating Base of Fort Mears, U.S. Army (Amaknak Island)**	Unalaska, Alaska	Military	1940 - 1945	A	Site
Attu Battlefield and U.S. Army and Navy Airfields on Attu**	Attu Island, Alaska	Military	1942 - 1945	A	Site
Adak Army Base and Adak Naval Operating Base**	Naval Air Station Adak, Alaska	Military	1941 - 1945	A	Site
Williams AFB Multiple Property Listing	Williams AFB, Arizona	Military, Community Planning	1941 - 1943	A, C	Buildings, Structures
Fort Miley Military Reservation	Golden Gate National	Military	1892 - 1950	A	District

<b>Property Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Area(s) of Significance</b>	<b>Period of Significance*</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Classification</b>
(Point Lobos Military Reservation)	Recreation Area, San Francisco, California				
Sacramento Air Depot Historic District	McClellan AFB, Sacramento, California	Architecture, Military	1936 - 1941	A, C	District
Lighter-than-Air Ship Hangars	Marine Corps Air Station Santa Ana, California	Military	1943	A	Structure
March Field Historic District	March AFB, Riverside, California	Architecture, Military	1928 - 1943	A, C	District
Muroc Dry Lake (Rogers Dry Lake)	Edwards AFB, California	Military	1933 - present	A	Site
San Francisco Port of Embarkation, U.S. Army**	Fort Mason, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, San Francisco, California	Military	1912 - 1945	A	District
Forts Baker, Barry and Cronkhite	Sausalito, California	Military	1866 - 1955	A	District
Radar Station B-71	Klamath, California	Military	1942	A	Building
U.S. Naval Air Station Sunnyvale	Naval Air Station Moffett Field, California	Military Engineering	1933 - 1935 1942 - 1946	A, C	District
Perdido Key Historic District	Perdido Key, Florida	Military	1828, 1862, 1898, 1905, 1940	A	District
Opana Radar Site**	Kawela, Hawaii	Military	Dec. 7, 1941	A	Site
Wheeler Field	Wheeler AFB, Hawaii	Military	1941	A	District
Hickam Field**	Hickam AFB, Hawaii	Military	1941	A	District
Palm Circle, 100 Area, Fort Shafter	Fort Shafter, Hawaii	Architecture, Military	1907 - 1945	A, C	District

<b>Property Name</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Area(s) of Significance</b>	<b>Period of Significance*</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Classification</b>
Kaneohe Naval Air Station	Marine Corps Air Station Kaneohe, Hawaii	Military	1941	A	District
CINCPAC Headquarters (Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet)	Naval Base Pearl Harbor, Hawaii	Military	1942 - 1945	A, B	Building
U.S. Naval Base Pearl Harbor**	Naval Base Pearl Harbor, Hawaii	Engineering, Industry, Military	1911 - 1945	A, C	District
Bethesda Naval Hospital Tower	National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Maryland	Architecture, Education, Military, Science	1939 - 1942	A, C	Building
David W. Taylor Model Basin	Naval Ship Research and Development Center, Bethesda, Maryland	Architecture, Engineering, Invention, Military, Science	1937 - 1939 1944 - 1945	A, C	Buildings
Armory Square (Springfield Armory)	Springfield, Massachusetts	Military, Political	1778 - 1968	A, C	District
Charlestown Navy Yard (Boston Naval Shipyard)	Boston, Massachusetts	Architecture, Engineering, Industry, Invention, Military, Social, Transportation	1800 - 1974	A, C	District
Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory	Los Alamos, New Mexico	Invention, Science	1943 - 1952	A	District
Trinity Site	White Sands Army Missile Range, New Mexico	Invention, Military, Science	July 16, 1943	A	District, Site
U.S. Naval Air Station, Tillamook, Dirigible Hangers A and B	Tillamook, Oregon	Engineering, Military	1942 - 1949	A, C	Building



Property Name	Location	Area(s) of Significance	Period of Significance*	Criteria	Classification
Frankford Arsenal	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Engineering, Military	1830 - 1935 <sup>1</sup>	A, C	District
Quartermaster's Depot, U.S. Marine Corps	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Military	1904 - 1962	A	Building
Oak Ridge Historic District	Oak Ridge, Tennessee	Architecture, Community Planning and Development, Military	1942 - 1959	A, C	District
Wendover Air Force Base	Wendover, Utah	Military	1940 - 1945	A	Site
Pentagon Office Building Complex	Arlington, Virginia	Architecture, Engineering, Landscape Architecture, Military, Politics/Government	1941 - present	A, B, C	Building
Navy Yard Puget Sound**	Naval Shipyard Puget Sound, Bremerton, Washington	Military	1938 - 1945	A	District
Puget Sound Radio Station Historic District	Naval Shipyard Puget Sound, Bremerton, Washington	Military	1907 - 1941	A	District

\* Some properties were significant in periods preceding or following World War II, in addition to their significance during World War II.

\*\* National Historic Landmark

All information on this table was obtained from the National Register of Historic Places, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

<sup>1</sup> Though the Frankford Arsenal National Register nomination form (1972; amended 1985) does not extend the period of significance beyond what was then the 50-year cut-off point, the 1985 amendment to the statement of significance briefly describes the significant role Frankford Arsenal played in research and development during World War II and recommends that the statement of significance be updated at some point in the future.

Once the above information is obtained, the National Register eligibility of properties associated with World War II permanent construction can be evaluated by answering the following questions about a property:

1. What is the nature of the property? Determine the date of construction; function(s) during World War II; and category of property (building, structure, object, site, or district).
2. What historic context does the property represent? Is it associated with permanent military construction in the United States between 1940 and 1945?
3. What is the property type? Is the property type significant in illustrating the historic context? Tables 2, 2a, 3, 3a, 4, and 4a provide a framework for identifying installation types and their component properties.
4. How does the property represent an important aspect of the historic context: through specific, important historical associations (Criterion A or B); architectural or engineering features (Criterion C); or information potential (Criterion D)?
5. Compare the property with related properties. Does it retain the distinctive characteristics of its type? How does it compare historically with other properties important within the historic context?
6. Is the property significant on a regional or national level within the historic context?
7. Does the property retain sufficient integrity to convey the significance of the historic context it represents?
8. Is the property one of the kind of properties usually excluded from the National Register? If so, determine if any of the Criteria Considerations apply.

For properties to be considered significant within the context of World War II permanent construction, the properties must possess important, specific association with the war and sufficient integrity to convey the World War II period of significance. Districts must retain the important components of the installation type; important components are those buildings and structures without which the installation could not have performed its mission. Supporting buildings and structures of secondary importance to the installation mission may be included in an historic district if they contribute to a distinguishable entity. A building or structure considered for individual listing must have important enough historical associations that, by itself, it represents an important element of the historic context. For example, an airship hangar can represent the military's lighter-than-air aviation program; however, a single building from a production line does not convey the military's ordnance production program, which was characterized by industrial processes carried out in large, inter-related complexes of production lines and support facilities.

An analysis of permanent construction during World War II indicated that the purpose of that construction, i.e., mission, is critical to understanding the importance of the resource. Military facilities were built for specific purposes. These purposes can be defined by "installation types." The primary types of installations are listed below.

## **Aircraft Production and Assembly**

### Significance

Aircraft production and assembly installations represent the tremendous expansion of the American aircraft industry. This expansion ranks as one of the more important industrial achievements during World War II. In 1939, the private aviation industry, under contract to the Army Air Corps, began production of the first American aircraft capable of exceeding 400 miles per hour. Fewer than 100 B-17 heavy bombers were flying. Within five years, the American aviation industry produced sufficient numbers of aircraft to fight a two-ocean, multi-front war and to assist Allied countries.

Criterion A: Aircraft production and assembly emerged as a critical industry during World War II since aviation was an integral part of U.S. military establishment. During the mobilization phase and early years of the war, the military invested in permanent construction at aviation production and assembly facilities to meet the needs of the expanding air forces.

Criterion C: Aircraft production and assembly installations generally will contain massive assembly line buildings that allowed aircraft assembly to occur indoors. Some properties at aircraft and production assembly plants may display the distinctive features of Art Deco or Art Moderne designs or represent innovative construction techniques that spanned wide interior spaces. By the end of the war, these kinds of buildings increasingly were constructed using temporary construction techniques to save critical building materials.

### Registration Requirements

Aircraft assembly plants must possess a direct association with the production of aircraft used during World War II. Plants built during the mobilization phase and first year of war provided the bulk of the wartime aircraft and the expertise that was used throughout the war. To possess sufficient integrity to convey their significance, aircraft assembly plants must retain the factory buildings where the aircraft were assembled and, ideally, support facilities that were part of the assembly process. The assembly building(s) must retain the materials, design, and feeling from the World War II period. The character-defining broad expanses of industrial windows, high roofs, and wide spans of uninterrupted interior space should be intact. In cases where the entire production line was housed in one building, that individual building may be sufficient to represent its type.

### Examples

No World War II aircraft assembly plants currently are listed in the National Register. Few World War II-era aircraft assembly plants remain under DoD ownership. The Martin Bomber Plant located at Offutt AFB, Nebraska, has been converted into office space.

## **Airfields and Air Stations**

### Significance

Army airfields and Navy and Marine Corps air stations are command construction installation types important within the World War II permanent construction historic context. From fewer than 50 airfields and stations in 1939, the air arms of the Army and Navy expanded to comprise numerous fields, municipal airports, and air bases. The Army Air Force had 783 operational facilities including 345 main bases, 116 sub-bases, and 322 auxiliary fields. The Navy had 45 naval air stations, 12 naval aviation reserve bases, 20 fields, and numerous auxiliary fields.

Criterion A: Aviation emerged as an integral part of U.S. military establishment during the inter-war period and was an essential part of the military during World War II. During the mobilization phase and early years of the war, the military invested in permanent construction at aviation installations to meet the needs of the expanding air forces. The aviation installations had various missions, such as training, repair, testing, or coastal defense, that contributed to the war effort.

Criterion C: Some properties on aviation installations display the distinctive features of Art Deco or Art Moderne designs, of standardized military designs, or of hangar design. Other hangars are examples of standardized military design. Hangars also may exemplify innovative construction methods to span wide areas, while conserving critical construction materials.

### Registration Requirements

An Airfield must have a direct, important association with World War II aviation. The installation must be associated with a specific program or mission or with a specific event that made an important contribution to the war effort. One factor to consider in the evaluation process is the role of the airfield or station. A main airfield that served a primary military mission throughout the war probably will have a stronger association with World War II, therefore, greater significance, than an auxiliary or reserve airfield that was used for only a short period during the war. Airfields can be associated with aviation training or with the development of aviation technology. The essential components of an airfield that were associated with the aviation mission must retain their integrity from the World War II period of significance. Important property types directly associated with mission at aviation installations include hangars, operations buildings, control towers, runways, training buildings, aviation shop buildings, and administration buildings. Residential and personnel support properties are supporting buildings that may contribute to a district, particularly if they retain the distinctive features of a style or type of construction from the World War II period, but are not likely to be individually eligible.

To possess sufficient integrity to qualify as a district, the World War II layout of the airfield or aviation station should be recognizable and the primary buildings and structures associated with the World War II-era mission, e.g., hangars, operations building, etc., should be present and retain integrity. To qualify for National Register listing as a building or structure, a property must (1) retain a high degree of integrity and (2) possess a specific, important association with World War II aviation or represent a significant example of a type of construction.

### Examples

The following properties associated with World War II airfields are listed in the National Register of Historic Places as of 1993: Ladd Field, Alaska; Cape Field, Alaska; Airship Hangars, MCAS Santa Ana, California; Wheeler Field, Hawaii; Hickam Field, Hawaii; Kaneohe Naval Air Station, Hawaii; Dirigible Hangars, NAS Tillamook, Oregon; Wendover AFB, Utah; March Field, California; and Williams AFB, Arizona. The airfields in Alaska and Hawaii are associated with the defense of military targets in the Pacific theater. The hangars at Santa Ana and Tillamook are listed for their association with the Navy's lighter-than-air aviation program and for their ability to exemplify the architectural and engineering features of the large-span hangars necessary for airships. Wendover is listed for a specific association with an historic event: it was the training site for the 509th Group prior to their mission over Japan to drop the atomic bombs in 1945. March Field is listed for its architectural design and construction and for its association with the development of the Air Corps on the West Coast; the majority of the construction dates from the late 1930s and does not represent wartime mobilization construction. Williams AFB was the location of flying training schools during World War II; its building stock represents temporary construction and utilities infrastructure. Since 1993, Randolph AFB, Texas; Scott Field, Illinois; NAS Chase Fields, Texas; and, NAAS Arlington, Washington, have been included in the National Register of Historic Places.

Both Randolph and Scott Air Force Bases were constructed during the 1930s and expanded during World War II. The installations are architecturally significant, as well as important for their role in the development of the Army Air Force.

## **Ammunition Depots**

### Significance

Ammunition depots are an important type of industrial construction installation within the World War II permanent construction historic context. They illustrate the logistical supply system organized to distribute a materiel necessary to winning the war.

Criterion A: World War II was a war of resources that required the marshalling of men and supplies on multiple fronts. Logistical support on the home front contributed to Allied victories. One of the most critical supplies was ordnance. The enormous amount of ordnance produced for the war required storage prior to overseas shipment. To meet this need, the military developed an extensive system of ammunition depots. One factor to consider in the evaluation of this installation type is the date of construction of the depot. Depots constructed during the Protective Mobilization Phase and at the start of the war played a greater role in the logistical support of the armed forces during the critical early months of the war than later depots. Innovations in architectural design and construction often occurred early in the war; later designs integrated these earlier innovations and were adapted to shortages in building materials. Some depots also executed other missions that contributed to the logistical support of the armed forces. Army ordnance depots sometimes included repair facilities and facilities for the storage of inert materiel. Selected Navy ammunition depots included ordnance assembly lines; these installations should be evaluated within the context of industrial production facilities, in addition to the ammunition depot context.

Criterion C: World War II ammunition depots may represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction. The volatile nature of ordnance required the construction of isolated installations with special safety features incorporated into the layout and design of the facilities. The typical ammunition depot was organized into discrete areas by function, such as administration, storage, and repair. During World War II, ordnance storage structures were dispersed widely over large tracts of land to safeguard against the spread of explosions. Rail lines and roads provided the means to move the materiel within and as well as to and from the depots. The military developed specific designs for explosive magazines to contain explosions.

### Registration Requirements

Ammunition depots must have direct, important associations with World War II. Installations that were built specifically for ordnance storage during World War II and that display their distinctive characteristics are associated directly with an important part of the overall war effort. Depots constructed during the first wave of war mobilization generally made more significant contributions to the war effort than those constructed towards the end of the war. In general, depots should be evaluated as districts, since individual ammunition bunkers generally lack individual distinction or associative history. Depots also must retain integrity of layout and design to convey the particular features of World War II ammunition depots. While depot installations strongly represent the logistical support system of World War II, individual or small clusters of ammunition magazines at other types of World War II installations, such as airfields, naval bases, training installations, and coastal defenses, do not represent the logistical support system developed for World War II, but represent minor support structures for the individual installation. Residential and personnel support buildings constructed at ammunition depots may be contributing resources in an historic district if they retain integrity from the World War II era, but these are secondary facilities

that supported the primary mission of the installation, and by themselves do not represent a significant historic context.

#### Examples

No World War II ammunition depots currently are included in the National Register.

### **Chemical Warfare Service Facilities**

#### Significance

Chemical Warfare Service (CWS) installations can be an important type of industrial construction installation within the World War II permanent construction historic context.

Criterion A: Although the chemical munitions produced at CWS installations were not used in combat during World War II, the availability of these munitions exerted an influence upon the war. In 1945, the Allies discovered vast quantities of chemical munitions in the Axis nations. The work of the CWS is credited with providing a credible deterrent to the Axis use of toxic agents.

Criterion C: The functional design and rapid construction of CWS facilities embodies the distinctive characteristics of the type and method of construction representative of World War II mobilization permanent construction.

#### Registration Requirements

CWS facilities must have direct, important associations with World War II. To possess sufficient integrity to represent CWS World War II activities, a chemical plant, arsenal, or proving ground must retain the structures associated with the major functions related to the production and testing of chemical weapons and protective gear. Chemical weapons production facilities were characterized by groups of production buildings organized by phases of production. The structures must retain integrity of design, materials, and location. Due to the toxic nature of the materials produced and tested at CWS facilities, many buildings may have been substantially modified during hazardous materials clean-up efforts. Changing technology also has caused the removal and replacement of original machinery, which may reduce the integrity of older CWS facilities. Where constructed, residential and personnel support facilities may be contributing resources in an historic district if they retain integrity from the World War II era, but they are secondary to the facilities that supported the primary mission of the installation, and by themselves do not represent a significant historic context.

#### Examples

No World War II CWS facilities currently are included in the National Register.

### **Coastal Defense**

#### Significance

Properties built as part of U.S. coastal defenses are in some circumstances significant command construction facilities within the World War II permanent construction historic context. As the war progressed, these facilities declined in importance as the strategic importance of aircraft and aircraft carriers increased.

Criterion A: The military built defenses along the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts to protect the U.S. shores from amphibious or submarine attack. The development of aircraft and carrier-based aircraft soon made fixed coastal fortifications obsolete. Due to these advances in military weaponry and strategies, coastal fortifications were a only minor part of the military domestic construction effort during World War II. Coastal fortifications may be considered within a local context for their significance in local war efforts. Coastal fortifications in Hawaii and Alaska are discussed under "Combat Operations."

Criterion C: A coastal defense installation may embody the distinctive characteristics of World War II permanent construction if it incorporates overhead cover in its design following the prototype established in 1937. Coastal defenses generally did not represent new advances in armament and generally do not represent important engineering efforts.<sup>ccxcviii</sup>

### Registration Requirements

To meet the National Register Criteria within the historic context developed in this report, a coastal fortification must have specific and direct associations with World War II. In most cases, coastal defenses in the continental United States do not represent a major element of U.S. military strategy and construction during World War II. World War II-era coastal batteries that are part of a complex of fortifications from various eras of coastal defense construction may be contributing elements in an historic district that represents the evolution of coastal fortification technology and strategy over time, including World War II. Batteries that are not associated with a specific wartime event or that are not part of a complex that represents a range of coastal fortifications technology probably do not meet the National Register criteria. For those coastal fortifications that are significant, they must possess sufficient integrity to represent the fortification technology of the World War II era. Concrete batteries and emplacements must be intact.

### Examples

The coastal defenses with World War II construction listed in the National Register are: Fort Miley, California; Forts Baker, Barry, and Cronkhite, California; and Perdido Key, Florida. These properties encompass examples of fortifications and batteries that illustrate the evolution of coastal fortifications over U.S. history. They represent the development of different phases of seacoast fortifications, from the pre-Civil War Third System to the Endicott System of the late-nineteenth century to World War II fortifications.

## **Combat Operations**

### Significance

Properties directly related to combat in the U.S. or its territories are important within the context of World War II construction. Only Alaska and Hawaii experienced direct combat during World War II.

Criterion A: In response to potential threats from Japan, the military built forts, airfields, and naval bases in Hawaii and Alaska to serve the forces in the Pacific theater of operations. The military also built coastal defenses at strategic locations to defend harbors and protect important military facilities in Hawaii and Alaska. Hawaii was a key military outpost during the war and served as the headquarters for the Pacific Fleet. Military construction in Alaska is associated with the Japanese invasion of the Aleutian Islands, a strategic location near both the United States and Japan. Alaska was the only site of World War II ground combat within the present-day United States.

### Registration Requirements

Facilities built in support of combat operations must have a direct, important association with World War II. Important associations include: the defense of the Aleutian Islands; support of the Pacific theater of operations; and defense of key military locations in Hawaii. These facilities must retain the essential components that served the World War II mission of the installation. For coastal defenses, these can include fortifications, bunkers, gun emplacements, command posts, and communications facilities. Other sites associated with combat operations and support may be examples of other types of installations such as airfields or naval bases. The individual components of the property must have the character-defining features that characterized the property during World War II. Since these properties are significant for their historical associations, integrity of design is not as critical as for properties significant for their design or construction; however, the properties must have sufficient integrity to convey their period of significance.

### Examples

Several properties in Alaska associated with the Aleutian Islands campaign are listed in the National Register: Sitka Naval Operating Base and U.S. Army Coastal Defense; Kodiak Naval Operating Base and Forts Greeley and Abercrombie; Ladd Field; Japanese Occupation Site, Kiska Island; Cape Field at Fort Glenn, Umnak Island; Dutch Harbor Naval Operating Base of Fort Mears; Attu Battlefield and U.S. Army and Navy Airfields; and, Adak Army Base and Adak Naval Operating Base. Some of these properties are sites that are significant as the locations of combat and Japanese occupation while others are historic districts with intact buildings and structures.

Large historic districts directly associated with the support of Pacific theater operations are located in Hawaii: Hickam Field; Wheeler Field; Pearl Harbor Naval Base; Headquarters, Commander-in-Chief, Pacific Fleet; Palm Circle, 100 Area at Fort Shafter; and, Kaneohe Naval Air Station. Some of these districts are significant for events and construction that pre-date the Second World War. The World War II construction includes administration buildings, hangars, maintenance and repair shops, housing, and personnel support.



## **Depots (non-ordnance) and Ports of Embarkation**

### Significance

Depots (non-ordnance) and ports of embarkation are an important type of command construction installation within the World War II historic context. These installations represented a logistical support system that organized the availability and delivery of materiel necessary to win World War II.

Criterion A: The scope of depot operations during World War II exceeded the military's previous experience. The military developed extensive depot systems to store, maintain, repair, and transport materiel to support forces within the United States and overseas. Extensive systems of depots were established to hold military materiel for long-term storage, to provide supplies to stateside forces, to maintain and repair military vehicles and aircraft, and to coordinate the shipment of supplies overseas. In the war of resources, the extensive network of depots provided the infrastructure to ensure that the fighting forces received critical materiel.

Ports of embarkation served as the point of departure for massive quantities of supplies and numbers of troops; they also served as receiving points for returning forces and for prisoners of war. These facilities were key components in the U.S. logistical support system, linking the homefront supplies and troops to the overseas theaters of war.

Criterion C: Non-ordnance depots and ports of embarkation may represent the distinctive characteristics of World War II mobilization construction. These installations may contain representative examples of military design for warehouses, transit sheds, and maintenance and repair buildings.

### Registration Requirements

Supply depots must possess direct, important associations with the logistical support of World War II operations, and retain sufficient integrity to convey their significance. Most World War II supply depots were built using temporary construction, and therefore should be evaluated as examples of World War II temporary construction. Many World War II warehouse districts have been modified substantially and the buildings have been reclassified as semi-permanent or permanent construction. In these cases, the buildings probably lack the qualities of integrity necessary to qualify for listing in the National Register. Individual warehouse buildings do not have a direct or important association with the logistical war effort; entire depot complexes better represent the logistical element of the World War II.

In addition, the organizational structure of the depot system should be considered in the evaluation process. Main depots may better represent the importance of a particular depot in the overall system, rather than sub-installations or annexes. Residential and personnel support buildings may be contributing resources in an historic district if they retain integrity from the World War II era, but they are secondary resources to the facilities that supported the primary mission of the installation, and by themselves do not represent a significant historic context.

Ports of embarkation must have been served as major points of shipment and transport during the war to be eligible for the National Register. Minor ports that shipped relatively small amounts of supplies may not have a sufficiently important association with the context of World War II to qualify under Criterion A. The relationship of the buildings to the transportation networks of rail lines and piers must be intact for the property to possess sufficient integrity to represent its period of significance.

## Examples

The Sacramento Air Depot at McClellan AFB, California, was completed just before U.S. involvement in World War II and, during the war, served as an important depot for the Army Air Force. Its activities included storage, maintenance, and repairs. It is listed for its permanent architecture, which is representative of inter-war military installations design and construction, and for its associations with military depot activity. The U.S. Marine Corps Quartermaster in Philadelphia also is listed in the National Register. It is significant for its association with supplying Marine Corps expeditions from World War I through the 1960s. During World War II, more than 6,000 employees worked around the clock processing supplies.

The San Francisco Port of Embarkation is listed in the National Register for its critical role in supplying men and materiel to the Pacific front. In total numbers of personnel and supplies, it ranked second only to the New York port. During the months after the attack on Pearl Harbor, the San Francisco port shipped more supplies than all other ports combined and had administrative authority over the other West Coast ports during periods of the war. The headquarters building and the port area, which consists of railroad tracks, storehouses, piers, and support buildings, are included in the historic district.

## **Industrial Construction Production Facilities**

### Significance

Industrial construction production facilities are an important class of permanent construction within the World War II context, and account for a large proportion of the overall wartime construction budget. The products manufactured at these industrial installations were critical to winning the war. Industrial facilities include: ordnance works, which produced military explosives and propellants; ordnance plants (Army) and ammunition depots (Navy), which assembled and loaded ammunition; arsenals, artillery and associated components production facilities; and, tank plants (Tables 3 and 3a) which produced weaponry.

Criterion A: The rapid development of an armaments and ammunition industry, "the arsenal of democracy," constituted a remarkable achievement. At the beginning of 1940, U.S. military armaments and ammunition production virtually was nonexistent. Within a few years, the United States created one of the most powerful armaments industries in the world. The industry was essential to produce the ammunition and weaponry required by the U.S. tactic of massed artillery fire and aerial bombing of enemy positions prior to sending in land forces. Though no one armament and ammunition facility made the difference in the war, these facilities, in their totality, were essential to the Allied victory.

Wartime mobilization deeply affected American lives and caused great changes in the labor force and in communities across the nation. The construction of huge munitions plants transformed rural communities into boom towns, with the accompanying dislocation of agriculture and housing shortages. Severe labor shortages prompted the entry of women and minorities into the industrial work force in unprecedented numbers. Wartime shortages, including consumer goods and transportation, altered the lives of the civilian population. The government-owned factories are emblematic of these massive economic shifts. In addition to reflecting broad trends in the effects of industrial mobilization on the economy and labor force, each government-owned factory has a particular history that is tied to the local community. These properties also should be evaluated for local significance within the context of the effects of industrial mobilization on the home front.

Criterion C: The functional design and rapid construction of industrial facilities embody the distinctive characteristics of World War II permanent construction and also may illustrate American industrial design. The design and construction of these facilities was dictated by the assembly-line nature of the production; the need for speedy construction; and, the scarcity of construction

materials. For ammunition production, the volatile nature of explosives production was also a factor in installation design. The balance struck between these constraints determined the design and construction of World War II industrial facilities.

### Registration Requirements

Industrial production facilities must possess a direct association with the production of armaments and ammunition during World War II. Plants built during the first waves of construction (1940 - 1941) represent the prototypical design for defense plants upon which later waves of construction were based. These "first wave" plants often better represent the mobilization effort necessary to prepare the nation for war and the distinctive design of defense industrial plants.

To possess sufficient integrity to convey their significance, World War II industrial facilities must retain the primary structures representative of the major functions related to the operation of the industrial process. These functional areas of a typical industrial facility are production lines, storage, administration, testing, and residential areas. Within these areas, the key structures that convey the mission of the facility, particularly the production line buildings and structures, must be intact. Production lines for the most volatile materials, such as high explosives, are characterized by separate buildings for different steps of the production process. The individual component buildings of the assembly line must be present to convey the industrial process. Most facilities still convey their significance without the World War II-era machinery if all buildings and structures and their spatial relationships are intact; however, facilities with intact machinery retain the highest degree of integrity and should be given preference in registration. Where constructed, residential and personnel support buildings may be contributing resources in an historic district if they retain integrity from the World War II era, but they are secondary to the facilities that supported the primary mission of the installation, and by themselves do not represent a significant historic context.

### Examples

The Springfield Armory is the only military industrial facility listed in the National Register that includes World War II in its period of significance. The Springfield Armory was the site of important ordnance manufacturing and storage facilities from the American Revolutionary War until the early twentieth century. In its later years, it served as a research and development center and pilot manufactory for small arms. Though the Frankford Arsenal is listed in the National Register for its military significance prior to 1935, it also served as a significant research and development site during the early years of World War II mobilization.

World War II industrial facilities have been determined eligible for listing in the National Register, although not formally listed. A January 1993 Programmatic Agreement (PA) among the U.S. Army Materiel Command, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and multiple State Historic Preservation Officers concerning a program to dispose of several installations under the Armament, Munitions and Chemical Command (AMCCOM) stated that the installations include properties eligible for inclusion in the National Register (Appendix III). The installations covered by the PA are Badger AAP; Joliet AAP; Indiana AAP; Kansas AAP; Radford AAP; Ravenna AAP; and Twin Cities AAP. All were built specifically for the World War II mobilization.

## **Medical Facilities**

### Significance

World War II medical facilities can be significant properties under the National Register Criteria for Evaluation. These facilities also can be contributing properties to installations with missions other than health care. Hospitals were designed to support military personnel from

induction through recuperation. A large number of hospitals were constructed to meet the needs of military personnel.

Criterion A: To be eligible under Criterion A, hospitals must have a specific, important association with events important within the World War II context or within the context of military medicine. Hospitals that were the site of particular medical advances or played important roles in providing medical care to military personnel may be eligible. The hundreds of World War II military hospitals are not all significant simply because they housed wounded servicemen during and after the war.

Some military hospitals also may be significant for their association with the development of military medicine over a long period of time, including but not limited to World War II.

Criterion C: Hospitals are an important building type. The design of hospitals reflects the changing understanding of infectious diseases, advances in sanitation practices, and developments in building and medical technology. Nineteenth- and early twentieth-century hospitals were built according to a dispersed pavilion plan, with widely spaced individual wards. During the 1930s, the preferred hospital design changed to consolidated, multi-storied towers, reflecting a better understanding of epidemiology and also decreasing the distances between wards. Military general hospitals constructed immediately before the war were built according to the multi-story, consolidated model, while hospitals built during the war followed the older, dispersed pavilion plan, which could be constructed more quickly at a lower cost.

#### Registration Requirements

To be eligible under Criterion A, a hospital property must be associated in an important way with a specific historic events or series of events, such as the development of an important treatment or other medical advance. To be eligible under Criterion C, a hospital must embody the distinctive characteristics of its type and possess sufficient integrity to represent those characteristics. In general, a hospital complex should be evaluated as a district, unless a specific medical event occurred in a particular building. The distinctive characteristics of World War II pavilion-plan hospitals are: a one- to three-story main building surrounded by dispersed wards, laboratories, and clinics; brick, stucco, or wood-frame construction; and simple detailing, sometimes reflecting regional styles such as Colonial Revival or Spanish Mission. One important factor in evaluating the integrity of the complex is the spatial relationships among the buildings. Subsequent construction or additions that obscure the original plan may compromise the integrity of the overall complex. For the consolidated, multi-story tower hospital type, the distinctive features are the design and composition of the hospital and architectural detailing. The majority of the design, materials, and workmanship must be intact for a World War II hospital to be representative of its type.

## Examples

The Bethesda Naval Hospital Tower, in Maryland, is listed on the National Register for its significance in the areas of medicine, architecture, education, military, and science. Construction was begun in 1939 and completed in 1942. The hospital is significant for its design, which consists of a twenty-story central tower above a base of interconnected three- and four-story pavilions. Noted architect Paul Cret designed this example of the streamlined Moderne style. The property also is significant for its role in medical research and in training Navy doctors.

## **Navy Bases and Stations**

### Significance

Naval bases and stations can be an important type of command construction installation within the World War II historic context. Operating bases were developed during the twentieth century to relieve the Navy Yards from administrative, personnel, and training functions. The functions of these bases became increasingly important during World War II.

Criterion A: Large naval operating bases are significant for the direct support that they provided to naval operations during World War II. Naval operating bases can encompass a wide variety of facilities: Marine barracks, training stations, air stations, minor repair facilities, radio stations, supply depots, and other subordinate shore activities. Naval operating bases may include fleet or district headquarters buildings where key military leaders made important strategic decisions.

Smaller bases may be significant if their primary mission, such as support of submarines, was significant. Minor section bases do not possess national significance, although they may possess local significance. In the cases of advance bases in Alaska, the properties may be significant as the site of an important event related to the war, such as the Aleutian campaign.

Criterion C: In general, Navy bases required fewer permanent facilities than Navy yards. Personnel support, storage, and residential buildings typically were built using temporary construction. However, during the protective mobilization phase, in some instances these facilities were constructed using permanent designs, particularly if post-war use was anticipated. The significance of these buildings' design and construction should be evaluated within the framework of 1940 design. Some may possess architectural merit, while others will exhibit utilitarian designs that are not important examples of a type, period, or method of construction.

### Registration Requirements

Naval bases must have a direct, important association with World War II to be eligible for the National Register. Examples of important, direct associations include bases that were the site of headquarters or served as the principal base supporting a particular operation or specific type of vessel important in the war effort. Other than headquarters buildings or a building associated with a specific event, individual properties at naval bases usually do not possess sufficient importance to merit individual listing; the base as a district probably will possess more importance. To possess sufficient integrity to convey its significance, a naval base should retain the key buildings and structures related to its primary areas, such as training, aviation, logistics, or headquarters.

## Examples

The five naval bases previously listed in the National Register with World War II associations are located in Alaska or Hawaii and are important for their roles in the war in the Pacific and in combat operations. Each also is designated as a National Historic Landmark. These four bases in Alaska are examples of advance bases, and included a variety of facilities, including seaplane stations, land-plane fields, submarine bases, and minor repair facilities. Kodiak Naval Operating Base, Dutch Harbor Naval Operating Base, and Adak Naval Operating Base, are categorized as sites significant under Criterion A, indicating that they are important for events that occurred at the site, not for the architectural design characteristics of the buildings or structures. Sitka Naval Operating Base is categorized as a district; it retains several facilities from the World War II period. It is significant as one of the few installations prepared to protect the North Pacific during the first months after the United States entered the war. U.S. Naval Base Pearl Harbor is significant under both Criteria A and C.

## **Navy Yards**

### Significance

Navy yards are an important type of command construction installation within the World War II context. Navy yards have performed essential work to support the fleet since the Navy began operating its first shipyard in the late eighteenth century. The Navy constructed its own ships, repaired ships, and provided logistical and administrative support to the fleet from its yards. Most navy yards were established before World War II; therefore, World War II construction of these yards illustrates the expansion and continued significance of the yard.

Criterion A: At the start of the protective mobilization phase of the war in 1940, Congress authorized the establishment of a two-ocean Navy and increased the existing force by 70 percent. Shipyards received the highest priority for construction during the fleet build-up. The U.S. Navy yards were vital to the support of the fleet during World War II and enabled the United States to wage and win a two-ocean war.

Criterion C: During the protective mobilization phase and first year of the war, shipyards received permanent construction due to the industrial nature of the work and the expectation that the facilities would be used after the war. Shipyard facilities may embody the distinctive characteristics of World War II industrial construction: masonry with metal frame construction; large banks of industrial windows; and, functional design. Dry docks are an important type of engineering construction that often are the most significant features from the World War II period.

### Registration Requirements

The shipyard facilities must have a direct, important association with World War II major ship construction and/or repair. Different shipyards played different roles; one measure of relative significance is the volume and type of repair and construction work undertaken at each yard. To be significant, the shipyard resources must have been industrial facilities used in ship repair and construction, or important administration buildings essential to the operation of the shipyard. Residential and personnel support facilities may be contributing resources in an historic district if they retain integrity from the World War II era, but they are secondary to the facilities that supported the primary mission of the shipyard, and by themselves usually do not represent a significant historic context.

Shipyards active during World War II have undergone modernization to build, repair, and service modern ships. Some facilities may no longer retain integrity from the World War II period. To retain integrity, the facilities directly associated with the important World War II shipyard activities, such as shops, dry docks, and cranes, must be intact and substantially unchanged since

the World War II era. The layout of the buildings and their relationship to the dry docks also must be intact.

### Examples

The nomination documentation for three continental shipyards listed in the National Register cite World War II as a period of significance. The Boston Navy Yard, Massachusetts, was an active shipyard from 1800 to 1974. During World War II, more destroyers were produced at the Boston facility than at any other U.S. shipyard. The older buildings were reused and new buildings added. These buildings represent the emergence of the United States as a naval superpower and the development of naval technology from the beginning of the nineteenth century through the middle of this century.

Puget Sound Navy Yard, in Bremerton, Washington, is designated a National Historic Landmark specifically for its role in World War II. The Puget Sound Navy Yard was the repair yard for battle-damaged battleships, aircraft carriers, and smaller warships of the Pacific Fleet; it was the only West Coast yard capable of repairing battleships during World War II. It epitomizes the rise of the United States as a Pacific naval power. The shipyard includes nearly 1,000 facilities, of which 64 are contributing properties in the World War II historic district. The historic district encompasses 189 of the shipyard's 1,347 acres.

The historic district at Mare Island Naval Shipyard, California, was expanded to include World War II resources since 1993. This shipyard, established in 1854, was the first naval shipyard established on the Pacific coast. During the twentieth century, the shipyard was expanded in response to wartime demands. During World War II, the shipyard produced nearly 400 vessels.

A fourth shipyard, Charleston Navy Yard, South Carolina, was determined eligible for listing in the National Register by the South Carolina SHPO.<sup>cccxcix</sup> Its period of significance extends from its founding in the early twentieth century through World War II; it illustrates the development of naval shipyards and is eligible under Criteria A and C. During World War II, it played a supporting role to the other major east coast shipyards.

## **Research, Development and Testing**

### Significance

Research, development, and testing (RD&T) facilities can be important command construction installations within the World War II context. World War II demonstrated the importance of technological superiority to a greater degree than in previous conflicts. New or improved weaponry was a significant advantage in winning the war.

Criterion A: During World War II, the military developed and tested many new weapons and improved the quality and manufacturing of others. These technological advances proved critical in the war effort.

Criterion C: RD&T facilities often were unique facilities, designed specifically to meet the technical requirements of a particular mission. They may have significance under Criterion C for their unique engineering designs. In other cases, standard buildings may have been used to house RD&T activities; in these instances, the properties should be evaluated primarily under Criterion A, rather than Criterion C. Standardized support facilities may be eligible as part of a district, but by themselves do not represent the RD&T mission.

### Registration Requirements

An RD&T facility must be associated with a significant technological research, development, or testing program that contributed to the war effort. The properties specifically associated with the RD&T activities must be present. If the property was the location of a significant event it may be eligible as a site for its associative value with that important event. The character-defining features for RD&T facilities will vary widely according to their specific purpose. In order to determine if the property retains integrity, a careful analysis of the World War II mission and facilities is necessary. In general, residential and personnel facilities may be contributing resources in a district if they retain integrity from the World War II era, but they are secondary to the primary installation mission, and by themselves do not represent a significant historic context.

### Examples

The variety of properties related to research, development, and testing previously listed in the National Register is indicative of the wide range of these properties. These resources include natural dry lakebeds, to model basins, to properties related to the Manhattan Project.

Rogers Dry Lake (also known as Muroc Dry Lake) at Edwards AFB, California, is listed in the National Register for its role during World War II and in the following years as an important site for testing experimental aircraft (Lakebed Runways 18 and 23). The David W. Taylor Model Basin at Carderock, Maryland, is significant in the areas of architecture, engineering, invention, military, and science. Opened in 1940, the model basin was the preeminent research facility for U.S. Navy ship design. The unique design and engineering of the 3,000+ ft model basin building and the towing basins also are significant.

Several properties associated with the Manhattan Project, a Special Project, are listed in the National Register. They are the Trinity Site, site of the world's first nuclear device detonation; Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, the place where scientists developed the nuclear fission bomb; and the Oak Ridge Historic District, a secret, planned community for 75,000 residents devoted to the development of the atomic bomb.

## **Special Projects**

### Significance

Special projects are important types of installations within the World War II historic context. These projects included research, development, and testing (RD&T) facilities and the new consolidated military headquarters building, the Pentagon.

Criterion A: Special projects met critical military needs or objectives during World War II. This investigation identified two special projects: the facilities constructed as part of the Manhattan Project to develop the Atomic Bomb and the Pentagon, the military headquarters in Washington, D.C.

Criterion C: Special projects often resulted in unique facilities, designed specifically to meet the technical requirements of a particular mission or need. They may have significance under Criterion C for unique architectural or engineering designs. In other cases, standard buildings may have been housed RD&T activities; in these instances, the properties should be evaluated primarily under Criterion A, rather than Criterion C. Standardized support facilities may be eligible as part of a district, but by themselves do not represent the mission of special projects.

### Registration Requirements



Special projects must be associated with critical military needs or objectives during World War II. The facilities specifically associated with the special project must be present. In some cases, these facilities may represent unique buildings. If the property was the location of a significant event it may be eligible as a site simply for its associative value with that important event. The character-defining features for facilities will vary widely according to their specific purpose. In order to determine if the property retains integrity, a careful analysis of its role in the special project during World War II is necessary.

### Examples

The Pentagon has been listed in the National Register of Historic Places under Criteria A, B, and C. It is a building significant for its role as the headquarters of the military establishment during the war, for its association with important military leaders directing the war effort, and for its architecture.

Several properties associated with the Manhattan Project also are listed in the National Register. They are the Trinity Site, site of the world's first nuclear device detonation; Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, the place where scientists developed the nuclear fission bomb; and the Oak Ridge Historic District, a secret, planned community for 75,000 residents with the sole purpose of developing the atomic bomb.

## **Strategic Communications**

### Significance

Strategic communications facilities may be significant command construction installations within the World War II context. While both services relied heavily on existing civilian communication organizations throughout the war, each service operated a small number of specialized communications installations in the U.S.

Criterion A: Global communication was important in the effort to coordinate multiple, far-flung military operations. Strategic military communications facilities are those that reached military units stationed throughout the world, rather than routine installation communication buildings. An important development related to communication was the application and improvement of radar (radio detecting and ranging).

Criterion C: Strategic communication facilities may exhibit significant engineering features associated with the development and construction of communications equipment.

## Registration Requirements

To be eligible for the National Register, a strategic communication facility must have an important association with a significant event or pattern of events. Radio stations that served as the primary links between headquarters and foreign fronts are the most significant of the strategic communications facilities. The facilities must retain their character defining features, which are the transmitters (antenna towers), operators building, and the helix house.

## Examples

Two radar sites associated with World War II are listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The Opana Radar Site in Hawaii is significant as the first land radar operated by the United States in wartime. Radar operators detected incoming aircraft on the morning of December 7, 1941; though their warning was disregarded, the event demonstrated the important military implications of radar. The original radar station consisted of two trucks and a trailer that held the portable radar unit; none of the original radar station is evident today. The property is listed as the site of historically significant events where the location itself possesses historical value. Radar Station B-71, near Klamath, California, was part of the World War II radar air defense network. The radar station was disguised to look like a farm. None of the original equipment remains.

## **Training**

### Significance

Military training facilities may be significant command construction installations within the context of World War II. The mobilization of personnel during wartime was tremendously important. However, the majority of structures associated with training activities were built using temporary wartime construction, and thus few are associated with the permanent construction context that is the subject of this study.

Criterion A: The United States mobilized more men for military service during the course of World War II than at any time in its history. In 1939, Navy enlisted personnel numbered about 110,000 men; by the end of the war, enlisted strength was over three million. By the war's end, 10.4 million soldiers had served in the Army. The vast majority of these men were trained at one of dozens of large training camps or cantonments developed by the military. These training facilities are associated with the massive mobilization of millions of Americans for World War II and, for many veterans of the war, these training facilities are the stateside places that best represent their wartime experience. A separate historic context has been developed for temporary cantonment and training camps (Garner 1993 and Wasch et al. 1993). In some instances, unique engineering structures of permanent construction, such as towers for airborne operations training, may be associated with specific military training programs.

Criterion C: Since most training facilities were built using temporary construction, they typically represent the distinctive characteristics of World War II temporary construction. The historic context developed for World War II temporary construction describes in great detail the significance of the standardized temporary construction program.

In some cases, individual buildings associated with training facilities, notably those built during the first phase of the Protective Mobilization period (1940), may have been built as permanent construction. Architecturally, these buildings usually are similar to those built during the inter-war period and, under Criterion C, should be assessed for their ability to represent a type, period, or method of construction, such as standardized military construction or period revival styles.

## Registration Requirements

To be eligible for the National Register, a training facility must have an important association with a significant event or pattern of events. The mobilization and training of millions of Americans during World War II was a significant event. Large camps and cantonments with specific associations to this massive mobilization may be eligible. However, most of these camps were constructed using temporary construction. The management of World War II temporary construction was the subject of a 1986 Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement (PMOA) developed in response to the a Congressional directive to demolish DoD World War II temporary buildings (Appendix III). Under the PMOA, DoD mitigated the demolition of this class of resources by extensively documenting their history and construction. That documentation is now complete and DoD may proceed with demolition of World War II temporary construction.

Buildings associated with training functions that are now classified as permanent or semi-permanent buildings due to post-war modifications, but which were originally built according to the temporary construction mobilization plans, should be evaluated within the context of temporary construction, not World War II permanent construction. In these cases, the buildings typically have been so modified that they no longer possess sufficient integrity to convey their historical associations.

Individual, isolated or widely dispersed permanent buildings typically do not convey the important association with mobilization training.

Permanent buildings associated with training may be eligible for the National Register if they possess a direct and important association with World War II training activity and possess sufficient integrity to convey their association with World War II training. They should possess integrity of location, association, setting, feeling, materials, and design.

## Examples

Williams Field, described above under the airfields section, was the location of flying training schools during World War II. Since 1993, Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana, and Fort Devens, Massachusetts, have been included in the National Register with a World War II association. Both of these installations were established before World War II and represent earlier training installations that continued their roles through the war.

## CHAPTER XV

### CASE STUDIES

Site visits to seven installations were conducted as part of this investigation to incorporate site-specific data into the World War II permanent construction historic context. These sites were selected following discussions with representatives from the Legacy Program, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc., based on the following criteria: (1) concentration of World War II facilities; (2) high level of integrity from the World War II era; (3) ability to illustrate a representative type of World War II installation; and, (4) geographic distribution. Archival research and a real property inventory developed by U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratory (USACERL) indicated that the primary types of military installations to receive permanent construction during World War II were depots, shipyards, research and development facilities, hospitals, and industrial installations. In addition, industrial installations were represented by several types of ordnance works, ordnance plants, and factories. Other installations, including operating bases, training stations, and air fields, received some permanent construction, but generally not to the same degree as those installation types listed above. The following installations were selected as case studies: Indiana Army Ammunition Plant, Indiana; McAlester Army Ammunition Plant (formerly Navy), Oklahoma; Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division, China Lake, California; Naval Surface Warfare Center Crane Division, Indiana; Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant, Ohio; Twin Cities Ammunition Plant, Minnesota; and, Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio. In addition, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, has released information about two other installations, Fort George G. Meade, Maryland, and Naval Air Station Anacostia, Washington, D.C., for inclusion as case studies in this report.

The following discussions provide summary data on the installations and demonstrate how resources at these installations can be evaluated within the World War II permanent construction historic context. The installation buildings are organized by property categories under the Identification sections of each case study. Existing information for each installation was used to develop this categorization. In some cases, detailed building inventories or cultural resource surveys provided documentation of original uses; in other cases, available documentation only identified historic uses of selected buildings.

#### **Indiana Army Ammunition Plant**

##### Location and Current Status

Indiana Army Ammunition Plant (INAAP) is a government-owned, contractor-operated (GOCO) installation encompassing roughly 10,650 acres located on the west bank of the Ohio River in Clark County, Indiana. It is located east of Charlestown, Indiana, and fifteen miles north of Louisville, Kentucky. The installation is part of the Army Munitions Command (AMCCOM), a subordinate command within the Army Materiel Command. Due to changes in the operation of AMCCOM, the Army is ceasing maintenance on certain installations, declaring the buildings excess, and eventually disposing of the buildings, while retaining the land. INAAP is included within this program and is among the installations addressed in a 1993 Programmatic Agreement among AMCCOM, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and multiple State Historic Preservation Offices.

## Summary History

INAAP, established in August 1940, was the first single-base smokeless-powder ordnance works authorized under the National Defense Program, and served as a model for the design of later installations. It also was the largest and most productive of the smokeless powder works. The creation of INAAP arose out of a dire need for explosive and propellant factories in the late 1930s. Due to the threat of U.S. involvement in the war, the National Defense Advisory Committee persuaded Congress to appropriate funds for the construction of munitions factories. Construction at INAAP began in 1940 when the U.S. War Department contracted with the DuPont Company to build a smokeless powder plant on a 5,500-acre site. This plant, known as the Indiana Ordnance Works (IOW #1), was designed, constructed, and operated by DuPont.

IOW began producing smokeless powder in April 1941. The facility consisted of 619 permanent buildings and approximately 100 temporary buildings. The permanent buildings were constructed of concrete, steel, and brick. After January 1941, the Army initiated cost-cutting measures to hold down construction costs at munitions factories. Construction at IOW was already well underway by this date, and plans were not modified to comply with the new directive. At other ordnance works in the planning stage, permanent buildings were replaced with temporary construction wherever possible. At the time of its construction, IOW was advertised as the largest powder plant in the world. It reached its peak production of nearly 1,000,000 pounds of powder in 1942.

INAAP was expanded in 1941 through the addition of a powder bag manufacturing and loading plant, the Hoosier Ordnance Plant (HOP), on an adjacent 4,900-acre facility. Production began at HOP in September 1941. The principal built resource at HOP was a large, one-story building that covered nearly four acres. It housed roughly 1,000 employees and hundreds of sewing machines. Employment at HOP fluctuated during the war according to need and available supplies, but peaked in March 1945 with 8,900 employees. In conjunction with the construction of IOW #1 and HOP, administrative buildings, support and storage buildings, residential housing areas, and recreational facilities are constructed.

INAAP was expanded further during World War II with the construction of the second Indiana Ordnance Works (IOW #2), which was intended to produce rocket-propellant. Construction began on IOW #2 in December 1944 on a parcel of land adjacent to IOW #1. This facility, however, was never completed. Construction was halted soon after the Japanese surrender in August 1945.

INAAP had a tremendous impact on the local economy. The plants provided thousands of jobs, and ultimately transformed the rural countryside of Charlestown into a thriving manufacturing center. The population of Charlestown increased dramatically from 936 in 1940 to more than 3,000 by the spring of 1941.

After the war, the Army designated INAAP a stand-by facility. It was reactivated during the Korean War and the Vietnam War. During the 1970s, INAAP added a new black powder manufacturing facility and two propellant-loading lines.

## Historic Context

The swift construction of facilities for explosives production was one of the impressive feats achieved by American industry during World War II. In the summer of 1940, the United States possessed a minimal number of facilities to manufacture explosives. By the end of the war, American superiority in ammunition made a devastating effect upon the Axis nations. To manufacture explosives, the War Department constructed a series of ordnance works throughout the mid-western United States.

At the beginning of the war, the nation's only military facilities for the production of explosives were Picatinny Arsenal in Dover, New Jersey, and the Naval Powder Factory in Indian Head, Maryland. Both facilities retained a working knowledge of the art of explosive production through the inter-war period, and were indispensable to the production mobilization effort of World War II. Operating at their maximum capacity, however, these facilities could not produce more than a tiny fraction of the material required for the war. To meet the shortfall, the War Department constructed ordnance works and assigned management of the facilities to private contractors. In the area of ammunition production, these Government Owned, Contractor Operated facilities or GOCOs, were divided into ordnance works, which produced explosives or their basic ingredients, and ordnance plants, which loaded or assembled ammunition. Explosives were divided into two categories: propellants and high explosives. Indiana, Alabama, Badger, Gopher, Oklahoma, and Sunflower Ordnance Works were constructed to produce propellants.

Identification

A total of 1,276 of INAAP's properties date from the World War II period. Property types represented among these World War II resources include those related to administration, industry, infrastructure, personnel support, housing, and transportation. Due to the large number of properties (1,276) that date from World War II, each building is not listed below. Instead, the property categories are described with representative examples.

Properties Associated with Administration. The two separate factories, IOW and HOP, each had a separate administration area. The buildings at IOW are steel frame, brick buildings, while those at HOP are wood-framed buildings clad in asbestos siding.

Bldg. 703	Main Administration Building (IOW)
Bldg. 720	Guard Headquarters (IOW)
Bldg. 702	Telephone Exchange (IOW)
Bldg. 2511	Employment Bldg. (HOP)

Properties Associated with Health Care. The IOW hospital building is similar in construction to the IOW administration buildings. It features a reinforced-concrete foundation and cinderblock and brick load-bearing walls. The HOP hospital is constructed of concrete block load-bearing walls on a reinforced-concrete foundation.

Bldg. 719-1	Hospital (IOW)
Bldg. 2601	Hospital (HOP)

Properties Associated with Industrial Functions. The propellant and explosives manufacturing area of IOW includes six smokeless powder manufacturing lines, ammonium oxidation plants, and nitric and sulfuric acid concentration plants. Each line and plant consists of many buildings that housed different steps of the manufacturing process. Each building within the production lines is integral to the manufacturing process. The volatility of propellants and explosives, and their ingredients, required isolating the manufacturing steps in separate buildings in order to contain potential explosions. The buildings were constructed of wooden-frame, clad with asphalt-metal siding, and built on reinforced-concrete foundations. Some buildings, such as the nitrating houses, were built of steel frame clad in brick. Safety features, such as escape chutes, were incorporated into the buildings.

The following building list describes Line A, a typical cannon powder manufacturing line. The buildings were arranged, and are listed, in the order of the production steps. The completed smokeless powder was transferred either to a shipping house or to a powder magazine (igloo storage).

Bldg. 101-1	Warehouse
-------------	-----------

Bldg. 104-1	Cotton Dry House
Bldg. 103-1	Conveyor
Bldg. 105-1	Nitrating House
Bldg. 108-1	Boiling Tub House
Bldg. 109-1	Pulping House
Bldg. 112-1	Poacher Tub Houses
Bldg. 113-1	Final Blend & Wringer House
Bldg. 201-1	Nitrocellulose Lag Storage
Bldg. 202-1	Dehydration-Press House
Bldg. 208-1	Mixer House
Bldg. 211-1	Horizontal Press House
Bldg. 214-1	Solvent Recovery House
Bldg. 218-1	Unloading & Screening House
Bldg. 219-1	Water Dry House
Bldg. 220-1	Controlled Circulation Dryer Powder House
Bldg. 221-1	Blending and Packing House
Bldg. 224-1	Air Test Bldg.

Industrial properties at HOP are the bag-manufacturing plant and eight charge and four igniter bag-loading lines. The bag-manufacturing plant is a one-story, steel-frame, concrete block building that covers four acres. This design consolidated the manufacturing of the cloth bags for artillery rounds under one roof. The saw-tooth monitor roof provided maximum daylight. The building is typical of large day-light factories, albeit at a monumental scale. The bag-loading lines consist of separate buildings for each phase of the bag loading process. They are constructed of steel frame and reinforced concrete with wood-framed gable roofs.

Bldg. 1001	Bag Manufacturing Bldg. (HOP)
Bldgs. 3003-3017	Smokeless Powder Bag Loading Bldgs. (HOP)
Bldgs. 4005-4008	Igniter Bag Loading Bldgs. (HOP)

IOW and HOP also included shop buildings that supported the industrial manufacturing processes. Shop buildings included machine shops and maintenance shops.

Properties Associated with Infrastructure. INAAP includes three power plants that date from World War II. The three-story buildings were built of reinforced concrete with brick cladding. They were powered by coal-burning boilers. The ordnance works also included seven Ranney water wells, located at approximately one-quarter mile intervals near the bank of the Ohio River, to supply the enormous water requirements of the smokeless powder manufacturing process. The Ranney Water Collector Corporation of New York designed the wells, which embody a distinctive technology developed by engineer Leo Ranney.

Properties Associated with Personnel Support. HOP included several canteens that served as lunch room facilities for the workers. They are one-story buildings, constructed of hollow tile, with wood-framed gable roofs. The clock house contained the time clock and time cards for plant employees.

Bldgs. 3401 - 3408      Canteen  
Bldg. 2512              Clock House

Properties Associated with Research, Development, and Testing.  
Bldg. 2591              Laboratory (HOP)

Properties Associated with Residential Use. Housing for key personnel at IOW #1 and #2 and HOP were constructed in an area adjoining the munitions factories. The residential area consists of 39 single-family, wooden-frame houses constructed from standardized plans. The largest houses were reserved for the commanding officer and for high-ranking officers assigned to nearby posts. The housing area resembles a suburban neighborhood. Some modest, wooden-frame, clay-tile, Craftsman-style bungalows from the 1920s also survive that pre-date the development of the munitions factory. During the construction of IOW #2, a temporary housing camp was erected in answer to the severe housing shortage; none of those buildings survive.

Properties Associated with Storage. Smokeless powder was stored in barrel-shaped, igloo storage structures constructed of reinforced concrete and covered with earth on three sides. These are examples of standard igloo storage structures. They were located in a separate area and spaced approximately 450 ft. apart. IOW also included 148 wooden-frame shipping houses.

Bldgs. 5001-5193, 5206, 5253,              Smokeless Powder Magazine  
5256, 5285, 5367-5369, 5373-5375,  
4801-4803  
Bldgs. 229-1 - 229-48              Shipping Houses

Properties Associated with Transportation. The warehouses located at the beginning of the production line, and the shipping houses, where the final product was stored were connected to rail lines.

## Evaluation

### *1. What is the nature of the property?*

Date established: 1941  
Function during WWII: Industrial construction: ordnance works (explosives production) and ordnance plant (bag manufacturing and loading)  
Category of property: district composed of buildings and structures

### *2. What historic context does the property represent?*

Time period: 1940-1945  
Geographic Area: United States  
Theme: World War II permanent and semi-permanent construction on the home front

### *3. What is the property type? Is the property type significant in illustrating the context?*

The installation includes both an ordnance works and an ordnance plant. INAAP retains the full range of property types typical of smokeless powder production and bag manufacturing and loading. Explosives production was an important component of the U.S. domestic ordnance production program during World War II and is significant in illustrating World War II permanent construction.

### *4. How does the property represent an important aspect of the historic context: through important historical associations (Criterion A) or architectural and design features (Criterion C)?*



INAAP is associated in a specific and important way with World War II ordnance production (Criterion A). It was the first single-base smokeless-powder ordnance works authorized under the National Defense Program, and served as a planning model for later installations. It also was the largest and most productive of the smokeless powder works. The United States suffered from a critical shortage of explosives in 1940. INAAP was a crucial component in the effort to supply propellant explosives for the war effort and was the prototypical ordnance works that served as a model for the design and operation of other GOCOs. INAAP also represents the distinctive characteristics of World War II permanent military construction (Criterion C). Its design and construction are emblematic of World War II mobilization factory design.

*5. Compare the property with related properties? Does it retain the distinctive characteristics of its type? How does it compare historically with other properties important within the historic context?*

The government constructed 34 ordnance works during World War II. INAAP, closely followed by Radford Ordnance Works, was the first of these facilities to be established. The Army retained 10 of these ordnance works after the war, including INAAP. INAAP was the prototypical ordnance GOCO and was a primary producer of powder for the war effort. It retains the distinctive characteristics of its type: permanent construction typical of first-wave plants begun during the Protective Mobilization phase; the component parts of the manufacturing lines; personnel, administration, and storage support areas; dispersed layout; and, a supporting bag manufacturing and loading plant.

*6. Is the property significant on a regional or national level within the historic context?*

INAAP represents an aspect of history of the United States as a whole, the World War II home front war effort to produce the "Arsenal of Democracy." The 1992 Cultural Resources Management Plan recommended that the facility possessed national significance. It also may be significant on a local level for the effects it had on the local economy and work force during the war and any lasting changes it produced. Site-specific research is necessary to determine its local significance.

*7. Does the property retain sufficient integrity to convey the significance of the historic context that it represents?*

As of the 1993 site visit, the INAAP retained sufficient integrity to convey the significance of the World War II permanent construction historic context. The production lines, support buildings, and layout remain intact. Alterations have been generally the result of routine maintenance. The majority of the major industrial buildings retain their original use. It retains integrity of setting, location, workmanship, association, feeling, materials, and design.

*8. Is the property one of the kind of properties usually excluded from the National Register?*

No. The Criteria Considerations do not apply.

#### Sources of Information

Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record Inventory. National Park Service. Department of the Interior. "Indiana Army Ammunition Plant." HABS/HAER Inventory, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. 1983.

MacDonald and Mack. "Historic Properties Report: Indiana Army Ammunition Plant, Charlestown, Indiana." Prepared under contract CX-0001-2-0033 between Building Technology

Incorporated, Silver Spring, Maryland, and the Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record, National Park Service, Washington, D.C. 1984.

Peter, Duane, et al. "Indiana Army Ammunition Plant: Cultural Resource Management Plan." Draft. Prepared for Indiana Army Ammunition Plant, AMCCOM Facilities, under contract to the Fort Worth District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 1992.

Voight, William, comp. "Ordnance War Administration History." Study No. 11, Monograph No. 1. "GOCO Facilities - Directory." MS (microfiche), AMCCOM Historical Office, Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois.

## **Fort George G. Meade**

### Location and Current Status

Fort George G. Meade is located in northwestern Anne Arundel County, Maryland. The installation encompasses approximately 6,000 acres. The installation is part of the U.S. Army Forces Command (FORSCOM). It is located midway between Baltimore and Washington, D.C.

In 1994, a Cultural Resource Management Plan was undertaken for Fort Meade. This plan recommended a historic district comprising approximately 131 contributing buildings on the installation. The historic district was recommended as eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A for its history and Criterion C for its example of military architecture during the inter-war period. Additional research was undertaken in 1996 to evaluate the permanent buildings constructed at the installation during World War II. The Maryland Historical Trust, acting as the State Historic Preservation Office, concurred with the evaluation assessments.

### Summary History

Fort Meade was established in 1917 as a World War I mobilization training cantonment. It was one of 32 temporary training cantonments established to mobilize personnel for the war effort. The buildings comprising the initial construction were wood-frame, temporary buildings. During the inter-war period, the installation became a permanent Army post. Construction of permanent buildings in the main post area followed standardized Quartermaster plans for barracks, administration, and officer housing.

During World War II, Fort Meade again became the site of troop mobilization. Construction of a temporary cantonment at Fort Meade began in December 1940. The J.E. Greiner Company of Baltimore served as the architectural and engineering firm for the project and the Consolidated Engineering Company of Baltimore was the constructing contractor. The temporary cantonment was constructed east of the main post. It was a separate entity within the installation and physically separated from the inter-war-era main post area. The temporary cantonment contained wood-frame barracks, dispensaries, administration buildings, mess halls, latrines, and personnel support buildings. This cantonment also included a few permanent buildings such as a potable water treatment plant and wells, maintenance and repair buildings, mess hall, cold storage building, and ammunition magazines.

During the war, the reception center at Fort Meade processed over 1 million individuals from Maryland into the Army. The post also served as the command and training center for the 29th National Guard Infantry Division, formed of men from Maryland and Virginia. After the war, the U.S. Second Army established its headquarters at the post and the installation has continued as an active installation until present.

### Historic Context

Between 1940 and 1941, the U.S. Army began to mobilize personnel for war. The world military situation led to protective U.S. mobilization measures. During the inter-war years, military budgets had been minimal, and the reduced level of funding was reflected in American military readiness. As in World War I, the U.S. army needed to establish a temporary cantonment system to accommodate a massive influx of inductees. In 1940, emergency construction activities were undertaken by the Quartermaster Corps; by 1941, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers was in charge of all construction activities. The mobilization training camps were constructed using standardized plans and wood-frame construction. Speed and efficient use of available building materials were critical considerations during the construction of mobilization training cantonments. Temporary

construction was preferred, but some support buildings required construction with permanent building materials.

### Identification

In the 1994 building survey of Fort Meade, 287 buildings were identified as World War II wood-frame temporary buildings. This class of buildings was the subject of mitigation required by a 1986 Programmatic Agreement among the Department of Defense, the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The mitigation documentation was completed in 1993 and DoD is permitted to demolish World War II temporary buildings.

In addition to the well-documented temporary buildings, several wood-frame and permanent buildings were constructed at Fort Meade to support the temporary cantonment. These buildings included personnel support buildings, infrastructure, maintenance and repair buildings, mess hall, cold storage building, and ammunition magazines. At Fort Meade, these buildings generally were functional utilitarian buildings with no individual architectural or design distinction. The notable exception was the water filtration plant. In addition, these resources generally were isolated and widely dispersed, so that they in themselves did not form a cohesive district, but were evaluated as individual resources.

Properties Associated with Administration. Fort George G. Meade had a wood-frame division headquarters building that was not identified as a World War II temporary building during the initial survey. Additional research revealed that this building indeed was a standard 700 plan for a headquarters building that had been modified on the site from a three-story building to a one-story building. As such, it was part of the class of temporary buildings covered under the 1986 Programmatic Agreement on temporary buildings and required no further documentation.

Bldg. 2844      Division Headquarters Building

Properties Associated with Industrial Functions. Industrial functions at Fort Meade were limited to ordnance maintenance and repair. Two such buildings were completed in 1941. They were constructed as part of a permanent maintenance complex begun during the inter-war period, and, as such, were not part of the World War II mobilization cantonment. During World War II, maintenance and repair activities played only a minor role Fort Meade's training mission. Therefore, these buildings were not significantly associated with World War II and not recommended for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

Bldg. 2244                      Oil Storage  
Bldg. 2244-D                  Standard Ordnance Shop

Properties Associated with Infrastructure. At Fort Meade, the water treatment plant, constructed in 1941, is an imposing brick and concrete edifice that exhibits a well articulated and refined design uncommon in the construction of this building type, especially during World War II. It was therefore recommended for listing in the National Register under Criterion C.

Other examples of infrastructure not recommended for listing in the National Register include two boiler houses, a water well with pump, and a sewage pumping station. A small concrete block boiler house (Building 618A) was constructed to heat an individual World War II temporary building. Completed in 1941, the water well with pump (Building 1957) is small, one-story, brick building that rests on a concrete foundation. A large boiler house/district heating plant (Building 2251) was constructed in 1941 from a standard plan to support the nearby temporary laundry building. Its corrugated metal walls and roof are supported by a steel frame. The sewage pumping station (Building 6328) is constructed of reinforced concrete and rests on a concrete foundation.

These examples of utilitarian infrastructure are isolated from other buildings on the installation and do not form part of an historic district. They are support buildings that, in themselves, do not possess individual significance either for their association with World War II under Criterion A or for their architecture under Criterion C.

Bldg. 618A	Heating Plant
Bldg. 1957	Water Well with Pump
Bldg. 2251	Boiler House
Bldg. 6328	Sewage Pumping Station
Bldg. 8688	Water Treatment Plant

Properties Associated with Personnel Support. Personnel support buildings constructed at Fort Meade include a 1500-person mess hall for enlisted personnel and an officer service club. The mess hall was completed from Theater of Operations (T.O.) plans. Although Theater of Operations plans were designed to be flimsier than wood-frame temporary mobilization construction, the example at Fort Meade was constructed from concrete block on a concrete foundation. The officer service club was constructed from 700 series plans, generally used for temporary construction, but this example also is constructed using concrete block.

These buildings were evaluated as not eligible for listing in the National Register because they were completed in 1945, three years after the initial mobilization cantonment was completed. As such they served as part of demobilization after the war was ended. Thus, the buildings had no significant direct association with World War II. In addition, both buildings have been extensively modified and they have lost integrity of setting since the barracks that originally surrounded the buildings were demolished.

Bldg. 370	Officer Service Club
Bldg. 2239	Consolidated Mess

Properties Associated with Storage. The buildings associated with storage at Fort Meade include a cold storage building and twelve ammunition magazines. The cold storage building was constructed in 1942 from a 700 series standardized plan. The building has reinforced concrete walls and rests on a concrete foundation. The twelve magazines are constructed of steel and designed to be portable. The twelve magazines are grouped in an area that is isolated from the rest of the cantonment.

These buildings were evaluated as not eligible for listing in the National Register because they are examples of utilitarian infrastructure that are isolated from other buildings on the installation and do not form part of an historic district. They are support buildings that, in themselves, do not possess individual significance either for their association with World War II under Criterion A or for their architecture under Criterion C.

Bldg. 4272	Cold Storage
Bldgs. M1-M12	Ammunition Magazines

### Evaluation

#### 1. *What is the nature of the property?*

Date established:	1917
Function during WWII:	command construction; mobilization training camp
Category of property:	individual resources because of dispersed location of resources

#### 2. *What historic context does the property represent?*

Time period: 1940-1945  
Geographic Area: United States  
Theme: World War II permanent and semi-permanent construction on the home front

3. *What is the property type? Is the property type significant in illustrating the context?*

The installation contained a wood-frame World War II temporary training cantonment as well as permanent buildings constructed to support that cantonment. Although training was an important activity during World War II, most training activities occurred at temporary cantonments that generally needed only a few insignificant permanent support buildings.

4. *How does the property represent an important aspect of the historic context: through important historical associations (Criterion A) or architectural and design features (Criterion C)?*

The permanent World War II buildings at Fort Meade do not represent an important aspect of World War II permanent construction. They generally are utilitarian buildings that supported a larger World War II temporary cantonment. At Fort Meade, most of the temporary buildings have been demolished. The demolition of the main cantonment has left the permanent buildings that once supported the cantonment as widely dispersed isolated resources that do not of themselves form an historic district. These support buildings do not have an important historical association with World War II under Criterion A, nor do they exhibit important architectural features under Criterion C necessary for individual listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Only the water treatment plant is considered eligible for the National Register under Criterion C because of its architectural design.

5. *Compare the property with related properties? Does it retain the distinctive characteristics of its type? How does it compare historically with other properties important within the historic context?*

The Army constructed over 100 temporary mobilization training camps of various sizes. The permanent buildings constructed to support the cantonment at Fort George G. Meade, in general, are utilitarian functional buildings that have no individual distinction. The water treatment plant is a distinguished architectural example of its building type.

6. *Is the property significant on a regional or national level within the historic context?*

Fort Meade as an Army installation has had an impact on the local economy, particularly when the mobilization cantonment was first constructed during World War II. Although the post currently may be a large employer in the immediate area, its economic impact has lessened since the development of Baltimore Washington economic corridor. However, the permanent World War II buildings, as remaining isolated elements of the World War II cantonment, do not possess significance on either the local or national level.

7. *Does the property retain sufficient integrity to convey the significance of the historic context that it represents?*

As of work completed in 1996, with the exception of the water treatment plant, the permanent buildings no longer retain sufficient integrity to convey any significance of the World War II permanent construction historic context. At Fort Meade, permanent construction generally was utilitarian construction to support the main temporary wood-frame training cantonment. Since most of the World War II temporary cantonment has been demolished, these dispersed buildings lack integrity of setting to convey their association with World War II. In addition, many of the individual buildings have been modified.

8. *Is the property one of the kind of properties usually excluded from the National Register?*

No. The Criteria Considerations do not apply.

Sources of Information

Baker, Mark L. "Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties Form: Building 2239." MS, prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore, Maryland, 1995.

R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc. "Fort George G. Meade Cultural Resource Management Plan." MS, prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore, Maryland, 1994.

R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc. "Fort George G. Meade Phase II Architectural Summary Report." MS, prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore, Maryland, 1996.

## **McAlester AAP**

### Location and Current Status

McAlester Army Ammunition Plant is a government-owned, government-operated (GOGO) munitions manufacturing and storage facility. The facility encompasses 44,962 acres (roughly 70 square miles) near McAlester, Oklahoma. Originally built as a naval ammunition depot, McAlester was transferred to the Army in October 1975, and is now under the Army Materiel Command.

### Summary History

McAlester, Oklahoma, was constructed in 1942 to provide additional inland ammunition depot storage to accommodate increased wartime demands. McAlester, Oklahoma, and Hastings, Nebraska, were designed with nearly identical plans; the contract for each depot called for the construction of 707 magazines, 70 inert storage buildings, two large-caliber loading plants, two medium-caliber loading plants, and two-line bomb and mine filling plants.

Brown-Bellows Construction Company received a \$53 million contract in July 1942 to construct the McAlester depot. McAlester was originally slated to house storage activities and two major-caliber, two medium-caliber, and two bomb-and-mine loading plants. Within four months of the initial building phase, 20-mm and 40-mm shell loading lines were incorporated into the original plan. A medium-caliber area was the first line to enter into production, on September 4, 1943. By the war's end, the depot included 199 permanent buildings, 94 temporary buildings, 152 inert storage buildings,

In May 1943, two rocket-motor loading plants were added to the A-Plant, and a mile-long bomb and mining production facility was completed by November 1943. Munitions produced in the A-Plant primarily consisted of mines and aerial depth bombs used in anti-submarine warfare. Five additional lines were completed and entered production in the following eighteen months. Construction activities continued throughout World War II, with additional magazines and inert storage buildings added to the original design scheme. Torpex, a highly volatile explosive, was produced in the east line of Bomb and Mine plant A. The depot suffered a serious accident on December 5, 1944, when 27 Mark 18 torpedo warheads exploded in a storage magazine, causing eleven casualties.

The construction of the depot had a dramatic affect on the surrounding countryside. The town of McAlester had a population of 12,401 in 1940. During the construction phase, the contractors had a work force of approximately 20,000. Housing shortages resulted from the flood of workers. Transportation to the depot site from the remote homes of workers in the surrounding 40 mile radius was also in short supply.

McAlester AAP grew to become the nation's second largest ammunition production and storage depot. Towards the end of the war, McAlester shifted its activities from the production of ammunition to renovating existing resources. By the end of the war, workers at McAlester had renovated over 14 million cartridges of ammunition.

### Historic Context

To prevent the competition between the services for explosives and their raw materials that had plagued the U.S. military during World War I, the Army and Navy shared responsibility for ammunition production. The Army was responsible for explosives production and for assembly of jointly-used types and calibers of ammunition. The Navy was responsible for loading and assembling its own finished artillery rounds.



The Navy performed both ammunition production and storage activities at its naval depots. Unlike the Army, the Navy constructed and operated its own depots and did not rely on private contractors. Prior to World War II, the Navy had nine ammunition depots in operation to meet peace-time needs. Eight of these depots were located along the coast, in close proximity to the navy yards. The inland depot, at Hawthorne, Nevada, was constructed in 1930 to reduce the congestion at coastal depots and provide a more modern facility for explosive storage.

The construction of Hawthorne was in direct response to the disastrous 1926 Lake Denmark Naval Ammunition Depot explosion, which was caused by the dangerous overloading of closely-spaced, above-ground ammunition magazines. The Army and Navy adopted strict standards specifying new construction standards for ammunition storage, limiting the quantity of explosives stored within each structure, and specifying minimum distances between storage structures. Hawthorne, established in 1930, was the first facility built according to the new standards, and set the pattern for later, vast inland depots characterized by rows of widely-spaced, arched reinforced-concrete high explosives magazines. Hawthorne also included a mine-filling plant, in keeping with the Navy practice to assemble its specialized ammunition at naval ammunition depots.

The U.S. authorization of a "two-ocean" navy in 1940 and the eventual outbreak of declared war strained the capacity of the Navy's existing depots. The nation's emergency construction program, initiated in 1940, included expansion plans for the Navy's ammunition depots. Existing depots were expanded and twelve new stations were built, including three inland depots. The Navy expanded Hawthorne and established Crane Ammunition Depot (June 1940) to serve the eastern United States. Despite these expansions, the Navy needed more production and storage facilities. In June 1942, the Navy established two additional depots at McAlester, Oklahoma, and Hastings, Nebraska, to fulfill the additional wartime demands. The two depots were designed to be nearly identical, with medium- and large-caliber loading plants, mine-filling plants, and hundreds of storage magazines. The construction of McAlester and Hastings doubled the Navy's ammunition storage and production capacity.

#### Identification

A comprehensive inventory, listing building numbers and their historic functions, was not available for McAlester AAP at the time of the site visit. Lists of building types were taken from the installation histories listed below in the "Sources of Information."

Properties Associated with Administration. Administration buildings were constructed of brick, structural clay tile, and reinforced concrete.

Main Administration Bldg.  
Misc. Administration Bldgs.  
Fire Station

#### Properties Associated with Health Care.

Dispensary

Properties Associated with Industrial Functions. The production lines were between 1,200 and 5,000 feet long and included separate buildings for the various steps of the loading process, plus support buildings such as receiving, shipping, storage, and lunch and locker facilities. Shell filling and ammunition production lines were virtually identical to their Army ordnance plant counterparts.

Major Caliber line:       7 bldgs.  
40 mm line:               7 bldgs.

Cartridge Loading & Assembly Bldgs. (2)  
Case Preparation Bldg. (1)  
Projectile Loading Bldg. (2)  
Misc. Bldgs.  
Medium Caliber line: 12 bldgs.  
20 mm line: 8 bldgs.  
Bomb and Mine lines (A&B): 24 bldgs.  
Pouring Bldg.  
Unboxing Bldg.  
Aluminum-Powder Sifting Bldg.  
Cooling Bldg.  
Case Preparation Bldg.  
Misc. Support Bldgs.  
Rocket Plant: 12 bldgs.

Machine Shop  
Locomotive Repair Shop  
Utilities Maintenance Shops  
Misc. Shop Bldgs.

Properties Associated with Infrastructure.

Boiler Houses  
Pumphouses  
Water Treatment Plant  
Sewage Treatment Plant

Properties Associated with Personnel Support. McAlester included a cafeteria in the administration area, while also including personnel facilities, such as lunch and locker rooms and wash houses, in the production line areas. Unlike Army ordnance plants, naval ammunition depots had sizeable contingents of enlisted military personnel assigned to the depots. In isolated places locations like McAlester, the Navy provided recreation facilities. Two recreation buildings were built, and included gymnasium facilities, bowling alleys, libraries, and pool and ping-pong tables.

Lunch and Locker Bldgs.  
Wash Houses  
Cafeteria  
Recreation Bldgs.

Properties Associated with Research, Development, and Testing. The depot had an Inspection Department that was responsible for ensuring the accuracy of weights and gauges.

Properties Associated with Residential Use.

Barracks  
Bachelor Officer Quarters (3)  
Married Officers' Quarters (3)

Properties Associated with Storage. Storage facilities at McAlester included above-ground inert materials storage and earth-bermed explosives storage. Inert storage warehouses utilized 10,000 square feet per building. Explosives storage facilities included the four major types of explosives storage buildings: triple Corbetta beehives; triple barrel vaults; rectangular boxes; and single barrel-vault high-explosive magazines. The beehive magazine type of explosives storage structure were not built at any other Navy installation. Some storage structures were included in the production lines to store component parts of the assembly process. The depot included 1,953 magazines of various types and 152 inert storage warehouses.

Fuze and Detonator Magazines  
High Explosive Magazines  
Bulk Explosive Magazines  
Gun Ammunition Magazines  
Ready Service Magazines  
Inert Storehouses Warehouses

Properties Associated with Transportation. McAlester Naval Ammunition Depot included 140 miles of railroad trackage and 235 miles of surfaced and paved roads.

Shipping and Receiving Bldgs.  
Rail lines  
Roads

### Evaluation

1. *What is the nature of the property?*

Date established: 1942  
Function during WWII: Industrial construction: naval ammunition depot  
Category of property: district composed of buildings and structures

2. *What historic context does the property represent?*

Time period: 1940-1945  
Geographic Area: United States  
Theme: World War II permanent and semi-permanent construction on the home front

3. *What is the property type? Is the property type significant in illustrating the context?*

The installation represents a naval ammunition depot. Naval ammunition depots were important in supporting the rapidly expanding, "two-ocean" navy authorized in response to World War II. These facilities assembled Navy-specific ammunition and stored the vast quantities of ammunition needed by the Navy's ships and planes.

4. *How does the property represent an important aspect of the historic context: through important historical associations (Criterion A) or architectural and design features (Criterion C)?*

McAlester AAP is associated in a specific and important way with the production of World War II ammunition. It was established in 1942 to accommodate the expanding needs for naval ammunition production and storage during World War II (Criterion A). McAlester AAP represents the distinctive characteristics of World War II permanent construction (Criterion C).

5. *Compare the property with related properties? Does it retain the distinctive characteristics of its type? How does it compare historically with other properties important within the historic context?*

The Navy entered the war years with one existing inland depot, Hawthorne, which served as the prototype. During the protective mobilization phase, a second inland depot, Crane, was established. After the United States' formal entry into the war, the Navy opened two additional inland depots, McAlester and Hastings. McAlester and Hawthorne were transferred to the Army. Crane remains a Navy weapons facility, while Hastings was transferred to the National Guard. McAlester AAP retains the character-defining features of

a World War II ammunition production facility: industrial areas composed of ammunition production lines; administration area; acres of high explosive storage representing the range of storage structure types; inert storage; and, shipping areas.

6. *Is the property significant on a regional or national level within the historic context?*

McAlester represents an aspect of history of the United States as a whole, the World War II home front war effort to produce the "Arsenal of Democracy." It may also be significant on a local level for the effects it had on the local economy and work force during the war and any lasting changes that it produced on the area. Site-specific research is necessary to determine its local significance.

7. *Does the property retain sufficient integrity to convey the significance of the historic context that it represents?*

As of the 1993 site visit, McAlester AAP retained sufficient integrity to convey the significance of the World War II permanent construction historic context. It retained integrity of setting, location, workmanship, association, feeling, materials, and design.

8. *Is the property one of the kind of properties usually excluded from the National Register?*

No. The Criteria Considerations do not apply.

Sources of Information

MacDonald and Mack. "Historic Properties Report: McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, McAlester, Oklahoma." Prepared under contract CX-0001-2-0033 between Building Technology Incorporated, Silver Spring, Maryland, and the Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record, National Park Service, Washington, D.C. 1984.

Navy Department, Bureau of Yards and Docks. *Building the Navy's Bases in World War II*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1947.

Woodside, E.L., CAPT USN. "History of Naval Ammunition Depot." MS, McAlester AAP, McAlester, Oklahoma.

## **Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division, China Lake**

### Location and Current Status

Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division, China Lake is located in the Mojave Desert, 155 miles northeast of the City of Los Angeles. The base occupies close to one million acres of land anchored between the Red Rock Canyon Mountains and the Funeral Mountains. The area is characterized by its sparse desert flat land, dry lake beds, and surrounding high rugged mountains. Unlike many other military installations, the role of China Lake has remained essentially unchanged since the installation was established in 1943. China Lake continues to serve as the U.S. Navy's largest weapons research, development, testing, and evaluation (RDT&E) facility for conventional weapons.

### Summary History

China Lake was established as the Naval Ordnance Test Station (NOTS) in November 1943 by the Bureau of Ordnance. The facility was intended to provide for the research, development, and testing of new weapons and provide primary training in the use of newly developed weapons. By 1943, the U.S. military realized the military potential of rockets. The 3.5-inch rocket was gaining hold, and work was expanding to support immediate wartime needs. The desert terrain, excellent year-round flying weather, and vast expanse of uninhabited land in the Mojave Desert near Inyokern provided an ideal location for a much needed proving ground for these rockets.

Construction at NOTS during the installation's initial months consisted of Quonset huts and temporary wood-frame buildings. Due to the need to attract top military and civilian personnel, efforts were made during and after World War II to upgrade and replace existing facilities. Because of this, the facility is home to many late war permanent buildings. The area rapidly became a full-service community to provide for the basic needs of military and civilian personnel in this remote desert location. Temporary housing and barracks were replaced with more comfortable houses; about 1,500 houses for civilian and military personnel were built. Schools, shopping centers, and recreation facilities were built. Research and testing activities were equipped with modern, state-of-the-art facilities.

The planning and development of China Lake was the result of a cooperative effort among the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Bureau of Ordnance, and the California Institute of Technology. The main emphasis during China Lake's early years was on developing and delivering air-launched rockets to the fleet. During World War II, personnel from the California Institute of Technology provided technical support for China Lake's rocket program. The base was unique for its successful collaboration between Navy personnel and civilian scientists and engineers. The five-inch high-velocity aircraft rocket (HVAR) known as "Holy Moses" was developed here and deployed in combat use by August 1944.

Development and production of propellants and explosives was another role that China Lake played during World War II. To meet the wartime need for solid rocket propellant (ballistite), the China Lake Pilot Plant was established in 1944. The location chosen for this plant was removed from the main administrative and housing areas of the installation due to safety concerns. Work with high explosives required that the plant be built in an isolated location. Construction of the China Lake Pilot Plant began in May 1944, and was completed by the end of 1945. In 1944, the plant produced propellant grains for twelve-inch guns; these propellants were intended only for pilot production, but the Navy's need for the propellant was so pressing that China Lake produced large quantities for the fleet. The plant buildings were designed to be monolithic, poured-concrete structures. The complex consisted of various buildings used to produce propellant, and to assemble and test rocket motors. The plant was responsible for the production of rockets until this

job eventually was taken over by private industry. The propellant production process established at China Lake was later implemented by private industry.

The Salt Wells Pilot Plant, constructed in 1945, was responsible for producing the precise, non-nuclear, chemical explosive charge for atomic bombs on behalf of the Manhattan Project. China Lake personnel also conducted detonation testing, bomb-case design, air drops of bomb shapes from B-29 bombers, and inspected equipment to be used in the tactical delivery of the first atomic bombs. These efforts were key in the development of a system capable of delivering the atomic bomb.

Although China Lake is the Navy's largest facility in terms of geographic area, the actual inhabited area is rather small. The majority of China Lake's acreage is devoted to weapons testing. Records indicate that 585 buildings were built during World War II. This wartime construction consisted of three phases: the temporary construction phase during 1943; the boom-time phase in 1944 when emphasis shifted to permanent construction; and, the wind-down phase in 1945 as the end of World War II became imminent. Permanent construction buildings that were associated with the test ranges, research and development (R&D), and propellant production were constructed of poured concrete. Housing and support facilities generally were constructed in brick.

### Historic Context

More than in previous conflicts, World War II demonstrated the importance of technological superiority. This superiority, however, was attained only through the investment in facilities designed to accommodate both research and development, and weapons testing. Among the other Navy facilities conducting research, development, and testing during World War II were the Naval Proving Ground at Dahlgren, Virginia; the Naval Ordnance Laboratory in White Oak, Maryland; and the David W. Taylor Model Basin in Carderock, Maryland.

### Identification

As of the 1993 site visit to China Lake, a comprehensive cultural resource inventory of existing facilities documenting their function during World War II had not been undertaken. The original uses listed below for the pre-1946 buildings was taken from a 1986 Long-Range Military Construction Plan. It does not include a complete listing of all World War II facilities.

#### Properties Associated with Administration.

Bldg. 00001	Headquarters
Bldg. 00878	Fire Station No. 1
Bldg. 00879	Guard House and Brig
Bldg. 01018	Telephone Bldg.
Bldg. 11110	Propulsion Complex Fire Station
bldg. 20009	Fire Station No. 2

#### Properties Associated with Industrial Functions.

Bldg. 00979	Plumbing Shop
Bldg. 00980	Carpenter Shop
Bldg. 00991	Metal Shop
Bldg. 00993	Paint Shop
Bldg. 00996	Shop
Bldg. 11050	Propulsion Complex Machine Shop
Bldg. 11070	" " Maintenance Shop
Bldg. 11080	" " Carpenter's Shop

Bldg. 11150	" "	Battery Shop
Bldg. 30895		General Maintenance Shop
Bldg. 30929		Repair Shop

Properties Associated with Infrastructure.

Bldg. 11160		Propulsion Complex Boiler Plant
Bldg. 12040	" "	Boiler Plant
		Sewage Plant
		Water Plant

Properties Associated with Personnel Support.

Bldg. 00019		Commissary/Navy Exchange
Bldg. 00020		Theater
Bldg. 00021		Navy Enlisted Recreation Center
Bldg. 00022		Gymnasium
Bldg. 00033		Community Clubhouse
Bldg. 00052		Bakery
Bldg. 00500		Commissioned Officers' Mess
Bldg. 00874		Petty Officers' Mess
Bldg. 00880		Enlisted Mess
Bldg. 01021		Laundry
bldg. 11130		Propulsion Complex Cafeteria
Bldg. 11030		Propulsion Complex Change House

Properties Associated with Research, Development, and Testing. The Salt Wells Pilot Plant was built for the preparation and analysis of non-nuclear, explosive components for atom bombs. The China Lake Pilot Plant was designed to develop and test propellants for Navy weapons. Other properties were associated with the development and testing of rockets. An airfield was constructed to assist with RD&T activities.

Salt Wells Pilot Plant:

Salt Wells Area	
Bldg. 15530	300-ton Press Bldg.
Bldg. 15534	High Explosives Magazine
Bldg. 15540	Explosive Handling & Boxing
Bldg. 15544	Explosive Handling & Boxing
Bldg. 15550	Explosives Melt & Casting Bldg.
Bldg. 15560	Explosives Molding & Casting Bldg.
Bldg. 15564	Explosives Molding & Casting Bldg.
Bldg. 15630	Explosive Mold Repair Shop
Bldg. 15741	Cast Propellant Processing
Bldg. 15742	Cast Propellant Processing
Bldg. 15743	Cast Propellant Processing
Bldg. 15744	Cast Propellant Processing
Bldg. 15745	Explosive Machining
Bldg. 15754	High Explosives Magazine
Bldg. 15764	Transfer Dock
Bldg. 15790	Explosives Examination
Bldg. 15794	Loading Dock

China Lake Pilot Plant:

12" Line Area of Propulsion Lab Complex	
Bldg. 10010	Propulsion Fuel Lab
Bldg. 10030	Remote Control Test Bldg.

Bldg. 10031 Inert Storage Dock  
Bldg. 10032 Inert Storehouse  
Bldg. 10040 Propellant Processing  
Bldg. 10041 RDT&E Storage  
Bldg. 10050 Propellant Grain Machining  
Bldg. 10060 Explosives Machining & Fuze Laboratory  
Bldg. 10070 Pilot Ordnance Inspection Bldg.  
Bldg. 10090 Explosive Processing, Assembly & Testing  
Bldg. 10091 Components Storage Dock  
Bldg. 10100 Propellant Processing  
Bldg. 10120 Propellant Extrusion  
Bldg. 10170 Propellant Grain Boxing  
Bldg. 10200 Propellant Rework  
Bldg. 10410 Grain Propellant Rest House  
Bldg. 10420 Grain Propellant Rest House  
Bldg. 10430 Pyrotechnic Storage  
Bldg. 10440 Pyrotechnic Storage

Airbreathing Propulsion Lab Area

Bldg. 10140 Propellant Process Bldg.  
Bldg. 10150 Paint, Dry, Inspect Bldg.  
Bldg. 10160 Ordnance Assembly Bldg.  
Bldg. 10180 Rocket Motor Crating & Packing  
Bldg. 10181 Test Facility

18-inch Line Area of Propulsion Lab Complex

Bldg. 10510 18-inch Press Bldg.  
Bldg. 10520 Small Arms Test Facility  
Bldg. 10521 Loading and Storage Dock  
Bldg. 10522 Loading and Storage Dock  
Bldg. 10530 Propellant Extrusion  
Bldg. 10540 Pellet Propellant Processing  
Bldg. 10550 Annealing Bldg.  
Bldg. 10560 Propellant Rolling  
Bldg. 10570 Propellant Machining  
Bldg. 10580 Propellant Machining  
Bldg. 10600 Supersonic Inspection of Ballistic Grains  
Bldg. 10601 Loading Dock  
Bldg. 10610 Propellant Curing  
Bldg. 10640 Ordnance Assembly Bldg.  
Bldg. 10810 High Explosives Magazine  
Bldg. 10820 High Explosives Magazine  
Bldg. 10830 High Explosives Magazine  
Bldg. 10840 High Explosives Magazine  
Bldg. 12010 Grain Propellant Storage

Thermal Research Area of Propulsion Lab Complex

Bldg. 10630 Explosives Laboratory  
Bldg. 10633 Data Reduction and Office Bldg.

Missile Assembly Area of Propulsion Lab Complex

Bldg. 10690 Assembly Bldg.

Environmental Test Area of Propulsion Lab Complex

Bldg. 12020 Grain Propellant Storage  
Bldg. 12140 Static Firing Testing



Bldg. 12170 Ordnance Vibration Testing  
Bldg. 12510 Small Ordnance Static Firing Testing

3-inch Line Area of Propulsion Lab Complex  
Bldg. 13110 Test Magazine  
Bldg. 13460 Experimental Propellant Processing  
Bldg. 13470 Experimental Ordnance Lab

Airfield

Bldg. 20030 Aviation Armament Shop  
Bldg. 20031 Ordnance Assembly  
Bldg. 20044 Ordnance Storage

Electronic Warfare Dept.

Bldg. 31405 Radar Laboratory  
Bldg. 31415 Radar Laboratory

Misc. Areas

Bldg. 00037 Technical Library  
Bldg. 31501 Explosives Testing  
Bldg. 31502 Explosives Lab  
Bldg. 31503 Materials Lab  
Bldg. 31504 Explosives Lab  
Bldg. 31511 Technical Lab

Launching Devices  
Targets  
Observation Towers

Properties Associated with Residential Use. The first residential buildings at China Lake were temporary, wooden structures. In an effort to attract a more stable work force for construction and the scientists necessary for the RD&T activities of the station, the Navy switched to permanent housing of higher quality.

Marine Barracks

Bldgs. 00451 - 00471 Navy Barracks  
Bldg. 00060 Construction Worker Housing  
Bldg. 00496 Bachelor Officer Quarters  
Bldg. 00499 Bachelor Officer Quarters  
Bldg. 00931 Civilian Engineer Housing

Properties Associated with Storage.

Bldg. 00023 Commissary Warehouse  
Bldg. 01022 Cold Storage Warehouse  
Bldg. 01023 Warehouse  
Bldg. 01024 Warehouse  
Bldg. 01025 Warehouse  
Bldg. 01027 Warehouse  
Bldg. 01028 Warehouse  
Bldg. 01029 Warehouse  
Bldg. 01030 Warehouse  
Bldg. 01031 Warehouse  
Bldg. 01032 Warehouse  
Bldg. 01033 Warehouse  
Bldg. 01040 Warehouse

Bldg. 01041	Warehouse
Bldg. 01042	Warehouse
Bldg. 01068	RDT&E Warehouse
Bldg. 01071	Warehouse
Bldg. 01073	Warehouse
Bldg. 12050	Warehouse
Bldg. 31001	Explosives Magazine
Bldg. 31002	Explosives Magazine
Bldg. 31011	Explosives Magazine
Bldg. 31012	Explosives Magazine
Bldg. 31029	Explosives Magazine
Bldg. 31044	Warehouse

Properties Associated with Transportation.

Bldg. 01055	Railroad Shop
Bldg. 11040	Vehicle Repair
Bldg. 20011	Airfield Terminal
Railroads	
Roads	

Evaluation

1. *What is the nature of the property?*

Date established: 1943  
 Function during WWII: Command construction: research, development, and testing installation  
 Category of property: district composed of buildings and structures

2. *What historic context does the property represent?*

Time period: 1940-1945  
 Geographic Area: United States  
 Theme: World War II permanent and semi-permanent construction on the home front

3. *What is the property type? Is the property type significant in illustrating the context?*

China Lake represents weapons research, development, and testing activities during World War II. Technological developments were critical to the war effort and RD&T facilities developed and tested many of the weapons and equipment that aided in the Allied victory. These types of facilities are significant in illustrating World War II permanent construction.

4. *How does the property represent an important aspect of the historic context: through important historical associations (Criterion A) or architectural and design features (Criterion C)?*

China Lake is associated in a specific and important way with World War II weapons research, development, and testing (Criterion A). At China Lake, the Navy conducted early tests on newly developing rocket technology and developed the "Holy Moses," a high-velocity aircraft rocket, in time to be deployed in 1944. Non-nuclear, explosive charges for the atom bomb were developed here, and research on tactical delivery of atomic bombs was conducted as part of the Manhattan project.

More research is needed to determine if the design and construction of the RD&T facilities at China Lake represent distinctive characteristics of engineering specifically related to their RD&T mission (Criterion C). In some cases, the RD&T activities were carried out in ordinary, non-specialized buildings. In other cases, the facilities were designed with specific features essential to the RD&T activities. More research on the processes housed in the different structures during World War II, the original design of the structures, and how that design related to the RD&T mission is needed to determine if the buildings may be significant under Criterion C.

*5. Compare the property with related properties? Does it retain the distinctive characteristics of its type? How does it compare historically with other properties important within the historic context?*

RD&T facilities are, by their nature, specialized facilities that are not directly similar to other installations. The distinctive features of a RD&T installation are the RD&T facilities designed for that installation's mission. In the case of China Lake, the RD&T facilities are the pilot plants for explosives and propellant development, the salt wells area for the development of the non-nuclear charge for the atom bomb, and the rocket development facilities. China Lake retains these RD&T facilities from the World War II era and the supporting structures. It ranks among the most historically significant of the U.S. World War II RD&T facilities.

*6. Is the property significant on a regional or national level within the historic context?*

China Lake represents an aspect of history of the United States as a whole, the World War II home front effort to develop the technology necessary to win the war through the research, development, and testing of new weapons. It also may be significant on the local level for the rapid transformation of an isolated desert community into a large, thriving town based on high-tech industry. Site-specific research is necessary to determine its local significance.

*7. Does the property retain sufficient integrity to convey the significance of the historic context that it represents?*

Due to the strength in design and construction of many of the buildings built during the last year of World War II, many buildings scheduled for demolition have been retained because of excessively high demolition cost. Many of the buildings built as temporary (mostly Butler Buildings) have been modified to maintain their usefulness. Due to the dry desert environment, the buildings dating from the World War II period, including those that are now abandoned, are very well preserved. Further research is necessary to determine if the buildings and structures retain the distinctive engineering features directly associated with the development of specific weapons programs, such as the "Holy Moses" program or the atom bomb explosive charge.

*8. Is the property one of the kind of properties usually excluded from the National Register?*

The Criteria Consideration regarding the fifty-year minimum age does not apply to the facilities constructed during World War II. However, many of these buildings were used in later years for the development of successive generations of rocket and missile technology. The installation's period of significance may extend well beyond the World War II era into the Cold War period. Further research is necessary to determine if the properties at China Lake that are less than fifty years old possess the required exceptional significance in order to be considered eligible for the National Register.

#### Sources of Information

Christman, Albert B. *Sailors, Scientists, and Rockets: Origins of the Navy Rocket Program and of the Naval Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Gerrard-Gough, J. D., and Albert B. Christman. *The Grand Experiment at Inyokern: Narrative of the Naval Ordnance Test Station During the Second World War and the Immediate Postwar Years*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1978.

Naval Weapons Center. "RDT&E Strategic (Long-Range) Military Construction (MILCON) Plan; Fiscal Year 1988 - 2007; Part 2, Facility Evaluations." March 1986. Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division, China Lake.

Ordnance Systems Department, Naval Weapons Center. "Origins of the China Lake Propulsion Laboratories." China Lake, California: Ordnance Systems Department.

Poindexter, Debra. *China Lake Commemorative 50 Years: 1943-1993*, China Lake, California: Naval Air Weapons Station, 1993.

## **Naval Station Anacostia**

### Location and Current Status

Naval Station Anacostia is a 292-acre facility located near the confluence of the Anacostia and Potomac Rivers in Washington, D.C. The station is an echelon II shore activity under the immediate command of Naval District Washington.

In 1995, an architectural inventory and evaluation was undertaken for 34 pre-1950 buildings located at the installation. The architectural investigations included archival research, intensive field survey, and report preparation. The report found that none of the resources possessed the qualities of significance for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The Historic Preservation Division, acting as the D.C. Historic Preservation Office, concurred with the evaluation assessments.

### Summary History

Naval Station Anacostia was established in 1918 as a World War I air station on land owned by the Army. The new naval station's earliest mission was to serve as a base for short test flights and to provide a suitable place for housing and for minor repairs of seaplanes near Washington, D.C. The Army also built a flying field, called Bolling Field, on the property east of the navy's field; this field was utilized as a pilot training site. NAS Anacostia was retained after the end of World War I and functioned as an experimental aircraft testing facility for the Navy during the inter-war period; it was involved primarily in the development of aviation and technology. In 1935, the entire property was transferred to Navy control and the Army occupied a new field located south of the naval station.

During World War II, the station was expanded to accommodate training for new recruits. During the war, nearly 2,000 aviation cadets received primary flight training at the station. Personnel assigned to the station reached nearly 1,000, including over 200 WAVES (Woman Accepted for Volunteer Emergency Service). In addition to training, the station hosted a Captured Enemy Equipment Unit to store, handle, and guard captured enemy equipment. In 1943, the Technical Air Intelligence Center (TAIC) opened an office at the station to study captured Japanese Air Force equipment. After 1943, the station's mission was: to operate and transport administrative aircraft for the Navy Department; to provide flight facilities and aircraft for naval aviators on active duty in the D.C. area; to provide facilities and logistical support for the Naval Air Reserve Training Unit; and, to provide logistic support for the Naval Photographic Center.

After World War II, the naval station continued to provide support. Due to air traffic congestion around Washington, D.C., flight operations at the station were discontinued in 1961 and moved to Andrews Air Force Base. Naval Station Anacostia continues to maintain and operate facilities to support naval aviators on active duty in the D.C. area and to support operations of those activities assigned by Chief of Naval Operations.

### Historic Context

Naval Station Anacostia was established during the early years of naval aviation. The Navy purchased its first aircraft in 1911 and established its first station at the old Pensacola Navy Yard in 1914. The Navy established ten additional air stations in 1917 and seven in 1918, including Naval Station Anacostia, in response to the U.S. entry into World War I.

During the 1920s and 1930s, the Navy operated relatively few aviation stations. In its combat plans, aircraft remained secondary to battleships. However, during the late 1930s, the Navy began to improve its aviation facilities as part of its general improvement of all shore

installations. In 1939, the Navy owned 1,000 planes and operated eleven air stations and eight reserve bases.

During the mobilization period beginning in 1940, construction of naval aviation facilities acquired a new urgency. After the successful Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in December 1941, the aircraft carrier emerged as an important war machine, placing naval aviation in the forefront of the war in the Pacific. Early in 1942, the authorized strength for naval aviation was increased to 27,500 planes. That meant that the Navy required a total of 67,000 planes to keep the 27,500 aircraft flying through replacing damaged or destroyed aircraft and providing parts for aircraft maintenance. By the end of World War II, the Navy operated nearly 80 stations and numerous satellite fields.

### Identification

The 1995 architectural survey of Naval Station Anacostia identified ten buildings remaining from World War II. These ten buildings represent World War II expansion of an already existing air station. The station has 22 extant buildings dating from the inter-war period (1920-1939). The installation has two concentrations of buildings: the original Navy section of the base located near the Anacostia River and the original Army section of the base located on the east side of the installation. The two areas originally were separated by the runways and tarmacs. The runways have been covered over and new construction occupies the site.

The resources located at Naval Station Anacostia were evaluated both individually and as an historic district. Comparisons with historic maps and photographs revealed that the extant 34 resources were once part of larger well defined air station that included runways, control towers, tarmacs, and numerous support structures. The removal of these elements and virtually all site features associated with flight activities has compromised the overall integrity of the entire installation as a district to represent a military air station. The majority of individual buildings have undergone extensive modifications that have altered their individual integrity of design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. These changes include incompatible additions, changes to wall and roof cladding, and alterations to fenestration patterns. The remaining buildings were evaluated as not possessing individual significance because they were not directly associated with the aviation testing and research mission of the installation.

Properties Associated with Administration. Naval Station Anacostia has three World War II buildings associated with administration. Building 150 currently is classified as semi-permanent construction. Research revealed that this building originally was constructed as a wood-frame temporary building that was sheathed in vinyl siding and reclassified as a semi-permanent building. This class of buildings was the subject of mitigation required by a 1986 Programmatic Agreement among the Department of Defense, the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. The mitigation documentation was completed in 1993 and DoD is permitted to demolish World War II temporary buildings.

The operations building (Building 92) is located on the west side of the base. It is a two-story stuccoed building in the Art Moderne style. Building 88 is a small one-story sentry house.

Bldg. 88	Sentry House
Bldg. 92	Operations Building
Bldg. 150	Administration Building (Temporary)

Properties Associated with Industrial Functions. The supply building represents industrial functions at Naval Station Anacostia. This three-story brick building was completed in 1943.

Bldg. 94                      Supply Building

Properties Associated with Infrastructure. Infrastructure constructed at Naval Station Anacostia during World War II included a heating plant, a storm pumping station, and a switch station. The heating plant was constructed of brick, while the two small buildings were constructed of poured concrete. All three buildings are utilitarian, functional construction with no individual architectural distinction.

Bldg. 110                      Pumping Station  
Bldg. 162                      Switching Station  
Bldg. 169                      Heating Plant

Properties Associated with Research. The photo science laboratory represents a research facility at the installation. This three-story brick building was completed in 1943.

Bldg. 168                      Photo Science Laboratory

Properties Associated with Residential Use. One Bachelor Officers Quarters was completed in 1942 at the installation. This is a two-story, brick building that exhibits Art Moderne ornamentation.

Bldg. 93                      Bachelor Officers Quarters

Properties Associated with Transportation. The engineering hangar represents transportation. This hangar was constructed in 1942 to provide additional space for airplanes and office space for the engineering department. The building is metal-frame construction supporting corrugated metal walls.

Bldg. 91                      Engineering Hangar

## Evaluation

### *1. What is the nature of the property?*

Date established:            1918  
Function during WWII:    Command construction: naval air station  
Category of property:    individual resources

### *2. What historic context does the property represent?*

Time period:                1940-1945  
Geographic Area:        United States  
Theme:                      World War II permanent and semi-permanent construction on the home front

### *3. What is the property type? Is the property type significant in illustrating the context?*

The installation was a naval air station during World War II. It was founded in 1918 and was one of the few naval air stations retained after the war. During World War II, it was one of nearly 80 aviation stations and numerous satellite fields operated by the Navy. Its role during World War II does not suggest an important association with the prosecution of the

war; the station supported aviation activities in the Washington, D.C., area and in the larger overall system of naval aviation stations.

*4. How does the property represent an important aspect of the historic context: through important historical associations (Criterion A) or architectural and design features (Criterion C)?*

The resources located at Naval Station Anacostia do not represent an important aspect of World War II permanent construction (Criterion C). The majority of the individual resources have undergone extensive modifications that have altered their integrity of design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. The remaining resources do not possess a strong association with the World War II mission of the installation (Criterion A).

*5. Compare the property with related properties? Does it retain the distinctive characteristics of its type? How does it compare historically with other properties important within the historic context?*

The installation as a whole no longer possesses integrity to represent a military air station from World War II under Criteria A or C. Comparisons with historic maps and photographs revealed that the World War II naval air station included runways, control towers, tarmacs, and numerous support structures. The removal of these elements and virtually all site features associated with flight activities has compromised the overall integrity of the entire installation.

*6. Is the property significant on a regional or national level within the historic context?*

Naval Station Anacostia was a relatively small installation within Washington, D.C., that supported naval aviators stationed in the area and activities as directed Chief Naval Operations. As a military installation, it has had an impact on the local level; however, this impact has not been significant. The permanent World War II buildings, as remnants of wartime expansion, do not possess significance on either the local or national level.

*7. Does the property retain sufficient integrity to convey the significance of the historic context that it represents?*

As of work completed in 1995, the installation as a whole and the individual permanent World War II buildings no longer retain sufficient integrity to convey their association as a World War II military air station.

*8. Is the property one of the kind of properties usually excluded from the National Register?*

No. The Criteria Considerations do not apply.

#### Sources of Information

R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc. "Architectural Inventory and Evaluation of Naval Station Anacostia, Washington, D.C." MS, prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore, Maryland, 1995.



## **Naval Surface Warfare Center Crane Division**

### Location and Current Status

The Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane Division (NSWC Crane) is located on 62,000 acres near Burns City, in Martin County, in south central Indiana, approximately 25 miles southeast of Bloomington. Since it was first established, Crane has operated as an ammunition depot. Following World War II, the Navy expanded Crane's capabilities by developing expertise in engineering and electronics at the installation. A quality evaluation laboratory was established at Crane in 1947 to test ordnance materials before their delivery to the fleet. The focus of activity at Crane is now on technology, rather than munitions. Presently, the installation serves all the armed services, but its main activities are ordnance production for the Army and ordnance storage and limited ordnance production for the Navy. Crane Army Ammunition Activity, part of the U.S. Army Armament Munitions and Chemical Command (AMCCOM) of the Army Materiel Command (AMC), is a tenant on NSWC Crane and uses the majority of the buildings.

### Summary History

The facility began in 1940 as the Naval Ammunition Depot Crane, one of the Navy's four great inland ammunition depots constructed during World War II. The decision to establish the depot in Crane was based on the need for an inland depot as a counterpart to Hawthorne, Nevada, to support the Navy's east coast operations. The inland depots were designed with the capacity to store and assemble larger amounts and greater varieties of ammunition than the smaller coastal depots. The location of ammunition depots in land was intended to minimize the risk of enemy air attack.

Funds for the new depot at Crane were appropriated in June 1940, and construction began that November. The general contractor was the Russell B. Moore Construction Company of Indianapolis, under the direction of the Bureau of Yards and Docks. The firm looked at the design and layout of Hawthorne, and relied on Bureau of Yards and Docks standardized plans, some of which were adapted to the specifics of the site. Initial plans for the facility called for 23 earth-covered magazines, personnel facilities, seven miles of railroads, a case-ammunition filling house, a bag-charging filling house, an Explosives D filling house, and administration and shop buildings. A series of expansions throughout the war resulted in a much larger facility than originally conceived. Construction at Crane did not end until 1944. By the end of the war, Crane included 1,054 earth-covered magazines.

Crane assembled a variety of munitions and flares: assorted types of 5-, 6-, 8-, 12-, 14-, and 16-inch shells; bag charges for navy guns of various calibers; 100-pound bombs; Mark 7 and five other types of torpedoes; and, various types of rockets. Between August and October 1944, an average of 50,000 tons of shells, flares, and other munitions were shipped out monthly.

The construction of Naval Ammunition Depot Crane had a profound effect on the local economy. At the peak of construction, the end of 1942, 8,000 construction workers worked on the site. Once the depot began full-scale production, the number of workers was even greater. By 1945, the depot employed about 10,350 civilians and 2,000 military personnel. Workers traveled from a wide radius to reach the depot. Adequate transportation and housing were in short supply. The Federal Public Housing Authority built housing for civilian workers outside the depot that became the town of Crane.

## Historic Context

To prevent the competition between the services for explosives and their raw materials that had plagued the U.S. military during World War I, the Army and Navy shared responsibility for ammunition production. The Army was responsible for explosives production and for assembly of jointly-used types and calibers of ammunition. The Navy was responsible for loading and assembling its own finished artillery rounds.

The Navy performed both ammunition production and storage activities at its naval depots. Unlike the Army, the Navy constructed and operated its own depots and did not rely on private contractors. Prior to World War II, the Navy's ammunition depots generally had been situated in coastal locations. The one exception was the inland depot established at Hawthorne, Nevada, in 1930 to serve as the primary ammunition supply depot for west coast Navy operations.

The construction of Hawthorne was in direct response to the disastrous 1926 Lake Denmark Naval Ammunition Depot explosion, which was caused by the dangerous overloading of closely-spaced, above-ground ammunition magazines. The Army and Navy adopted strict standards specifying new construction standards for ammunition storage, limiting the quantity of explosives stored within each structure, and specifying minimum distances between storage structures. Hawthorne, opened in 1930, was the first facility built according to the new standards, and set the pattern for later, vast inland depots characterized by rows of widely-spaced, arched, reinforced-concrete, high explosives magazines or "igloos." Hawthorne also included a mine-filling plant, in keeping with the Navy practice to assemble its specialized ammunition at naval ammunition depots.

The U.S. authorization of a "two-ocean" navy in 1940 and the eventual outbreak of declared war strained the capacity of the Navy's existing depots. The Navy expanded Hawthorne and established Crane Ammunition Depot (June 1940) to serve the eastern United States. Despite these expansions, the Navy needed facilities to assemble and store munitions. In June 1942, the Navy established two additional depots at McAlester, Oklahoma, and Hastings, Nebraska, to fulfill the additional wartime demands.

## Identification

A comprehensive inventory, listing building numbers and their historic functions, was not available for NSWC Crane at the time of the site visit. Lists of building types were taken from the installation histories listed below in the "Sources of Information." Building numbers, when known, are provided.

Like other large ordnance facilities, the primary activities at Crane were organized into discrete functional areas: administration; assembly lines; storage; shipping and receiving; and residential. The primary construction material at Crane is reinforced concrete. The early administration, residential, and storage buildings display a unifying design element of horizontal incisions in the concrete. In some cases, the incisions are located only around doorways or windows and at corners, suggesting simplified quoins; in other instances, the incisions ring the buildings, creating horizontal bands of concrete. Steel construction, wood-framed roofs, and masonry were also used.

### Properties Associated with Administration.

Bldg. 1 Administration Building  
Bldg. 11 Fire Station

Properties Associated with Education.

Bldg. 115 Munitions Handling Training

Properties Associated with Health Care.

Bldg. 12 Dispensary

Properties Associated with Industrial Functions. The industrial area buildings originally were to be constructed of limestone, but shortages of time and funds meant that they were built of concrete instead.

Case-ammunition Filling House  
Bag-charge Filling House  
Explosives D Filling House  
Illuminating and Flare Loading Plant  
Mine and Bomb Filling Plant  
20mm Cartridge Filling Plant  
40mm Cartridge Filling Plant  
Bldg. 5 Maintenance Shop  
Bldg. 56 Machine Shop and Carpenter Shop

Properties Associated with Infrastructure. Crane was able to purchase electricity from existing nearby electricity sources and did not need to build its own power plants as did other, more isolated facilities.

Bldg. 4 Water Treatment Plant  
Sewage Disposal Plant  
Pump Houses

Properties Associated with Personnel Support.

Bldg. 14 Recreation Building  
Bldg. 8 Laundry  
Bldg. 9 Gas Service Station  
Bldg. 77 Gymnasium  
Commissary

Properties Associated with Research, Development, and Testing

Bldg. 6 Surveillance Test House

Properties Associated with Residential Use. The permanent barracks were constructed of brick. The 23 stone and wood officers' single-family detached houses were designed by Russell B. Moore Construction Company to be compatible with a 1938 WPA-constructed park ranger residence already on the site.

Bldg. 13 Barracks  
Marine barracks  
WAVE barracks  
Navy barracks  
Married Officer Housing

Properties Associated with Storage. Storage buildings for high explosives were built according to the military safety standards, with strict minimum distance requirements and maximum capacity limits. The number of the different types of explosive storage structures are listed below. Building 40 covered nearly five acres and was equipped with humidity and temperature control to

prevent corrosion of precision instruments and surfaces. At the time of its construction, it was said to be largest, poured-concrete building in the world.

Torpedo Storehouse (5)  
Bldg. 40 Torpedo Storehouse  
Bldg. 41 Torpedo Storehouse  
Bldgs. 34, 36, 37, 38 Torpedo Storehouses  
Bldg. 2 General Storehouse  
Bldg. 3 Paint and Oil Storehouse  
High Explosives Magazines (arch-type) (1,054)  
Inflammable Materials Magazines (510)  
Inert Storehouses (167)

Properties Associated with Transportation. A large internal network of roads and rail lines was constructed to enable transportation of material and personnel within the installation. By 1946, 195 miles of rail lines and 332 miles of roads were constructed. Component parts arrived at two receiving points, then were sent to the appropriate part of the depot via the internal train lines.

Bldg. 7 Locomotive and Crane Shed  
Bldg. 10 Garage  
Rail Lines  
Roads

### Evaluation

1. *What is the nature of the property?*

Date established: 1940  
Function during WWII: Industrial construction: naval ammunition depot  
Category of property: district composed of buildings and structures

2. *What historic context does the property represent?*

Time period: 1940-1945  
Geographic Area: United States  
Theme: World War II permanent and semi-permanent construction on the home front

3. *What is the property type? Is the property type significant in illustrating the context?*

The installation represents a naval ammunition depot. Naval ammunition depots were important in supporting the rapidly expanding, "two-ocean" navy authorized in response to World War II. These facilities assembled Navy-specific ammunition and stored the vast quantities of ammunition needed by the Navy's ships and planes.

4. *How does the property represent an important aspect of the historic context: through important historical associations (Criterion A) or architectural and design features (Criterion C)?*

NSWC Crane is associated in a specific and important way with the production of World War II ammunition. It was the Navy's second, large inland dept, established in 1940 as the east coast counterpart to Hawthorne to accommodate the expanding needs for naval ammunition production and storage during World War II (Criterion A). NSWC Crane represents the distinctive characteristics of World War II permanent construction (Criterion C).

5. Compare the property with related properties? Does it retain the distinctive characteristics of its type? How does it compare historically with other properties important within the historic context?

The Navy entered the war years with one existing inland depot, Hawthorne, which served as the prototype. During the protective mobilization phase, an additional inland depot, Crane, was established. After the United States' formal entry into the war, the Navy opened two additional inland depots, McAlester and Hastings. McAlester and Hawthorne were transferred to the Army. Crane remains a Navy weapons facility, while Hastings was transferred to the National Guard. NSWC Crane retains the character-defining features of a World War II ammunition production facility: industrial areas composed of ammunition production lines; administration area; residential area; acres of high explosive storage representing a range of storage structure types; inert storage; and, shipping areas.

6. Is the property significant on a regional or national level within the historic context?

NSWC Crane represents an aspect of history of the United States as a whole, the World War II home front war effort to produce the "Arsenal of Democracy." It may also be significant on a local level for the effects it had on the local economy and work force during the war and any lasting changes that it produced on the area. Site-specific research is necessary to determine its local significance.

7. Does the property retain sufficient integrity to convey the significance of the historic context that it represents?

As of the 1993 site visit, NSWC Crane retained sufficient integrity to convey the significance of the World War II permanent construction historic context. Because of the Navy's continued use of the property, and conversion to high-tech industries, some of the buildings have been modified. However, the World War II areas of the installation retain integrity of setting, location, workmanship, association, feeling, materials, and design.

8. Is the property one of the kind of properties usually excluded from the National Register?

No. The Criteria Considerations do not apply.

#### Sources of Information

Northern Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command. *Cultural Resources Survey, Crane Division, Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane, Indiana*. Northern Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command, June 1992.

Reid, Robert L. and Thomas E. Rodgers. *A Good Neighbor: The First Fifty Years at Crane, 1941-1991*. Bloomington, Indiana: Western Sun Printing Company, Inc., 1991.

United States Navy Department, Bureau of Yards and Docks. *Building the Navy's Bases in World War II*, Volume 1. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1947.

## **Ravenna AAP**

### Location and Current Status

The Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant (Ravenna AAP) is located approximately 10 miles east of Ravenna on a 21,427-acre site in Portage and Trumbull Counties, Ohio. The facility was established in 1940 for loading, assembling, and packing a variety of types of conventional ammunition. Ravenna AAP is part of the Army Munitions Command (AMCCOM), a subordinate command within the Army Materiel Command. Due to changes in the operation of AMCCOM, the Army is ceasing maintenance on certain installations, declaring the buildings excess, and eventually disposing of the buildings, while still retaining the underlying lands. Ravenna AAP is included within this program and is part of a 1993 Programmatic Agreement among AMCCOM, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and Multiple State Historic Preservation Offices.

### Summary History

Ravenna AAP originally was constructed as two separate installations: the Ravenna Ordnance Plant, which was designed for the production of ammunition, and the Portage Ordnance Depot, which was built for the storage of ammunition. In 1943, these two installations were combined under one administration.

In 1940, the Atlas Powder Company of Wilmington, Delaware was awarded the contract to plan and operate the Ravenna Ordnance Plant. The architect for the facility was Wilbur Watson and Associates; the general contractor, the Hunkin-Conkey Construction Company. Hunkin-Conkey also served as the contractor for the Portage Ordnance Depot, with the Jennings-Lawrence Company of Columbus, Ohio, serving as the architect.

Construction at both the Ravenna Ordnance Plant and the Portage Ordnance Depot started in 1940. Together, the two facilities contained an administration area, explosive storage areas, and manufacturing areas. The manufacturing facilities consisted of: shell-loading lines; four lines for loading fuzes and boosters; and, Ammonium Nitrate plants. The production lines, like the magazines, were separated from one another by distances sufficient to prevent the possibility of one explosion causing sympathetic explosions at adjacent lines. These required distances were established by the Ordnance Department.

An administration area built in conjunction with the production and storage facilities at Ravenna consisted of an administration building, staff houses, hospital, maintenance building, fire station, laundry, and other personnel support buildings.

Following the war, the Atlas Powder Company turned the Ravenna plant over to the Ordnance Department. In November 1945, the name of the installation was changed to Ravenna Arsenal and it was placed on standby status. Since World War II, Ravenna AAP has continued to function as a storage facility, and also has carried out demilitarization activities. With the exception of brief re-activation periods during the Korean and Vietnam conflicts, the production facilities at Ravenna AAP have been on stand-by status since World War II. Lines 2, 3, 7, 10, and 11 were operated during the Vietnam conflict, primarily for producing 40mm grenades. During these two reactivation periods, the assembly line buildings were renovated.

## Historic Context

The rapid construction of facilities for ammunition assembly was one of the impressive feats of American industry during World War II. Prior to the industrial mobilization authorized in the summer of 1940, the United States had no facilities for the mass loading and assembly of large quantities of heavy ammunition. Frankford and Picatinny Arsenals were the only sources of new military artillery ammunition, and they did not have the required capacity for a global war effort. Private munitions manufacturers were not equipped to produce specialized military ammunition, and were reluctant to construct the specialized factories due to the uncertain return on their investment. The U.S. government developed a plan that allowed government-owned, contractor-operated (GOCO) plants to produce the needed munitions. More than 60 GOCOs of various types were built.

During the war, the U.S. Army Ordnance Department developed 15 large ammunition assembly plants. At these plants, workers turned explosives and metal components into the finished artillery ammunition rounds needed to arm and support Allied troops. Like ordnance works that produced explosives, ordnance plants typically were located on isolated sites in the interior of the country that had access to water and transportation. They caused enormous shifts in population and shortages of housing in the rural areas where they were located.

Ordnance plants produced a tremendous variety of ammunition. Most produced both artillery and aerial bombs. Artillery ammunition included rounds for howitzers, tank guns, anti-tank guns, and anti-aircraft guns. Each type of gun required various calibers of different types (high explosive, armor piercing, tracer, incendiary, and illumination rounds). During World War II, the Ordnance Department produced 20 sizes of 270 different types of artillery and 70 different types of bombs. The demand for each type of ammunition changed unpredictably, depending on the needs of the battlefield.

Ravenna AAP exemplifies one of the Army's large ammunition manufacturing facilities established by the War Department at the start of the war. Many of these manufacturing facilities are now inactive. The large ammunition plants that remain in the DoD inventory are: Cornhusker AAP, Nebraska; Joliet AAP, Illinois (formerly Elwood Ordnance Plant); Iowa AAP, Iowa; Kansas AAP, Kansas; Lone Star Ordnance Plant, Texas; and, Milan AAP, Tennessee. What was originally the Portage Ordnance Depot represents a typical ammunition storage facility. While some Army depots were intended to store ammunition prior to its delivery to the fleet, other depots were located near ordnance plants to hold the ammunition immediately after its production. Ravenna's Portage Ordnance Depot fell into the latter category of depots. Other similar depot facilities included: Milan Ordnance Depot, Tennessee; Red River Ordnance Depot, Texas; Fort Wingate Ordnance Depot, New Mexico; and, Tooele Ordnance Depot, Utah.

## Identification

Properties Associated with Administration. The administration area included both permanent, masonry buildings and some wooden frame buildings. The general contractor for the plant construction called the buildings "tastefully designed" in "an Early American type of architecture."

Administration Bldg.  
Employment Bldg.  
Outside Labor Bldg.

Properties Associated with Health Care. The frame hospital includes 12,900 square feet.  
Hospital

Properties Associated with Industrial Functions. The three loading lines are called "melt loading lines" because explosives were melted then poured into shell casings. The load lines have similar construction: the lines are approximately 5,000 feet long, with buildings interconnected by ramps and monorail systems; the buildings range in size from 25 by 36 feet to 100 by 400 feet, and from one to three stories; and, the buildings are constructed with reinforced-concrete foundations, steel frames, reinforced- concrete, brick, or tile walls, and corrugated asbestos tile roofs. Fences surround each load line area. The typical components of one of the load lines is listed below.

Load Line No. 1 (compound rounds of ammunition)

- Inert Storage Bldg.
- Ammonium Nitrate Service Bldg.
- TNT Service Bldg.
- Fuze Service Bldg.
- Primer Service Bldg.
- Shell-receiving Bldg.
- Receiving and Painting Bldg.
- Melt-and-Pour or Melt-load Bldg.
- Drilling and Assembly Plant
- Packing and Shipping Bldg.

Load Line No. 2 (fixed rounds and bombs)

Load Line No. 3 (fixed rounds and bombs)

The Fuze and Booster area contains seven lines: two fuze lines; two booster lines; a detonator line; an artillery primer line; and, a percussion element line. Buildings in these lines range from 8 by 8 feet to 80 by 400 feet; all are one-story structures. The seven lines include 195 buildings. The buildings are constructed of reinforced-concrete foundations, steel frames clad in brick, tile or reinforced concrete, and corrugated asbestos roofs and connected by covered ramps. Below is listed the buildings of the Booster Line as an example of the sequence of buildings in one of these lines:

Booster Line

- Tetryl Magazine
- Tetryl Screening and Blend Bldg.
- Blended Tetryl Rest House
- Tetryl Pelleting Bldg.
- Tetryl Pelleting Bldg.
- Tetryl Cupping Bldg.
- Cupping Rest House
- Detonator Magazine
- Booster Assembling and Shipping Bldg.

Another manufacturing area is the Ammonium Nitrate Plant. These buildings also are constructed with reinforced-concrete foundations, steel frames, and brick or tile cladding.

- Evaporation House
- Crystallization House ("Kettle house")
- Neutral Liquor Storage
- Boiler House
- Water Works

The Administration Area includes some permanent-construction shop buildings.

- Maintenance Bldg.

Properties Associated with Infrastructure.

- Water Treatment Plants
- Powerhouse



Properties Associated with Personnel Support. Each production line has personnel support facilities incorporated within the line, which enabled workers to "punch-in" and clean up near their work place. A steel-frame, brick laundry is located in the Administration Area for the laundering of munitions workers uniforms. A frame cafeteria also is located in the Administration Area.

Change Houses  
Time Clock Alleys  
Laundry  
Cafeteria

Properties Associated with Residential Use. The residences were constructed of wooden frame with slate roofs.

Single-family detached houses

Properties Associated with Storage. Various type of explosive storage structures were constructed at Ravenna Ordnance Plant. The depot area (Portage Ordnance Depot) consisted of a small administration area, and 762 "igloo" type magazines.

Explosive Igloos  
Bomb Igloos  
Shell Igloos  
Smokeless Powder Magazines  
Fuze and Booster Magazines  
Explosive Magazines  
Inert Storage Warehouses

Properties Associated with Transportation.

Garage and Auto Repair Shop  
Rail Lines  
Roads

## Evaluation

### 1. *What is the nature of the property?*

Date established: 1940  
Function during WWII: Industrial construction: ordnance plant/load and assemble large ammunition; ordnance depot  
Category of property: district composed of buildings and structures

### 2. *What historic context does the property represent?*

Time period: 1940-1945  
Geographic Area: United States  
Theme: World War II permanent and semi-permanent construction on the home front

### 3. *What is the property type? Is the property type significant in illustrating the context?*

The installation type is large ammunition assembly plant and ordnance depot. The plant retains the range of property types typical of large ammunition assembly plants and ordnance depots. Large ammunition assembly plants were an important component of the U.S. domestic ordnance production program during World War II and are significant in illustrating World War II permanent construction.

### 4. *How does the property represent an important aspect of the historic context: through important historical associations (Criterion A) or architectural and design features (Criterion C)?*

Ravenna AAP is associated in a specific and important way with the World War II ordnance production (Criterion A). It was a "first wave" plant constructed prior to the United States declaration of war. Prior to the creation of the GOCO plants, the United States did not have the capability of producing the quantities of large ammunition necessary for the massed bombing strategies of the war. Large, specialized, military ammunition was a critical materiel that was in drastically short supply at the beginning of the war. The Ravenna plant was a crucial component in the effort to supply large ammunition. The Ravenna plant also represents the distinctive characteristics of World War II permanent military construction (Criterion C). Its materials and design are emblematic of World War II mobilization factory design.

*5. Compare the property with related properties? Does it retain the distinctive characteristics of its type? How does it compare historically with other properties important within the historic context?*

After World War II, the Army kept only seven of the fifteen large ammunition assembly plants for stand-by large ammunition production. Ravenna AAP was on stand-by status for most of the years between 1946 and 1993, with the exception of brief re-activation periods during the Korean and Vietnam conflicts, and received few modifications. After World War II, the gates around the assembly lines were located and the buildings inside remained essentially untouched. Lines 2, 3, 7, 10, and 11 (5 of the plant's 10 lines) were operated during the Vietnam conflict, primarily for producing 40mm grenades. The buildings underwent minor renovations during the reactivation phases. The plant retains the distinctive characteristics of its type: permanent construction typical of first-wave plants begun during the Protective Mobilization phase; distinct assembly lines with each component building connected by ramps and monorail; dispersed layout; ammunition storage area; administration area; and, full-range of support buildings.

*6. Is the property significant on a regional or national level within the historic context?*

Ravenna AAP represents an aspect of history of the United States as a whole, the World War II home front war effort to produce the "Arsenal of Democracy." It also may be significant on a local level for the effects it had on the local economy and work force during the war and any lasting changes it produced. Site-specific research is necessary to determine its local significance.

*7. Does the property retain sufficient integrity to convey the significance of the historic context that it represents?*

As of the 1993 site visit, Ravenna AAP retained sufficient integrity to convey the significance of the World War II permanent construction historic context. Though some deterioration had occurred due to the lack of maintenance on the buildings during their stand-by years, the installation retained integrity of setting, location, workmanship, association, feeling, materials, and design.

*8. Is the property one of the kind of properties usually excluded from the National Register?*

No. The Criteria Considerations do not apply.

#### Sources of Information

MacDonald and Mack. "Historic Properties Report: Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant, Ravenna, Ohio." Prepared under contract CX-0001-2-0033 between Building Technology Incorporated, Silver Spring, Maryland, and the Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record, National Park Service, Washington, D.C., 1984.

McDowell, Lorraine L., ed. *Building the Ravenna Ordnance Plant: A Job History*. Cleveland, Ohio: The Hunkin Conkey Construction Co., 1941.

Voight, William, comp. "Ordnance War Administration History." Study No. 11, Monograph No. 1. "GOCO Facilities - Directory." MS (microfiche), AMCCOM Historical Office, Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois.

## **Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant**

### Location and Current Status

The 2,400-acre Twin Cities AAP is located approximately 1.5 miles northeast of New Brighton, Minnesota, 10 miles north of Minneapolis. The installation is part of the Army Munitions Command (AMCCOM), a subordinate command within the Army Materiel Command. Due to changes in the operation of AMCCOM, the Army is ceasing maintenance on certain installations, declaring the buildings excess, and eventually disposing of the buildings, while still retaining the underlying lands. Twin Cities AAP is included within this program. During the site visit in 1993, the site retained integrity; however, the installation was in the process of removing machinery and stripping buildings in preparation for demolition. AMC is documenting the installation in accordance with the stipulations of the 1993 Programmatic Agreement concerning the program to cease maintenance, excess, and dispose of certain properties.

### Summary History

The establishment of Twin Cities Ordnance Plant as a government-owned, contractor-operated (GOCO) small arms ammunition plant was authorized in 1941; construction began August 16, 1942. The Federal Cartridge Company was selected as the operator of the plant; Smith, Hinchman & Grylls, a Detroit firm, as the architect/engineer. The mission of the plant was to produce .30 and .50 caliber ammunition.

The plant was constructed in three phases: plant #1, plant #2, and plant #2 expansion. Plants #1 and #2 each consisted of three large manufacturing buildings, with necessary support buildings; the plant #2 expansion consisted of one large manufacturing building with support buildings. Plant #1 construction began on August 16, 1941. It was designed and partially completed before steel became a critical material in short supply. The major plant #1 buildings are constructed of reinforced concrete and structural steel framing clad in brick. Steel also was used for floor grating, window sash, and decking under built-up roofing.

The Twin Cities plant was built following prototypical designs developed by Smith, Hinchman & Grylls. The design was dictated by the work flow of the production lines. First, the production lines were diagrammed, then the buildings were designed around the production process. Safety and engineering features also determined the materials used and the design. The resulting buildings are prototypical modern factory buildings that also display characteristics of the International Style: regularity of form; lack of ornament; and emphasis of volume over mass.

Construction on plant #2, which doubled the Twin Cities manufacturing capacity, began in early 1942. To accommodate the need for rapid construction and conservation of scarce materials, the new plant's construction materials were radically different from its predecessor. The plant #2 shop buildings were built of wood frame and clad in wood; brick firewalls separated the hazardous wings from the main part of the building. The wood structural members for the primary buildings were prefabricated, which cut the framing time in half. Plant #2 expansion began June 10, 1942. Further additions to plants 1 and 2 were completed April 14, 1944. In 1944, two .30 caliber shops were converted to 155mm and 105mm shell-casing manufacturing.

The Twin Cities Ordnance Plant, including buildings, machinery, and equipment, cost \$68,585,808. The Twin Cities plant produced over 4.3 billion rounds, about ten per cent of small arms ammunition manufactured in the United States during World War II. Its work force numbered 28,000.

Of the twelve small arms ammunition plants operated during World War II, the Army retained only Twin Cities and Lake City, Missouri, for stand-by small arms production. Twin Cities

was placed on layaway status immediately after World War II and was reactivated during the Korean and Vietnam wars. It currently is scheduled for disposal.

### Historic Context

With the outbreak of war in 1939, the United States was faced with the reality that it did not have adequate facilities to manufacture small arms ammunition. Of all the ordnance shortages at the beginning of World War II, the shortage of small arms ammunition was the most critical. Mobilization for World War II required rapid expansion of the munitions program. Prior to World War II, Frankford Arsenal served as the principal manufacturer of small arms ammunition. In 1938 and 1939, plans were made to upgrade Frankford Arsenal's antiquated machinery with state-of-the-art equipment. Plans were drawn that detailed model plant layouts and machinery requirements.

The standardized plans developed at Frankford Arsenal provided the groundwork for the construction of twelve small arms ammunition plants during World War II. The plants were built during five waves of construction between 1940 and 1942. Twin Cities AAP was part of the second wave of construction. The early wave of small arms ammunition plants received the highest priority for construction material, A-1-A. These were the only Army ordnance facilities to receive such a priority. The ammunition produced at small arms plants was used by infantry units, in aircraft machine guns, in anti-aircraft machine guns, in tanks, and in virtually all other combat operations.

### Identification

Twin Cities originally consisted of approximately 150 buildings (plant #1). The major buildings were the administration building (Bldg. 105), two .30-caliber shops (Bldgs. 101, 102), a .50-caliber shop (Bldg. 103), a lead shop (Bldg. 111), a primer manufacturing building (Bldg. 135), and a power house (Bldg. 115). The construction of plant #2 doubled the capacity of Twin Cities and added approximately 120 buildings. The primary buildings were two .30 caliber shops (Bldgs. 501A and 501B), a .50 caliber shop (Bldg. 503), a lead shop (Bldg. 511), a primer manufacturing building (Bldg. 535), and a power plant (Bldg. 515). The buildings constructed for Plant No. 1 bear building numbers in the 100s; for plant #2, in the 500s. A 1984 historic properties report noted 262 buildings at the facility (MacDonald and Mack).

#### Properties Associated with Administration.

Bldg. 105	Administration and Service Building
Bldg. 106A-B	Guard and Gate House
Bldg. 157	Fire House
Bldg. 158	Sentry Boxes
Bldg. 183	Radio House
Bldg. 506A-B	Guard and Gate Houses
Bldg. 557	Fire Engine House
Bldg. 561	Sentry Boxes

Properties Associated with Industrial Functions. Because small arms manufacturing was less dangerous than other types of munitions assembly, the manufacturing steps could be housed in single large buildings. Personnel facilities, such as locker rooms, also could be in the small arms shops. Some more dangerous components, tracers, igniters, and primers, were assembled in separate areas.

#### Small Arms Manufacturing:

Bldg. 101	.30 Caliber Shop
Bldg. 102	.30 Caliber Shop
Bldg. 103	.50 Caliber Shop

Bldg. 501A	.30 Caliber Shop
Bldg. 501B	.30 Caliber Shop
Bldg. 503	.50 Caliber Shop

Small Arms Manufacturing Support:

Bldg. 128	Tracer Chemical Distribution House
Bldg. 129A-B	Primer Chemical Distribution House
Bldg. 131	P.E.T.N. Dry House
Bldg. 132A-B	Primer Pre-Mix Houses
Bldg. 133A-B	Primer Mixing Buildings
Bldg. 134A-D	Primer Mixing Control Buildings
Bldg. 135	Primer Manufacturing Building
Bldg. 136	Tracer Magnesium Distribution House
Bldg. 138A-C	Tracer Composition Manufacturing Buildings
Bldg. 139A-D	Tracer Composition Store Houses
Bldg. 140A-C	Primer Pre-Dry Houses
Bldg. 141A-B	Primer Dry Houses
Bldg. 142	Primer Composition Store House (.30 Caliber)
Bldg. 143	Primer Composition Store House (.50 Caliber)
Bldg. 144A-H	Igniter Composition Store Houses
Bldg. 193A-D	I-B Composition Dry House
Bldg. 195	I-B Alloy Distribution House
Bldg. 196	I-B Nitrate Distribution House
Bldg. 197	I-B Composition Store Houses
Bldg. 198	I-B Composition Manufacturing Building
Bldg. 528A-B	Tracer Chemical Distribution Building
Bldg. 529A-B	Primer Chemical Distribution Buildings
Bldg. 531	P.E.T.N. Dry House
Bldg. 532A-B	Primer Pre-Mix Houses
Bldg. 533A-D	Primer Mixing Buildings
Bldg. 534A-B	Primer Mixing Control Buildings
Bldg. 535	Primer Manufacturing Building
Bldg. 536A-B	Tracer Magnesium Distribution Houses
Bldg. 538A-F	Tracer Composition Manufacturing Buildings
Bldg. 540A-C	Primer Pre-Dry Houses
Bldg. 541A-B	Primer Dry Houses
Bldg. 546	Primer Spatula Inspection Building
Bldg. 575	I-B Composition Manufacturing Building
Bldg. 576	I-B Manufacturing .50 Caliber
Bldg. 595	I-B Alloy Distribution House
Bldg. 596	I-B Nitrate Distribution House

Shop Buildings:

Bldg. 111	Lead Shop
Bldg. 112	Tool and Gauge Shop
Bldg. 113	Salvage Building
Bldg. 511	Lead Shop
Bldg. 513	Salvage Building
Bldg. 588	Plant Maintenance Shop
Bldg. 594	Machine Maintenance Shop

Properties Associated with Infrastructure. Twin Cities Ordnance Plant infrastructure included: water; fences; roads; parking lots; sidewalks; bridge; storm sewer; railroads; gas; electricity; sanitary sewer; and steam.

Bldg. 109	Steel Tank and Tower
Bldg. 115	Boiler House

Bldg. 116	Water Treatment Plant
Bldg. 117A-D	Well Houses Nos. 1,2,3,4
Bldg. 118	Sewage Pumping Station
Bldg. 150	Water Reservoir
Bldg. 158	Gas Meter House
Bldg. 159	Condensate Pump House No. 1
Bldg. 164	Explosion Barricades
Bldg. 166	Condensate Pump House No. 2
Bldg. 180	Sewage Lift Station No. 2
Bldg. 181	Sewage Lift Station No. 3
Bldg. 186	Well House No. 5
Bldg. 515	Boiler House
Bldg. 515A	Boiler House Addition
Bldg. 517A-C	Well Houses Nos. 6, 7, 8
Bldg. 558	Gas Meter House
Bldg. 564	Explosion Barricades
Bldg. 568	Electric Equipment House Substation
Bldg. 580	Sewage Lift Station No. 2
Bldg. 599	Scrap Incinerator Building

Properties Associated with Personnel Support.

Bldg. 153	Powder Area Locker Room
Bldg. 154	Attendant's Station
Bldg. 552	Tracer Area Locker Room
Bldg. 553	Powder Area Locker Room
Bldg. 554	Attendants' Station
Bldg. 587	Commissary Kitchen

Properties Associated with Research, Development and Testing. All buildings at Twin Cities associated with RD&T served testing functions. Sample batches of ammunition were tested, i.e. fired, prior to sending out shipments of completed rounds. The Buildings 108 and 145 were designed to handle 16,000 rounds of ammunition daily.

Bldg. 108	Ballistics Building
Bldg. 145	Proof House
Bldg. 147	Target House No. 1
Bldg. 148	Target House No. 2
Bldg. 151	Tool and Gauge Laboratory
Bldg. 156A-D	Observation House (Ammunition Testing)
Bldg. 163	Observation House
Bldg. 170	Target House No. 3
Bldg. 171	Observation House
Bldg. 184	Partial Flume Meter House
Bldg. 504	Physical and Chemical Laboratory
Bldg. 508	Ballistics Building

Properties Associated with Residential Use. The residential property at Twin Cities Ordnance Plant consisted of single-family houses that were on the site prior to the government's purchase of the land. Houses were left intact where possible. In some cases, houses were relocated to new sites on the property. Some houses were sold and moved off of the property.

Bldgs. 200, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 305, 315, 318, 401  
(These are original building numbers, which were changed at some point after the war.)

Properties Associated with Storage.

Bldg. 119A-U	Powder Storage Buildings
Bldg. 120	Empty Case Building
Bldg. 121A-B	Powder Sampling Magazine
Bldg. 122A-B	Service Magazine
Bldg. 124A-B	Powder Canning Houses
Bldg. 125	Magnesium Storage Building
Bldg. 126	Chemical Storage Building
Bldg. 127	" "
Bldg. 130	P.E.T.N. and TNT Magazine
Bldg. 137	Ballistics Powder Storage Magazine
Bldg. 149A-O	Primer Store Houses
Bldg. 172	Tracer and Igniter Powder Storage Building
Bldg. 191	Alcohol Storage Building
Bldg. 519A-F	Powder Storage Buildings
Bldg. 520	Empty Case Building
Bldg. 522A-B	Service Magazines
Bldg. 523A-B	Powder Canning Houses
Bldg. 524A-B	Canned Powder Magazines
Bldg. 525	Magnesium Storage Building
Bldg. 526A-C	Chemical Storage Buildings
Bldg. 530	P.E.T.N. and TNT Magazine
Bldg. 539A-D	Tracer Composition Store Houses
Bldg. 542	Primer Composition Store House (.30 caliber)
Bldg. 543	Primer Composition Store House (.50 caliber)
Bldg. 544A-H	Igniter Composition Store Houses
Bldg. 549A-O	Primer Store Houses
Bldg. 569	Powder Storage Magazine
Bldg. 572A-C	Storage Buildings
Bldg. 574A-B	I-B Composition Storage
Bldg. 578A-D	I-B Alloy Store Houses
Bldg. 579A-D	I-B Nitrate Store Houses
Bldg. 589	Finished Cartridge Storage
Bldg. 572A-C	Storage Buildings
Bldg. 590	Misc. Storage Building
Bldg. 591	Alcohol Storage Building



Properties Associated with Transportation.

Bldg. 114	Garage
Bldg. 155	Fuel Oil Pump House

Evaluation

1. *What is the nature of the property?*

Date established: 1941 - 1942  
Function during WWII: Industrial construction: small arms ammunition assembly plant  
Category of property: district composed of buildings and structures

2. *What historic context does the property represent?*

Time period: 1940-1945  
Geographic Area: United States  
Theme: World War II permanent and semi-permanent construction on the home front

3. *What is the property type? Is the property type significant in illustrating the context?*

The installation type is small arms ammunition plant. The plant retains the full range of property types typical of small arms ammunition plants; in particular, it retains the manufacturing areas. Small arms ammunition plants were an important component of the U.S. domestic ordnance production program during World War II and are significant in illustrating World War II permanent construction.

4. *How does the property represent an important aspect of the historic context: through important historical associations (Criterion A) or architectural and design features (Criterion C)?*

Twin Cities AAP is associated in a specific and important way with the World War II ordnance production (Criterion A). It was an early "second wave" plant constructed prior to the United States declaration of war. Small arms ammunition was a critical materiel that was in drastically short supply at the beginning of the war. The Twin Cities plant was a crucial component in the effort to supply small arms ammunition and produced ten percent of all small arms ammunition used by the military during World War II.

The Twin Cities plant represents the distinctive characteristics of World War II permanent military construction (Criterion C). Its materials and design are emblematic of World War II mobilization factory design.

5. *Compare the property with related properties? Does it retain the distinctive characteristics of its type? How does it compare historically with other properties important within the historic context?*

After World War II, the Army kept only two of the twelve small arms ammunition plants for stand-by small arms ammunition production and placed them on layaway status: Twin Cities and Lake City. Twin Cities was on stand-by status for most of the years between 1946 and 1993 and received few modifications, other than some machinery updates. It retains the distinctive characteristics of its type: permanent construction typical of second-wave plants begun during the Protective Mobilization phase; large assembly plant buildings; dispersed layout; and, full-range of support buildings. A 1993 cultural resources inventory and assessment reported that, in particular, Building 101 retains the machinery from the World War II period. The Lake City plant was modified more extensively over the years since World War II.

6. *Is the property significant on a regional or national level within the historic context?*

Twin Cities AAP represents an aspect of history of the United States as a whole, the World War II home front war effort to produce the "Arsenal of Democracy." It also may be significant on a local level for the effects it had on the local economy and work force during the war and any lasting changes it produced. Site-specific research is necessary to determine its local significance.

7. *Does the property retain sufficient integrity to convey the significance of the historic context that it represents?*

As of the 1993 site visit, Twin Cities AAP retained sufficient integrity to convey the significance of the World War II permanent construction historic context. It retained integrity of setting, location, workmanship, association, feeling, materials, and design.

8. *Is the property one of the kind of properties usually excluded from the National Register?*

No. The Criteria Considerations do not apply.

Sources of Information

"Completion Report Twin Cities Ordnance Plant, St. Paul, Minnesota." 2 books. Compiled by Architect-Engineer in collaboration with the Area Engineer. December 1942 - January 1943. MS, Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant, New Brighton, Minnesota.

MacDonald and Mack. "Historic Properties Report: Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant, New Brighton, Minnesota." Prepared under contract CX-0001-2-0033 between Building Technology Incorporated, Silver Spring, Maryland, and the Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record, National Park Service, Washington, D.C. 1984.

Murphey, Joseph, et al. "Inventory and Assessment of Small Arms Production Equipment of the Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant, New Brighton, Minnesota." Fort Worth Army Corps of Engineers. 1993.

Voight, William, comp. "Ordnance War Administration History." Study No. 11, Monograph No. 1. "GOCO Facilities - Directory." MS (microfiche), AMCCOM Historical Office, Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois.

## **Wright-Patterson AFB**

### Location and Current Status

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base comprises 8,145 acres located approximately ten miles northeast of Dayton, Ohio. Presently, Wright-Patterson AFB is one of the most important Air Force bases. It is the home of the Air Force Materiel Command, headquarters a major command responsible for logistics; a major research and development complex; an important Air Force graduate education center; the second largest Air Force medical complex; and, the U.S. Air Force Museum.

### Summary History

Although Wright-Patterson's history as a military installation dates from World War I, the area's first association with aviation began in 1904. That year, Wilbur and Orville Wright selected a parcel of land known as Huffman Prairie where they operated a pilot training school. This Huffman Prairie site was designated a National Historic Landmark in 1990.

What constitutes the present Wright-Patterson AFB was developed originally as three separate military facilities: Wilbur Wright Field, the Fairfield Aviation General Supply Depot (FAGSD), and Wright Field. The functions of a fourth airfield, McCook Field, were transferred to Wright Field. The Wilbur Wright Field (originally 2,075 acres) and the FAGSD (originally 40 acres) were established during World War I on adjacent parcels (they constitute today's Area C on the base). The Wilbur Wright Field served as an aviation training facility. FAGSD was established to provide logistics support to Wilbur Wright Field and the three other Signal Corps schools located in the Midwest. A third World War I airfield, McCook Field, was established north of downtown Dayton (not adjacent to the other two installations) as an engineering and research facility.

After World War I, Wilbur Wright Field and the Fairfield Depot were eventually merged. The facility underwent several name changes, but was generally called the Fairfield Air Depot. It served as major supply depot and aircraft and engine overhaul facility during the inter-war period. The Army closed McCook Field and, in 1927, established Wright Field on 4,520 acres northeast of Dayton, which included the acreage of Wilbur Wright Field and the Fairfield Air Depot. Wright Field was the headquarters for the Materiel Division of the Army Air Corps, which was responsible for developing advanced aircraft, equipment, and accessories. New permanent buildings were built at Wright Field to house the testing and research functions relocated from McCook Field. In 1931, the portion of Wright Field east of Huffman Dam, encompassing Fairfield Air Depot and the old site of Wilbur Wright Field, was designated Patterson Field, in honor of the family that led the effort to donate the land for Wright Field to the government. Patterson Field and the remaining portion of Wright Field operated as separate installations during World War II, but were consolidated into a single installation, Wright-Patterson AFB, in January 1948.

Before this consolidation, however, the predecessor organizations grew independently, undergoing dramatic expansions during World War II. Employment at the fields grew from 3,700 in 1939 to roughly 50,000 in mid-1945. Increases in both acreage and number of buildings accompanied this growth.

At Wright Field, the wartime construction was associated with the expanding aeronautical engineering program. The Materiel Division was split into the Materiel Command and the Air Service Command. Wright Field was the headquarters for the Materiel Command, which was responsible for the development, testing, and procurement of aircraft. Wright Field grew from a modest installation with 30 buildings to a 2,064-acre facility with 300 buildings and the Air Corps' first, modern, paved runways. Permanent buildings constructed during World War II included administrative buildings, support buildings, utility buildings, and specialized research and test

facilities. At the time of its construction in 1941, the 20-foot wind tunnel was the largest wind tunnel in the world.

Patterson Field became the headquarters for the Air Service Command, which was responsible for all Army Air Force logistical functions, including maintenance and supply. The Air Service Command constructed a new headquarters building and additional administrative and support facilities at Patterson Field (now known as Area A of the base). Patterson Field also received large number barracks, and supporting mess halls, chapels, hospital facilities, and recreation facilities, to accommodate the large number of recruits who were trained at Wilbur and Patterson Fields. Facilities for the hundreds of civilian workers also were built. The civilian work force grew so rapidly that two new housing projects, Skyway Park and Wood City, were built. Some of these support buildings were constructed of permanent construction because of their intended post-war use. Many temporary mobilization structures were demolished after the war, including Skyway Park.

The Fairfield Air Depot complex at Patterson Field supported the Air Corps during the war as a major logistical center for aviation supplies and equipment. The depot maintained, repaired, overhauled, and supplied unprecedented numbers of airplanes and their equipment. To support these depot activities, brick and concrete-block storehouses, engine repair facilities, an administrative headquarters, and support buildings were constructed. Existing buildings also were expanded.

Archival data indicates that 304 buildings were constructed at Wright-Patterson between 1940 and 1946. Current site records indicated that, of the 304 buildings, 20 have been demolished. According to the 1947 master plan, 61 of the World War II-era buildings were temporary mobilization construction. Many of the mobilization buildings have been altered subsequently and are now categorized as permanent buildings on the building inventory.

### Historic Context

With the increasing threat of war in the late 1930s, the role of the Army Air Corps was expanded due to the belief that air power would play a critical role in the national defenses. This resulted in the establishment of new airfield facilities and the expansion of existing facilities. At the end of the 1930s, the Air Corps operated approximately 20 airfields. By the close of the war, the Army Air Force had expanded to include 783 operational facilities: 345 main bases, 116 sub-bases, and 322 auxiliary fields. The Army Air Force also operated 8 air depots.

The rapid development of aircraft during the war meant that testing facilities worked on an accelerated schedule. Often the military issued production orders before a prototype was finished. New aircraft models were tested in the wind tunnel at Wright-Patterson and component parts were tested at the installation laboratories. The military relied heavily on testing at Wright-Patterson to ensure that the new aircraft meet the necessary standards.

The Materiel Division of the Army Air Forces maintained a system of depots for aviation-specific supplies and to repair, maintain, and overhaul aircraft and equipment. The Air Corps operated four major supply and maintenance depots in 1939: Middletown, Pennsylvania; San Antonio, Texas (now Kelly AFB); Sacramento, California (now McClellan AFB); and Fairfield, Ohio (now Wright-Patterson AFB). During the war, the depot system expanded to include eight aviation depots under the materiel command. Fairfield Air Depot was a key depot for aircraft repair, maintenance, and repair parts.

In the 1990s, Wright-Patterson undertook a comprehensive survey of its historic resources. A draft cultural resource management plan was prepared. Currently, the built resources are being restudied as part of an environmental impact statement.

## Identification

### Properties Associated with Administration.

#### Wright Field:

Bldg. 14HQ Materiel Command  
Bldg. 15HQ Materiel Command  
Bldg. 20125 HQ Materiel Command  
Bldg. 20126 Engineering Division, Materiel Command  
Bldg. 20084 Security Sentry House

#### Patterson Field

Bldg. 10262 HQ Air Service Command  
Bldg. 30260 Gatehouse

#### Fairfield Air Depot Operations (at Patterson Field):

Bldg. 30010 Headquarters (Fairfield Air Service Command)  
Bldg. 30201 Engineering Office Bldg.

### Properties Associated with Communication.

#### Patterson Field:

Bldg. 30199 Radio Transmitter Bldg.

Properties Associated with Defense. The design of Bldg. 30153 was intended to allow personnel and aircraft to scramble in an immediate response to an offensive threat. The crews slept within 100 feet of the aircraft and the hangar doors were designed to open quickly through a system of counterweights. Bldg. 34004 had a similar function.

#### Patterson Field:

Bldg. 30093 Radar Bldg.  
Bldg. 30153 97th Fighter Interceptor Squadron Alert Hangar  
Bldg. 30206 Air Dock and Base Operations  
Bldg. 34004 4043rd Strategic Wing Squadron Operations and Alert Scramble Facility

### Properties Associated with Education.

#### Wright Field:

Bldg. 20103 Physiological Training Bldg.

### Properties Associated with Health Care.

#### Wright Field:

Bldg. 20040 Dispensary

#### Patterson Field:

Bldg. 30219 Hospital  
Bldg. 31173 Out-patient Clinic

Properties Associated with Industrial Functions.

Wright Field:

Bldg. 20190 Ordnance Aircraft Service Bldg.

Fairfield Air Depot:

Bldg. 30259 Armament Fire Control Bldg.  
Bldg. 30013 Engine Overhaul Facilities  
Bldg. 30022 Base Construction and Utilities Bldg.  
Bldg. 30089 Engine Overhaul & Repair Facility  
Bldg. 30095 Salvage and Disposal Bldg.  
Bldg. 30109 Air Corps Reclamation  
Bldg. 30110 Rubber Reclamation  
Bldg. 30148 Modification Hangar  
Bldg. 30207 Instrument Repair  
Bldg. 30256 Vertical Engine Test Building  
Bldg. 30259 Armament Fire Control Bldg. (Norden Bombsite Bldg.)

Properties Associated with Infrastructure. (partial list)

Wright Field:

Bldg. 20043 Pit Pump House  
Bldg. 20074 Utility Vault  
Bldg. 20075 Night Light Control Bldg.  
Bldg. 20078 Gas Regulator Bldg.  
Bldg. 20085 Booster Pump House No. 1  
Bldg. 20085A Water Pump Station  
Bldg. 20086B Pump House  
Bldg. 20086C Pump House  
Bldg. 20086D Pump House  
Bldg. 20086G Pump House  
Bldg. 20088A Pump Station  
Bldg. 20128 Transformer Bldg.

Patterson Field:

Bldg. 10271 Heating Plant (Air Service Command)  
Bldg. 10279 Switching Station  
Bldg. 10284 Gas Meter House  
Bldg. 10855 Booster Pump Station  
Bldg. 31229 Water Softener Bldg.

Fairfield Air Depot:

Bldg. 30018 Transformer House  
Bldg. 30112 Gas Regulator House  
Bldg. 30118 Transformer  
Bldg. 30171 Water Plant No. 2  
Bldg. 30181 Water Plant No. 7  
Bldg. 30182 Water Plant No. 6

Properties Associated with Personnel Support.

Wright Field:

Bldg. 20217 Cafeteria  
Bldg. 20210 Picnic Shelter  
Bldg. 20430 Library

Bldg. 20684 Gym  
Bldg. 20745 Laundry

Patterson Field:

Bldg. 10274 Base Civilian Recreation Hall  
Bldg. 10297 Bakery  
Bldg. 11400 Service Club

Properties Associated with Research, Development, and Testing. Wright Field included a line of hangars and shops housing the base's flight test, aircraft modification, and maintenance missions.

Wright Field

inclined runway  
Bldg. 20001 Flight Test Hangar No. 1  
Bldg. 20004 Modification Hangar & Flight Research Laboratory  
Bldg. 20005 Engineering Shops  
Bldg. 20006 Signal Corps Special Hangar  
Bldg. 20007 Engineering Shops Office  
Bldg. 20008 Operations & Flight Test Bldg./Control Tower  
Bldg. 20009 Experimental Installation Hangar  
Hangar 20022 Armament Laboratory  
Bldg. 20022B Armament Range House  
Bldg. 20156 Flight Section Shop

Wright Field also included laboratory buildings and their support facilities.

Wright Field:

Bldg. 20018A Power Plant Laboratory  
Bldg. 20018B Dynameter Lab  
Bldg. 20018C addition to Dynameter Lab  
Bldg. 20018D Power Plant Laboratory  
Bldg. 20018E Unconventional Power Plant Lab  
Bldg. 20018F Power Plant Cold Rooms  
Bldg. 20024A Power Bldg. No. 1  
Bldg. 20024B Test Chamber No. 1  
Bldg. 200024C Shop and Office Bldg.  
Bldg. 20025B Test Chamber No. 2  
10-foot wind tunnel  
Bldg. 20025C Power Bldg. No. 2  
Bldg. 20026 Supersonic Test Laboratory  
Bldg. 20027 Vertical Wind Tunnel  
Bldg. 20028 Aircraft Radio Laboratory  
Bldg. 20028A Medical Lab  
Bldg. 20070 Fuel & Oil Branch (Power Plant Lab)  
Bldg. 20071B Power Plant Laboratory  
Bldg. 20071D Propulsion Research Lab  
Bldg. 20029 Aero-Medical Research Laboratory  
Bldg. 20055 Centrifuge Bldg.  
Bldg. 20196 Oxygen Branch  
Bldg. 20197 Oxygen Equipment Test Facility  
Bldg. 20198 Aerospace Medical Research Lab  
Bldg. 20020 Propeller Laboratory  
Bldg. 20020A Acoustical Enclosure for Propeller Whirl Rigs  
Bldg. 20061 Oil Storage for Torque Stands  
Bldg. 20071 Engine Test Torque Stands  
Bldg. 20071A Propulsion Research Laboratory  
Bldg. 20079 Jet Propulsion Laboratory

Bldg. 20079A	Jet Propulsion Lab Press Room
Bldg. 20079B	Jet Propulsion Stand No. 1 (Torque Stand)
Bldg. 20079C	Jet Propulsion Stand No. 2 (Torque Stand)
Bldg. 20079D	Jet Propulsion Stand No. 3 (Torque Stand)
Bldg. 20047	Jet Thrust Propulsion Laboratory
Bldg. 20045	Equipment Laboratory
Bldg. 20050	Aircraft Research Engineering Bldg.
Bldg. 20051	Experimental & Raw Material Processing Lab/Foundry
Bldg. 20028	Aircraft Laboratory
Bldg. 20052	Aircraft Laboratory Bldg. B
Bldg. 20055	Centrifuge Bldg.
Bldg. 20065	Static Test Bldg.
Bldg. 20042	Fireproof Instrument Test Laboratory
Bldg. 20192	Special Weapons Bldg. #1
Bldg. 20193	Special Weapons Bldg. #2
Bldg. 20194	Special Weapons Bldg. #3
Bldg. 20195	Special Weapons Bldg. #4
Trisonic Wind Tunnel Complex:	
	20-foot Wind Tunnel

Properties Associated with Storage.

Wright Field:

Bldg. 20057	Air Corps Supply Warehouse
Bldg. 20061	Warehouse
Bldg. 20061A	Warehouse
Bldg. 20062	Ordnance Storage No. 1
Bldg. 20063	Ordnance Storage No. 2
Bldg. 20064	Aircraft Parts Warehouse
Bldg. 20741	Quartermaster Commissary
Bldg. 20335	Film Vault

Patterson Field (Air Service Command and Base)

Bldg. 10280	Warehouse (publications & film)
Bldg. 10281	Warehouse (supply and equipment)
Bldg. 30210	Quartermaster Warehouse/Commissary
Bldg. 30257	Air Corps Warehouse
Bldg. 30258	Air Corps Warehouse

Fairfield Air Depot (at Patterson Field):

Bldg. 30020	Cement Warehouse
Bldg. 30028	Post Utilities Paint and Dope
Bldg. 30029	Post Utilities Warehouse and Shed
Bldg. 30029A	Post Utilities Warehouse and Shed
Bldg. 30046	Quartermaster Salvage Warehouse
Bldg. 30069	Signal Corps Warehouse
Bldg. 30070	Misc. Warehouse
Bldg. 30071	Warehouse
Bldg. 30114	Chemical Warehouse
Bldg. 30174	Medical Supply Warehouse
Bldg. 30252	Depot Supply Warehouse No. 5
Bldg. 30253	Depot Supply Warehouse No. 6
Bldg. 30254	Depot Supply Warehouse No. 7
Bldg. 30255	Depot Supply Warehouse No. 8
Bldg. 30267	Engine Storage Bldg.

Properties Associated with Transportation.



Wright Field		
Bldg. 20089	Vehicle Filling Station	
Patterson Field		
Bldg. 10298	Motor Pool & Gas Station	
Bldg. 30268	Air Corps Blitz Hangar	
paved runways		
Fairfield Air Depot		
Bldg. 30021	Motor Facilities	
Bldg. 30058	Engineering Maintenance Shop	
Bldg. 30059	Depot Supply Motor Repair	
Bldg. 30060	Automotive Repair	

## Evaluation

### 1. *What is the nature of the property?*

Date established: 1917  
 Functions during WWII: Command construction: airfield/research, development, and testing/depot (Army Air Force)  
 Category of property: districts composed of buildings and structures within the base boundaries

### 2. *What historic context does the property represent?*

Time period: 1940-1945  
 Geographic Area: United States  
 Theme: World War II permanent and semi-permanent construction on the home front

### 3. *What is the property type? Is the property type significant in illustrating the context?*

Wright-Patterson AFB contains three components: an airfield (Area C); a research, development, and testing (RD&T) installation (Area B); and, an aviation depot (Areas C and A) from the World War II period. These components developed in three separate areas on the installation and each area includes a wide range of building types, such as administration, personnel support, and infrastructure. Each distinct area represents a type of World War II installation.

The RD&T area of Wright-Patterson AFB (Area B) was essential to developing the weapons, equipment, and aircraft that supported the eventual Allied victory. The outcome of World War II owed a tremendous debt to technological superiority, which was attained through investment at specifically-designed RD&T facilities. The military developed only a handful of RD&T facilities, compared with the hundreds of other types of installations.

The Fairfield Air Depot (Area C) at Wright-Patterson was one of eight air depots in operation during World War II. Aviation depots performed critical maintenance, repair, and overhaul activities on military aircraft to keep them in flying condition. As logistical activities at the depot increased during World War II, additional warehouses were constructed.

Patterson Field (Area C) represents typical airfield construction. Airfields are an important type of installation within the World War II historic context. The Army built many more airfields than it did RD&T or depot facilities, but several of the main bases provided essential support to the air arm of the Army.

*4. How does the property represent an important aspect of the historic context: through important historical associations (Criterion A) or architectural and design features (Criterion C)?*

Wright-Patterson AFB is associated in a specific and direct way with World War II aviation development and support (Criterion A). It was the headquarters for the Materiel Command, which was responsible for the development, testing, and procurement of aircraft, and headquarters for the Air Service Command, which was responsible for all Army Air Force logistical functions, including maintenance and supply. Critical testing of new aircraft and parts was undertaken at specialized, one-of-a-kind facilities at Wright-Patterson. Additionally, it provided important logistical support at its Fairfield Air Depot operations that helped keep the Army Air Forces supplied and the planes ready for service. The airfield also included important scramble hangars that aided in readiness training and defense.

Wright-Patterson AFB includes large administration, industrial, and RD&T facilities designed in distinctive, Art Deco architecture (Criterion C). The World War II permanent construction continued the distinctive architectural character developed at the installation during the 1930s. The RD&T and logistical support areas embody the distinctive characteristics of Art Deco industrial design.

Five historic districts within the boundaries of Wright-Patterson AFB have been identified. Two of these districts contain buildings primarily associated with the World War II period: the Army-Air Force Historic District and the Logistics Area Historic District. The Army-Air Force Historic District located in Area B contains World War II buildings constructed when the Army Air Corps became the Army Air Force with an expanded mission. These buildings are unified by their Art Deco design, which this study defined as "poured or cast-in-place concrete in large massed volumes with simple reveal lines, windows placed in a ribbon effect on the building mass, some large-scale aircraft admitting doors, generally with 'flat' roofs." The Army-Air Force district abuts the Wright Field historic district that contains buildings constructed prior to World War II, representing the first major construction period of Wright Field and distinguished by its architecture.

The Logistics Area Historic District comprises warehouses associated with intervening logistics activities. These buildings are wood frame or brick and generally date from 1941 to 1943. This district comprises two discontinuous areas, two buildings in Area A and seven buildings in Area C. The intervening area contains unrelated officer housing, post-1950 housing, and modern buildings. These buildings generally are one-story storage buildings.

One area of the installation evaluated as not possessing significance is Patterson Field (Area C). This area comprises airplane hangars located along a runway, administration buildings, maintenance and repair buildings, and infrastructure. Patterson Field represents a typical airfield. It was established as a training field during World War I, but became associated with the logistics and supply mission of the Fairfield Air Depot during World War II. As a working airfield, this area does not possess the same level of significance as Wright Field (Area B). Patterson Field's World War II hangars have been renovated and modified since their original construction and no longer possess sufficient integrity to convey their association as a World War II airfield.

*5. Compare the property with related properties? Does it retain the distinctive characteristics of its type? How does it compare historically with other properties important within the historic context?*

Wright Field (Area B) of Wright-Patterson AFB is unique in its aviation RD&T functions. RD&T installations typically were unique facilities with specifically-designed structures. Its mission of aircraft development and testing ranks among the most important RD&T functions of World War II.

The former Fairfield Air Depot was one of eight depots operated by the Army Air Force. While the activities of each depot were less individually critical to the war effort, their combined effort insured the successful operation of crucial air power. Additionally, Wright-Patterson AFB served as the headquarters for the command that operated Army Air Force logistics and supply, giving it a supervisory role over the other aviation depots.

6. *Is the property significant on a regional or national level within the historic context?*

Wright-Patterson AFB represents an aspect of the history of the United States as a whole, the World War II home front effort to develop the technology necessary to win the war and the development of modern military aviation.

7. *Does the property retain sufficient integrity to convey the significance of the historic context that it represents?*

As of the 1993 site visit, Area B of Wright-Patterson AFB retained sufficient integrity to convey its associations with its primary mission during World War II. The administrative headquarters, RD&T facilities, and flight line remain intact. Many of the specialized research facilities retain exterior integrity, though most windows are energy-efficient replacements. The World War II buildings retain integrity of setting, location, workmanship, association, feeling, materials, and design.

8. *Is the property one of the kind of properties usually excluded from the National Register?*

No. The Criteria Considerations do not apply.

#### Sources of Information

Air Force Systems Command. *ASD Tomorrow*. Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio: Acquisition Civil Engineering, 1991.

Mueller, Robert. *Air Force Bases within the United States of America on 17 September 1982*. Washington: Office of Air Force History, United States Air Force, 1989.

Ohio Historic Inventory Forms, Wright-Patterson AFB [1990]. MS, Office of History, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio

Richardson, David G., Jill York O'Bright, and William S. Harlow. "Wright Brothers Associated Properties in the Dayton, Ohio Area." MS, National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form. National Park Service, Midwest Region, Omaha, Nebraska, 1990.

Slayton, Amy E. "Aeronautical Engineering at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base: A Brief Overview." MS, Office of History, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, n.d.

Walker, Lois and Diane Sorenson. "Draft Historic Resources Management Plan for Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio (Fiscal Years 1992-1996)." MS, USACERL, Champaign, Illinois.

Walker, Lois E. and Shelby E. Wickam. *From Huffman Prairie to the Moon: The History of Wright-Patterson Air Force Base*. Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio: Office of History, 1986.

---

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

### Published Material

Air Force Systems Command. *ASD Tomorrow*. Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio: Acquisition Civil Engineering, 1991.

Alaska Geographic Society. *The Aleutians*. Anchorage: Alaska Geographic Society, 1980.

Allen, Gwenfread. *Hawaii's War Years*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1950.

Allen, Robert L. *The Port Chicago Mutiny*. New York: Warner Books Inc., 1989.

Anderson, Karen. *Wartime Women: Sex Roles, Family Relations, and the Status of Women During World War II*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1981.

Arakaki, Leatrice R., and John R. Kuborn. *7 December 1941: The Air Force Story*. Hickam AFB: Pacific Air Forces Office of History, 1991.

*Architectural Forum*. 1940-1945.

*Architectural Record*. 1940-1945.

Armstrong, Ellis L. *History of Public Works in the United States 1776 - 1975*. Chicago: American Public Works Association, 1976.

Army Communications-Electronics Command, Historical Office. *A Concise History of Fort Monmouth, New Jersey*. Fort Monmouth: Communications-Electronics Command, 1985.

*Army Ordnance*. 1940-1946.

Army Times. *Guide to Army Posts*. Harrisburg: Stackpole Books, 1966.

Arnold-Forster, Mark. *The World at War*. New York: Stein and Day, 1973.

Bailey, A. *Explosives, Propellants and Pyrotechnics*. London: Brassey's, 1989.

Baldwin, Ralph B. *The Deadly Fuze: The Secret Weapon of World War II*. San Rafael, California, Presidio Press, 1980.

Banham, Reyner. *A Concrete Atlantis: U.S. Industrial Building and European Modern Architecture*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1986.

Barnes, G. M. *Weapons of World War II*. New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1947.

Black, Frederick R. *Charlestown Navy Yard, 1890-1973*. Boston: Boston National Historical Park, 1988.

- Blood, Kathryn. *Negro Women War Workers*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1943.
- Blum, John Morton. *V was for Victory*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1976.
- Brophy, Leo P., and George J. B. Fisher. *The Chemical Warfare Service: Organizing for War*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1959.
- Brophy, Leo P., Wyndham D. Miles, and Rexmond C. Cochrane. *The Chemical Warfare Service: From Laboratory to Field*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1959.
- Brown, Jerold E. *Where Eagles Land: Planning and Development of U.S. Army Airfields, 1910-1941*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1990.
- Buchanan, Albert Russell. *Black Americans in World War II*. Santa Barbara, California: Clio Books, 1977.
- Caidin, Martin. *Air Force: A History of American Air Power*. New York: Bramhall House, 1966.
- Calvocoressi, Peter and Guy Wint. *Total War*. New York: Penguin, 1985.
- Campbell, D'Ann. *Women at War with America: Private Lives in a Patriotic Era*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Campbell, Levin H. *The Industry-Ordnance Team*. New York: Whittlesey House, 1946.
- Carlisle, Rodney. *Powder and Propellants: Energetic Materials at Indian Head, Maryland, 1890 - 1990*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Navy, 1990.
- Catton, Bruce. *The War Lords of Washington*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1969.
- Christman, Albert B. *Sailors, Scientists and Rockets: Origins of the Navy Rocket Program and the Naval Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971.
- Cohen, Stan. *The Forgotten War: A Pictorial History of World War II in Alaska and Northwestern Canada*. Missoula, Montana: Pictorial Histories Publishing Company, 1981.
- Coletta, Paolo E., ed. *United States Navy and Marine Corps Bases, Domestic*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1985.
- Coll, Blanche D., Jean E. Keith, and Herbert H. Rosenthal, *The Corps of Engineers: Troops and Equipment*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1958.
- Conn, Stetson, Rose C. Engleman, and Byron Fairchild. *Guarding the United States and Its Outposts*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964.
- Connery, Robert H. *The Navy and Industrial Mobilization in World War II*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951.
- Craven, Wesley Frank, and James L. Cate, eds. *The Army Air Forces in World War II*. Vol. 1. *Plans and Early Operations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Army Air Forces in World War II*. Vol 5. *The Pacific: Matterhorn to Nagasaki, June 1944 to August 1945*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Army Air Forces in World War II. Vol 6. Men and Planes.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.
- Crowell, Benedict. *America's Munitions, 1917-1918.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1919.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Armies of Industry: Our Nation's Manufacture of Munitions for a World in Arms, 1917-1918.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1921.
- DeCaux, Caroline A. *Employment of Women in Army Supply Depots in 1943.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1945.
- Deighton, Len. *Blood, Tears and Folly: An Objective Look at World War II.* New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1993.
- Denfeld, D. Colt. *The Defense of Dutch Harbor, Alaska From Military Construction to Base Cleanup.* Anchorage: Alaska District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1987.
- Dooley, Patricia L. "Gopher Ordnance Works: Condemnation, Construction, and Community Response." *Minnesota History* 49 (Summer 1985):215-228.
- Engineering News-Record.* 1940-1945.
- Esposito, Vincent J. *A Concise History of World War II.* New York: Frederick A. Praeger Publishers, 1965.
- Faulkner, Sandra, M. *Naval Operating Base, Dutch Harbor and Fort Mears, Unalaska Island.* Anchorage: National Park Service, 1987.
- The Federal Architect.* 1940-1943.
- Ferry, W. Hawkins. *The Legacy of Albert Kahn.* Detroit: The Detroit Institute of Arts, 1970; Wayne State University, Detroit: The Way Press, 1987.
- Fine, Lenore, and Jesse A. Remington. *The Corps of Engineers: Construction in the United States.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972.
- Fleming, Charles A., Robin L. Austin, and Charles A. Braley, III. *Quantico: Crossroads of the Marine Corps.* Washington, D.C.: History and Museums Division Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps.
- Foss, William O. *The United States Navy in Hampton Roads.* Norfolk: The Donning Company, 1984.
- Frampton, Kenneth. *Modern Architecture: A Critical History.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.

- Garner, John. *World War II Temporary Military Buildings: A Brief History of the Architecture and Planning of Cantonments and Training Stations in the United States*. USACERL Technical Report CRC-93/01. Champaign, Illinois: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Construction Engineering Research Laboratory, 1993.
- Gabel, Kurt. *The Making of a Paratrooper: Airborne Training and Combat in World War II*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1990.
- Gerrard-Gough, J. D., and Albert B. Christman. *The Grand Experiment: Narrative of the Naval Ordnance Test Station During the Second World War and the Immediate Postwar Years*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1978.
- Goldberg, Alfred. *The Pentagon: The First Fifty Years*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1992.
- Goodenough, Simon. *War Maps*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1982.
- Gosling, F. G. *The Manhattan Project: Science in the Second World War*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Energy, 1990.
- Green, Constance M., Harry Thomson, and Peter C. Roots. *The Ordnance Department: Planning Munitions for War*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1955.
- Groves, Leslie R. *Now It Can be Told: The Story of the Manhattan Project*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962.
- Gurney, Gene. *The Pentagon*. New York: Crown Publishers, 1964.
- Hagan, Kenneth J. *This People's Navy: The Making of American Sea Power*. New York: The Free Press, 1991.
- Hamlin, Talbot, ed. *Forms and Functions of 20th Century Architecture*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.
- Hanighen, F. C. *Merchants of Death*. New York: Garden City Publishing Co., Inc., 1937.
- Hartmann, Susan M. *The Home Front and Beyond: American Women in the 1940's*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1982.
- Herb, Charles O. *Ordnance Production Methods*. New York: Industrial Press, 1951.
- Hildebrand, Grant. *Designing for Industry: The Architecture of Albert Kahn*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1974.
- Holley, Irving Brinton. *Buying Aircraft: Materiel Procurement for the Army Air Forces*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964.
- [Hussey, Ann K]. *A Brief History of Kelly Air Force Base*. Kelly AFB: San Antonio Air Logistics Office, 1988.
- Huston, James A. *The Sinews of War: Army Logistics, 1775-1953*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.
- Jones, Vincent C. *Manhattan: The Army and the Atomic Bomb*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1985.

- Kahn, Albert. "Architecture in the National Defense Building Program." *Michigan National Architect*. 15 (December 1941):51.
- Keegan, John. *The Second World War*. New York: Viking, 1989.
- Levy, Michael H. *Pursuit of Excellence: A History of Lowry Air Force Base*. Lowry AFB: Lowry Technical Training Center, 1987.
- Lewis, Emanuel R. *Seacoast Fortifications of the United States: An Introductory History*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1970.
- Lott, Arnold S. *A Long Line of Ships: Mare Island's Century of Naval Activity in California*. Annapolis: United States Naval Institute, 1954.
- Lull, Edward P. *History of the United States Navy-Yard at Gosport, Virginia (Near Norfolk)*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1874.
- Maryland Historical Society. *Maryland Participation in World War II*. Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1950.
- Matloff, Maurice. *American Military History*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969.
- Maurer, Maurer. *Aviation in the U.S. Army, 1919-1939*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1987.
- McCollum, Kenneth G., ed. *Dahlgren*. Dahlgren: Naval Surface Weapons Center, 1977.
- McDowell, Lorraine L., ed. *Building the Ravenna Ordnance Plant: A Job History*. Cleveland, Ohio: The Hunkin Conkey Construction Co., 1941.
- McNeil, Jim. *Charleston's Navy Yard*. Charleston: Coker Craft Press, 1985.
- Mighetto and Youngmeister, Inc. *Historical Survey of Mare Island Naval Complex, Intermediate Inventory*. Berkley: Mighetto & Youngmeister, 1985.
- Millet, Alan R. *Semper Fidelis: The History of the United States Marine Corps*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1980.
- Millett, John D. *The Organization and Role of the Army Service Forces*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1954.
- Minnesota Times* (Twin Cities), 15 October 1945.
- Mosher, Charles D., and Delpha R. Mosher. *The Scioto Ordnance Plant and the Marion Engineer Depot*. Marion, Ohio: Marion County Historical Society, 1987.
- Morrison, Samuel Elliot. *History of Naval Operations in World War II*. Vol 1. *Battle of the Atlantic*. Boston: Little Brown Inc., 1948.



- \_\_\_\_\_. *History of Naval Operations in World War II*. Vol. 7. Aleutians, Gilberts, and Marshalls, June 1942 - April 1944. Boston: Little, Brown, Inc., 1951.
- Mueller, Robert. *Air Force Bases: Active Air Force Bases Within the United States of America on 17 September 1982*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1989.
- Murray, James V., and John Swantek. *The Watervliet Arsenal: A Chronology of the Nation's Oldest Arsenal*. Watervliet Arsenal: Public Affairs Office, 1993.
- Nelson, Donald M. *Arsenal of Democracy: The Story of American War Production*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1946.
- Newman, Dorothy K. *Employing Women in Shipyards*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1944.
- Ogden Air Logistics Center, History Office. *History of Hill Air Force Base*. Hill AFB: Air Logistics Command, 1988.
- Pemsel, Helmut. *A History of War at Sea*. Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1983.
- Pencil Points*. 1940 - 1945.
- Pevsner, Nikolaus. *A History of Building Types: The A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts, 1970*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976.
- Poindexter, Debra. *China Lake Commemorative 50 Years: 1943-1993*, China Lake, California: Naval Air Weapons Station, 1993.
- Polenberg, Richard. *War and Society: The United States, 1941-1945*. New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1972.
- Poole, Lisa. *Torpedo Town, U.S.A.: A History of the Naval Undersea Warfare Engineering Station, 1914-1989*. Keyport, Washington: Diamond Anniversary Publishing, 1989.
- Quayle, L. A. "Volumetric Pouring Machine," *Mechanical Engineering* 67 (September, 1945): 599-606.
- Reh, Louise M., and Helen Lou Ross. *Nipsic to Nimitz: A Centennial History of Puget Sound Naval Shipyard*. Bremerton, Washington: Federal Managers' Association, 1991.
- Reid, Robert, and Thomas Rodgers. *A Good Neighbor: The First Fifty Years of Crane*. Evansville: University of Southern Indiana, 1991.
- Rethi, Lili. *United States Naval Dry Dock Construction from Drawings by Lili Rethi*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Yards and Docks, 1941.
- Riker, Dorothy. *The Hoosier Training Ground: A History of Army and Navy Training Centers, Camps, Forts, Depots, and Other Military Installations Within the State Boundaries During World War II*. Bloomington: Indiana War Commission, 1952.
- Risch, Erna. *The Quartermaster Corps: Organization, Supply and Services*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1953.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Quartermaster Support of the Army: A History of the Corps 1775 - 1939*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1962.

- Roberts, Robert B. *Encyclopedia of Historic Forts*. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1988.
- Robins Air Force Base, Heritage Committee. *A Pictorial History of Robins Air Force Base, Georgia*. Wright-Patterson AFB: Air Force Logistics Command, 1982.
- Rowland, Buford, and William B. Boyd. *U.S. Navy Bureau of Ordnance in World War II*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1954.
- Sande, Theodore A. "American Industrial Architecture from the Late 18th Century to the Mid-20th Century," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 35 (December 1976):271.
- Sill, Van Rensselaer. *American Miracle: The Story of War Construction Around the World*. New York: The Odyssey Press, 1947.
- Slattery, Thomas J. *Rock Island Arsenal: An Arsenal for Democracy*. Rock Island Arsenal: U.S. Army Armament, Munitions and Chemical Command Historical Office, 1992.
- Smart, Jeffery K. *U.S. Army Chemical Research, Development and Engineering Center: Historical Highlights*. Edgewood Arsenal: Chemical Research, Development and Engineering Center, 1988.
- Smith, Clarence M. *The Medical Department: Hospitalization and Evacuation, Zone of the Interior*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1956.
- Smith, R. Elberton. *The Army and Economic Mobilization*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1959.
- Snyder, Louis L. *The War, A Concise History: 1939-1945*. New York: Julian Messner, 1965.
- Spector, Ronald. *Professors of War: The Naval War College and the Development of the Naval Profession*. Newport: Naval War College Press, 1977.
- Stone & Webster Engineering Corporation. *A Report to the People*. Privately Printed, 1946.
- Stout, Wesley W. *Tanks are Mighty Fine Things*. Detroit: Chrysler Corporation, 1946.
- Straub, Eleanor F. "Women in the Civilian Labor Force." In *Clio was a Woman: Studies in the History of American Women*, ed. Mabel E. Deatrich and Virginia C. Purdy, 206-225. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1980.
- Sudbury, Elretta. *Jackrabbits to Jets: The History of North Island, San Diego, California*. San Diego, California: Neyenesch Printers, 1967.
- Taylor, Frank J., and Lawton Wright. *Democracy's Air Arsenal*. New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1947.
- Taylor, Graham. *DuPont and the International Chemical Industry*. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1984.

- Terret, Dulany. *The Signal Corps: The Emergency*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1956.
- Thompson, George R., and Dixie R. Harris. *The Signal Corps: The Outcome*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.
- Thompson, George R., et al. *The Signal Corps: The Test*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1957.
- Thomson, Harry C., and Lida Mayo. *The Ordnance Department: Procurement and Supply*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960.
- Trexel, C.A., and A. Amirikian. "Welded Caissons for Naval Dry Docks." *The Welding Journal* (March 1943).
- Trimble, William F. *Wings for the Navy: A History of the Naval Aircraft Factory, 1917-1956*. Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1990.
- Tuleja, Thaddeus V. *A Short History of the New York Navy Yard*. New York: New York Navy Yard, 1959.
- United States. Air Force Historical Studies Division. *Legislative History of the AAF and USAF 1941 - 1945*. Maxwell AFB: Air University, 1955.
- United States. Bureau of the Budget. *The United States At War: Development and Administration of the War Program by the Federal Government*. New York: Da Capo Press, 1972.
- United States. Congress. House of Representatives. *Authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to Proceed with the Construction of Certain Public Works, and for Other Purposes*, House Report 85, 77th Congress, 1st Session, February 17, 1941.
- United States. Congress. Senate. Armed Services Committee. *Hearings . . . on A. 286, A Bill to Authorize the Construction of a Research Laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1948.
- United States. Congress. Senate. *Authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to Proceed with the Construction of Certain Public Works, and for Other Purposes*, Senate Report 616 77th Congress, 1st Session July 28, 1941.
- United States. Department of Defense. Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Environment. Legacy Resource Management Program. *Report to Congress*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1991.
- United States. Department of the Interior. National Park Service. "Archeology and Historic Preservation: Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines. *Federal Register* 48, No. 190 (29 September 1983).
- United States. Department of the Interior. National Park Service. History Division. *History and Prehistory in the National Park System and the National Historic Landmarks Program*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1987.

- United States. Department of the Interior. National Park Service. Interagency Resources Division. *National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1991.
- United States. Department of the Interior. National Park Service. Interagency Resources Division. *National Register Bulletin 24: Guidelines for Local Surveys: A Basis for Preservation Planning*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1991.
- United States. Federal Public Housing Authority. *Public Housing: The Work of the U.S. Federal Public Housing Authority*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1946.
- United States. Navy Department. Bureau of Yards and Docks. *Activities of the Bureau of Yards and Docks. World War, 1917-1918*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1921.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Building the Navy's Bases in World War II*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1947.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Continental Construction*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Yards and Docks, 1953.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Design Data*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1938.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Navy Department-Bureau of Yards and Docks-1949, Shipbuilding and Docking Facilities*. Washington, D.C.: Navy Department, 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Public Works of the Navy Data Book, May 1945*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Yards and Docks, 1945.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Public Works of the Navy, May 1937*. Bulletin No. 38. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1937.
- United States. War Assets Administration. *The Disposal of Synthetic Ammonia Plants*. Washington, D.C.: War Assets Administration, 1946.
- United States. War Department. Ordnance Department. *Ordnance Safety Manual*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1941.
- United States. War Department. *Technical Manual 9-1901, Artillery Ammunition*. Washington, D.C.: War Department, 1944.
- United States. War Department. *Technical Manual 9-2900, Military Explosives*. Washington, D.C.: War Department, 1940.
- United States. War Production Board. *The Facilities and Construction Program of the War Production Board and Predecessor Agencies*. Washington, D.C.: War Production Board, 1945.
- [Vogel, William P.] *Kingsbury: A Venture in Teamwork*. New York: Todd & Brown, Inc., 1946.
- Walker, Lois E., and Shelby E. Wickam. *From Huffman Prairie to the Moon: The History of Wright-Patterson Air Force Base*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1986.

- Walton, Francis. *Miracle of World War II: How American Industry Made Victory Possible*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1956.
- Warnock, A. Timothy. *The Battle Against the U-Boat in the American Theater*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1993.
- Wasch, Diane Shaw, Perry Bush, Keith Landreth, et al., James Glass, and Arlene Kriv, editor. *World War II and the U.S. Army Mobilization Program: A History of 700 and 800 Series Cantonment Construction*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record.
- Weigley, Russell F. *History of the United States Army*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984.
- Wheeler, William R. *The Road to Victory: A History of Hampton Roads Port of Embarkation in World War II*. 2 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1946.
- Wilson, Richard G., Dianne H. Pilgrim, and Dickran Tashjian, *The Machine Age in America, 1918-1941*. New York: The Brooklyn Museum, 1986.
- Woodward, E. R. "Significance of Ammonia in the National Defense," *Chemical and Metallurgical Engineering*, February 1941, 117-119.
- Wynn, Neil. *The Afro-American and the Second World War*. London: Elek, 1976.
- Young, Peter. *The World Almanac of World War II*. New York: Pharos Books, 1981.
- Ziegler, Martha J. *Women's Employment in Artillery Ammunition Plants, 1942*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1942.
- Zilg, Gerard Colby. *DuPont: Behind the Nylon Curtain*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1974.

---

### **Archives and Unpublished Material**

- Baker, Mark L. "Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties Form: Building 2239." MS, prepared by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore, Maryland, 1995.
- Barksdale, Arthur Sydnor. "History of the Norfolk Navy Yard in World War II, 1945," MS, Navy Department Library, Washington Navy Yard, Washington.
- Best, Brooke V., Eliza Edwards, and Leo Hirrel. "Navy Cold War Guided Missile Context: Resources Associated with the Navy's Guided Missile Program, 1946-1989. MS, prepared for Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Atlantic Division by R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc., 1995.
- Bureau of Yards and Docks. Bureau News Memoranda, 1941. Naval Construction Battalion Center, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Port Hueneme, California.
- Cannan, Deborah, Leo Hirrel, Katherine Grandine, Kathryn Kuranda, Bethany Usher, Hugh McAloon, and Martha Williams. "National Historic Context for Department of Defense

- Installations, 1790-1940. MS, prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, by R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc., 1995.
- "Completion Report Twin Cities Ordnance Plant, St. Paul, Minnesota." 2 books. Compiled by Architect-Engineer in collaboration with the Area Engineer. December 1942 - January 1943. MS, Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant, New Brighton, Minnesota.
- Gallacci, Caroline, and August Gene Grulich. "Puget Sound Naval Shipyard Shore Facility Properties in Bremerton, Washington." MS, National Park Service, Washington, 1986.
- Goodwin, R. Christopher, & Associates, Inc. "Cultural Resource Management Plan, Aberdeen Proving Ground," MS, Draft Report, prepared for Baltimore District Corps of Engineers, 1993.
- Goodwin, R. Christopher, & Associates, Inc. "Inventory, Evaluation, and Nomination of Fort Knox Using CRIS Software," MS, Draft Report, prepared for Baltimore District Corps of Engineers, 1993.
- Goodwin, R. Christopher, & Associates, Inc. "Architectural Investigations Undertaken in Conjunction with the Base Realignment of Dahlgren Division, Naval Surface Warfare Center," MS, prepared for Department of the Navy, Atlantic Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, 1993.
- Goodwin, R. Christopher, & Associates, Inc. "Architectural Inventory and Evaluation of Naval Station Anacostia, Washington, D.C." MS, prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore, Maryland, 1995.
- Goodwin, R. Christopher, & Associates, Inc. "Fort George G. Meade Cultural Resource Management Plan." MS, prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore, Maryland, 1994.
- Goodwin, R. Christopher, & Associates, Inc. "Fort George G. Meade Phase II Architectural Summary Report." MS, prepared for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore, Maryland, 1996.
- Grandine, Katherine, et al. "Inventory, Evaluation, and Nomination of Military Installations: Naval Base Charleston." MS, prepared by R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc., for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, 1994.
- Grandine, Katherine, and Deborah Cannan. "Support and Utility Structures and Facilities (1917-1946) Overview, Inventory, and Treatment Plan." MS, prepared for Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Atlantic Division by R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc., 1995
- Gregory, Chester W. "The Problem of Labor During World War II: The Employment of Women in Defense Production," Ph.D. diss., Ohio State University, 1969.
- Hasbrouck Peterson Associates. "Comprehensive Historic Building Survey: Great Lakes Naval Training Center [1987]." MS, Hasbrouck Peterson Associates, Chicago.

- [Hedrick, David I.] "U.S. Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgren, Virginia," MS, [Naval Administrative Histories of World War II, No. 132], Navy Department Library, Washington Navy Yard.
- Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record Inventory. National Park Service. Department of the Interior. "Indiana Army Ammunition Plant." HABS/HAER Inventory, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., 1983.
- [Kacharian, John C.] "Conservation, Development, Preservation Plan: The Historic Preservation Plan: Basic Information and Inventory," Vol. 1, MS, Directorate of Engineering and Housing, Watervliet Arsenal, 1986.
- Kilner, Keith, Carswell AFB. Personal Communication, September 17, 1993.
- Landreth, Keith, U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratory, Personal Communication, October 1992.
- Levitt, Martin L. "The United States Navy and Lighter-Than-Air Aviation." Ph.D. diss., Temple University, 1990.
- Lewis, Berkeley R. and C.R. Rosa, "History of the Ordnance Department in World War II, Monograph #4, Ammunition," MS (microfiche) AMCCOM Historical Office, Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois.
- Litchman, Shelia T. "Women at Work, 1941-1945: Wartime Employment in the San Francisco Bay Area," Ph.D. diss., University of California, Davis, 1981.
- McDonald and Mack. "Historic Properties Reports." Prepared under contract CX-0001-2-0033 between Building Technology Incorporated and the Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record, National Park Service, Department of the Interior. MS, Building Technology Incorporated, Silver Spring, Maryland, 1984.
- McAlester AAP. Real Property Records, McAlester AAP, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1993.
- Moreell, Ben. Correspondence, Bureau of Yards and Docks, 1939-1942. MS, Naval Construction Battalion Center, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Port Hueneme, California.
- Moreell, Ben. Personal Papers. Articles and Speeches, 1938-1945. MS, NAVCECOS Library, Port Hueneme, California.
- Moreell, Ben. Personal Papers. Military Miscellaneous Correspondence of Particular Historical Value, 1917-. MSS, NAVCECOS Library, Port Hueneme, California.
- Murphey, Joseph, et al. "Inventory and Assessment of Small Arms Production Equipment of the Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant, New Brighton, Minnesota." Fort Worth Army Corps of Engineers, 1993.
- National Archives and Records Administration. Records of the Navy Bureau of Yards and Docks. Records Group 71. General Correspondence.
- National Archives and Records Administration. Records of the Navy Bureau of Ordnance. Records Group 74. General Correspondence.

National Archives and Records Administration. Records of the Office of the Chief of Engineers. Records Group 77. Completion Reports.

National Archives and Records Administration. Records of the Adjutant General's Office. Records Group 407. Project File, Fort Knox.

National Archives and Records Administration. Records of the Office of the Chief of Ordnance. Records Group 156. Histories of Ordnance Installations and Activities (Entry 646).

Naval Weapons Center. "RDT&E Strategic (Long-Range) Military Construction (MILCON) Plan; Fiscal Year 1988 - 2007; Part 2, Facility Evaluations." Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division, China Lake, March 1986.

Northern Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command. "Cultural Resources Survey, Crane Division, Naval Surface Warfare Center, Crane, Indiana." MS, Northern Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command, June 1992.

Ohio Historic Inventory Forms, Wright-Patterson AFB [1990]. MS, Office of History, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

Ordnance Systems Department, Naval Weapons Center. "Origins of the China Lake Propulsion Laboratories." China Lake, California: Ordnance Systems Department, n.d.

Peck, F. Taylor. "A History of the Naval Gun Factory, Washington D.C." Ph.D. diss., Georgetown University, 1950.

Peter, Duane, et al. "Indiana Army Ammunition Plant: Cultural Resource Management Plan." Draft. Prepared for Indiana Army Ammunition Plant, AMCCOM Facilities, under contract to the Fort Worth District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1992.

Portsmouth Naval Shipyard Museum. Drydock File. Portsmouth Naval Shipyard Museum, Portsmouth, Virginia.

Richardson, David G., Jill York O'Bright, and William S. Harlow. "Wright Brothers Associated Properties in the Dayton, Ohio Area." MS, National Register of Historic Places Multiple Property Documentation Form. National Park Service, Midwest Region, Omaha, Nebraska, 1990.

Slayton, Amy E. "Aeronautical Engineering at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base: A Brief Overview." MS, Office of History, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, n.d.

Smith, Hinchman, and Grylls. "Completion Report: Twin Cities Ordnance Plant", MS, Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1942-1943.

Union Pacific Railroad. "Geographically Correct Map of the United States, issued by Union Pacific Railroad [with] List of Military Posts in the United States, Showing Railroad Stations and Post Office Addresses." 1942 Map. Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis.

United States. Air Force. Collections, and acquisitions from the Corps of Engineers. U.S. Air Force Historical Research Center. Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama.

United States. Army Services of Supply. "Report to Congress, 1942." MS, U.S. Air Force Historical Research Center, Maxwell AFB.



- United States. National Park Service. Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record. "Historic Properties Report, Picatinny Arsenal," MS, Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey.
- United States. National Park Service. National Register of Historic Places Nomination Forms. Various forms including Hickam Air Force Base, Cape Field, Watervliet Arsenal, Watertown Arsenal, Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Sitka, Kodiak, and Dutch Harbor Naval Operating Bases. MSS, National Park Service, Washington, D.C.
- United States. Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina. "The Industrial History of Charleston Navy Yard, 1939-1945, [1945]." MS, Navy Department Library, Washington Navy Yard, Washington.
- United States. Navy Department. "United States Naval Administrative Histories of World War II." MSS, Navy Department Library, Washington Navy Yard.
- United States. Navy Department. Bureau of Yards and Docks. "Bureau News Memorandum, 237." November 1, 1941, d-1001. Naval Construction Battalion Center, NAVFACENGCOM, Port Hueneme, California.
- [United States. War Department. Ordnance Department. Small Arms Division.] "Small Arms Ammunition: A History of an Industry, 1918 - 1944." [1945]. 2 Vol. MS, at U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District, Planning Division.
- Voight, William, comp. "Ordnance War Administration History." Study No. 11, Monograph No. 1. "GOCO Facilities-Directory." MS (microfiche), AMCCOM Historical Office, Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois.
- Walker, Lois E., and Diane Sorenson. "Draft Historic Resources Management Plan for Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio." MS, USACERL, Champaign, Illinois, Fiscal Years 1992-1996.
- Welborne, Mary C. "Construction for the Army Air Forces in the Continental United States and Foreign Countries, 1939-1945" [undated draft copy as Air War College project], MS, U.S. Air Force Historical Research Center, Maxwell AFB, Alabama.
- West, James H. "A Short History of the New York Navy Yard, 1941," MS, Navy Department Library, Washington Navy Yard, Washington.
- Woodside, E.L., CAPT USN. "History of Naval Ammunition Depot." MS, McAlester AAP, McAlester, Oklahoma, n.d.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc., is grateful to the many individuals and organizations that assisted us during this project. We appreciate the support of the Department of Defense (DoD) Legacy Resource Management Program, particularly the assistance of Dr. Constance Werner Ramirez, former Army Federal Preservation Officer, and Dr. J. Bernard Murphy, Navy Historic Preservation Officer. We also would like to thank the Planning Division of the Baltimore District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for its outstanding support as the manager of this Legacy Program demonstration project. Our thanks go out to Ms. Mary Shipe, the original District Project Manager, and to Mr. Mark Baker, who assumed that role midway through the project. Mr. Baker provided careful review comments on the draft reports and assisted with consolidating and completing the report.

Other DoD personnel also provided valuable assistance. We thank Ms. Glen Alderton (formerly of the Navy Legacy Program) and Mr. Jeff Shrimpton (formerly of the Army Legacy Program) for their careful review of the report outline. The U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratory (USACERL), supplied data on DoD's real property inventory of World War II-era permanent facilities and information on CERL's documentation of World War II temporary construction. Mr. Joseph Murphey, AIA of the Ft. Worth District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, was an invaluable source for reports, maps, and articles from the World War II period. Mr. Paul Lusignan, Historian with the National Register of Historic Places, reviewed the draft report and provided valuable, insightful, and thorough comments. We deeply appreciate his effort. In addition, we thank Dr. Paul R. Green, Ms. Lynn Engelman, and Dr. Burgess who provided written comments on behalf of the Department of the Air Force.

We also would like to extend our thanks to the staffs of the many reference repositories consulted during the course of this project. The staffs of the National Archives and the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C.; the Navy Department Library, Washington Navy Yard; the Library of the Naval Construction Battalion Engineering Center, Port Hueneme, California; U.S. Air Force Historical Research Center, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama; and, the Armament, Munitions, and Chemical Command (AMCCOM) Historical Office, Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, provided important assistance for our research.

We are grateful to the installation personnel at Indiana AAP; McAlester AAP; Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division China Lake; Naval Surface Warfare Center Crane; Ravenna AAP; Twin Cities AAP; and, Wright-Patterson AFB for their outstanding assistance during our site visits to these installations. We also would like to thank the AMCCOM HQ office for coordinating the visits to the AMCCOM installations. In addition, the Baltimore District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers released data on Fort George G. Meade and Naval Station Anacostia for use in this report.

R. Christopher Goodwin, Ph.D. was the Project Director, Kathryn Kuranda, M. Arch. Hist. was the Principal Investigator, and Deborah C. Whelan, B.A. served as the Project Manager. Leo Hirrel, Ph.D. was the project historian. William T. Dod, M.A., and Patrick Jennings, B.A., served as research historians on the project. Hampton Tucker, M.A., served as the project architectural historian. Lisa Beebe and Augustine Fahey prepared the report graphics. Site visits were conducted by William T. Dod, Katherine Grandine, Leo Hirrel, Patrick Jennings, Hugh McAloon, Geoffrey Melhuish, Hampton Tucker, and Deborah C. Whelan. Brooke Best, Eliza Burden, and Katherine Grandine assisted with writing the summary histories for the installation case studies. Deborah C. Whelan and Katherine Grandine consolidated the report into a single document. Sandi Castle and Sharon Little produced the report.

## APPENDIX I

### TIME LINE OF SELECTED EVENTS RELATED TO WORLD WAR II (1939-1946)

#### 1939

- 15 March German troops occupy the remainder of Czechoslovakia following Germany's 1938 occupation of the Sudetenland (Keegan 1989:40).
- 22 August German-Soviet Nonaggression Treaty; agreement to parcel Poland between the two countries in the case of a German-Polish War (Keegan 1989:43).
- September German subs sink 41 Allied ships totalling 153,800 tons during September (Young 1981:37).
- 1 September Germany invades Poland; annexes port city of Danzig (Keegan 1989:44).
- 3 September French and British ultimatums demanding German troop withdrawal from Poland expire, resulting in a state of war between those countries and Germany (Keegan 1989:44).
- World War II starts in Europe. New Zealand declares war on Germany (Arnold-Forster 1973:295).
- German U-Boat sinks British liner *SS Athenia* off the coast of Ireland; Battle of the Atlantic begins.
- 7 September British assemble first British Atlantic convoys to prevent shipping losses from German U-Boats (Young 1981:38).
- 8 September Roosevelt issues limited national emergency declaration. U.S. Army receives approval for recruiting to a force level of 242,000. Navy and War Departments release the "Industrial Mobilization Plan-Revision of 1939" (Sill 1947:287).
- 17 September Eastern Poland occupied by units of the Soviet Army (Arnold-Forster 1973:295).
- 29 September Germany and the Soviet Union initial pact partitioning Poland between the two countries (Arnold-Forster 1973:295).
- October Roosevelt forms Advisory Committee on Uranium following communication with Albert Einstein (Young 1981:40).
- 3 October Inter-American Conference declares sea safety zones south of Canada, where naval action by warring nations is prohibited (Snyder 1965:186).
- 6 October Polish resistance against German and Soviet invasions ends; Hitler makes peace offers to Great Britain and France (Keegan 1989:46,54).
- 10 October France rejects Hitler's October 6 peace offer (Keegan 1989:54).

- 12 October Great Britain rejects Hitler's October 6 peace overtures (Keegan 1989:54).
- 3 November 1937 U.S. Statute of Neutrality is amended, and a "cash-and-carry" clause is added (Arnold-Forster 1973:295).

## **1940**

- 3 January President Roosevelt asks Congress to approve \$1.8 billion in defense expenditures (Snyder 1965:183).
- 9 April German troops invade Denmark and take Copenhagen; Denmark surrenders (Snyder 1965:73). Contemporaneous German land, sea, and air invasion of Norway causes the Norwegian government to flee to Great Britain; Germany installs pro-Nazi government in Norway.
- 14 April Great Britain lands force on the Norwegian coastline at Namsos and Andalsnes (Snyder 1965:79).
- 1 May Remaining organized Norwegian forces surrender (Arnold-Forster 1973:296).
- 10 May The Battle of France begins as German land and air forces invade Holland, Belgium, and Luxembourg (Keegan 1989:64-65). Luxembourg capitulates (Snyder 1965:86).
- 13 May German forces cross Meuse River into France (Arnold-Forster 1973:47).
- 14 May Dutch high command surrenders (Keegan:1989:65).
- 16 May Roosevelt requests \$896 million in new defense expenditures, and annual U.S. Industrial Production Schedule of 50,000 planes (Sill 1947:287).
- 20 May German Armed forces reach the English Channel coast at Abbeville. British expeditionary, Belgian, and French forces in Belgium are separated from the main French forces in France (Arnold-Forster 1973:50).
- 26 May Initial sea-borne evacuation of British soldiers to England through Dunkirk begins (Snyder 1965:90).
- 27 May King Leopold of Belgium requests armistice with the Germans (Snyder 1965:86).
- 29 May Roosevelt creates advisory commission to the Council of National Defense (Sill 1947:287).
- 31 May Roosevelt requests additional \$1,277,741,170 appropriation to accelerate fulfillment of U.S. military and naval needs (Snyder 1965:183). Measure approved by Congress by June 26 (Sill 1947:288).
- 4 June Under German pressure, Operation Dynamo ends after the successful naval evacuation of 338,226 men from Dunkirk (Arnold-Forster 1973:52). German forces turn south to conquer France (Keegan 1989:83).
- 8 June British forces evacuate Norway in the face of superior German air and artillery power and German advances in Western Europe (Snyder 1965:78).
- 10 June French Premier Reynaud appeals to Roosevelt for immediate military aid from the United States (Snyder 1965:103).

- Italy declares war on France and Great Britain; invades southern France (Snyder 1965:100).
- 13 June Reynaud again requests aid (Snyder 1965:103).
- Bill allocating \$1.3 million for additional naval military construction becomes law (Young 1981:63).
- SS Eastern Prince* leaves the U.S. for Great Britain carrying first shipment of surplus U.S. artillery pieces and rifles sold to the British. To circumvent the U.S. neutrality laws, the U.S. government arranges the purchase of the material by a U.S. domestic steel maker that in turn sells the weapons to the British (Young 1981:63).
- 14 June U.S. Navy receives authorization for an 11 per cent expansion (Sill 1947:287).
- 15 June Roosevelt informs French Premier Reynaud that U.S. cannot help France against the Germans (Snyder 1965:103).
- Roosevelt approves Navy bill increasing naval air arm by 16,000 air crew and 10,000 planes (Young 1981:63).
- 16 June Churchill offers a Franco-British union; French reject offer. Premier Reynaud resigns and is succeeded by Marshal Henri Pétain (Snyder 1965:104).
- U.S. Congress approves Pittman Resolution encouraging enhancement of Latin American republics' military defenses, and approves munitions sales to Western Hemisphere nations (Snyder 1965:186).
- 20 June Roosevelt signs a bill authorizing a two-ocean Navy and construction of 200 additional U.S. warships. These measures composed the largest naval expansion in U.S. history (Snyder 1965:183).
- 22 June France surrenders to Germany (Snyder 1965:105).
- The Pro-Nazi French government under Petain at Vichy administers unoccupied Southern France, and French possessions in Africa and Southeast Asia.
- Congress approves national-defense tax measures designed to raise \$1 billion per year (Snyder 1965:185).
- 28 June Army and Navy contracts receive priority, advance payment for the Act to Expedite the National Defense

- July Allied ship losses to German subs skyrocket; U-Boats sink 38 Allied ships this month (Young 1981:65).
- 1 July Congress allocates additional \$550 million for various projects, including construction of 45 more ships (Young 1981:65).
- 10 July German air forces attack British coastal shipping; The Battle of Britain begins (Arnold-Forster 1973:68).
- 16 July Hitler issues Fuhrer Directive No.16 describing preparations for German invasions of England (Operation Sea Lion) (Keegan 1989:91).
- 19 July The "Two-Ocean Navy Expansion Act" becomes law and provides for the construction of an additional 1,325,000 T. of warships (35 battleships, 88 cruisers, and 20 aircraft carriers) and 15,000 naval planes (Young 1981:68). Measure expands total U.S. fleet by 70 per cent (Sill 1947:288).
- 23 July U.S. agrees to British purchase of up to 40 per cent of annual U.S. aircraft production (Young 1981:68).
- August German U-Boats sink 56 Allied ships, totalling 267,000 T. (Young 1981:69).
- 22 August Reconstruction Finance Corporation creates the Defense Plant Corporation (Sill 1947:288).
- 23 August \$10 million of Roosevelt's emergency fund money transferred to Reconstruction Finance Corporation for defense housing work (Sill 1947:288).
- 27 August Congress approves inclusion of the National Guard into Federal service (Snyder 1965:184).
- 28 August The coordinator of defense housing releases first program list (Sill 1947:288).
- September An additional 59 Allied ships sunk by U-Boats (Young 1981:73).
- 3 September Roosevelt arranges transfer of 50 obsolete destroyers to Britain, in exchange for 99-year leases on naval and air bases in Newfoundland, Bermuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica, St. Lucia, Trinidad, Antigua, and British Guiana (Snyder 1965:184).
- 9 September Additional military appropriations of \$5.5 billion are approved. Government orders 210 new warships, including 7 battleships and 12 aircraft carriers (Young 1981:75).
- 12 September Congress approves the Army and Navy Appropriation Bill designating \$100,000,000 in Defense housing funds for both services (Sill 1947:289).
- 13 September Italian forces invade Egypt (Esposito 1965:376).
- 16 September Congress passes Selective Service Training and Service Act, establishing first U.S. peacetime draft. Act sets annual training totals of 1.2 million men (Regular Service) and 800,000 men (Reserve Duty) (Snyder 1965:184). Bill also permits government to commandeer plants unwilling to cooperate on defense work (Sill 1947:289).
- 26 September Roosevelt approves War and Navy Department and Maritime Commission requests for Defense housing appropriations of \$95,340,000 (Sill 1947:289).

- 27 September Tripartite Pact signed by Germany, Japan, and Italy (Arnold-Forster 1973:297).
- October U-Boats sink a record 352,400 T. of Allied shipping (Young 1981:78).
- 4 October Roosevelt approves Lanham Defense Housing Act, allocating \$150 million for Defense housing (Sill 1947:289).
- 5 October Navy Secretary Knox issues limited call-up of Naval Reserves (Young 1981:79).
- 8 October U.S. defense allocations increase by \$1.7 billion in Third Supplemental Defense Appropriation Act of 1941; 1941 military appropriation totals \$12 billion.
- Special Defense Facility Amortization and Other Alterations to Excess Profits Tax Law approved under the Second Revenue Act of 1940 to spur defense plant building and munitions production (Sill 1947:289).
- 16 October First registration held for Selective Service; 16.4 million men registered (Snyder 1965:184).
- 21 October Hitler delays execution of Operation Sea Lion (Snyder 1965:120).
- 28 October Italy invades Greece (Arnold-Forster 1973:297).
- 29 October First selective service draft number drawing is held (Snyder 1965:184).
- 30 October The Battle of Britain ends (Keegan 1989:94).
- 9 December British initiate first campaign against the Italians in North Africa, and defeat Italian forces at Sidi Barrani (Arnold-Forster 1973:297,98).
- 17 December Roosevelt formulates basic principles of Lend-Lease Program to Great Britain (Young 1981:84).
- 20 December Roosevelt creates Office of Production Management, to organize defense production and to forward aid "short of war" to countries fighting the Axis (Snyder 1965:185).
- 29 December Roosevelt advances vote of U.S. as the "Arsenal of Democracy;" advocates full U.S. aid to Britain (Young 1981:85).

## 1941

- 2 January Roosevelt outlines plans for construction of 200 standardized-design 7500-T freighters known as Liberty Ships (Young 1981:85).
- 7 January Roosevelt creates the Office of Production Management, which assumes the Defense Advisory Commission's production, purchasing, and priorities functions (Sill 1947:289).
- 8 January Roosevelt requests \$10.8 billion military allocation for 1941 (Young 1981:86).
- 1 February U.S. Navy is reorganized into three fleets: Atlantic; Pacific; and Asiatic (Young 1981:88).

- 12 February German forces under General Erwin Rommel arrive in Tripoli to bolster sagging Italian forces (Arnold Forster 1973:102).
- 8 March Congress passes Lend-Lease Act permitting the manufacture, sale, lease, or transfer of war material to countries critical to U.S. defense (Heinrichs 1988:11,16).
- 12 March First Lend-Lease appropriations bill (\$7,000,000,000) introduced into Congress (Young 1981:93).
- 6 April Germany invades Greece and Yugoslavia (Arnold-Forster 1973:298).
- 11 April President Roosevelt forms the Office of Price Administration to control prices and profits, maintain balance of civilian vs. defense needs (Young 1981:98).
- 22 April Navy increases authorized strength to 232,000 T. of warships, with allowance for expansion to 300,000 T. in emergency (Sill 1947:290).
- 29 April \$150 million appropriation added to original Lanham Defense Housing Act (Sill 1947:290).
- May U-Boats sink 58 ships (325,500 T.) of Allied shipping (Young 1981:101).
- 27 May Roosevelt announces a State of Unlimited National Emergency (Sill 1947:290).
- 31 May Germans complete their occupation of Greece, Yugoslavia, and Crete (Arnold-Forster 1973:100).
- 4 June Non-defense Use of iron and steel activities is restricted under the first "Civilian Allocation Program" begun by the Office of Price Administration Civilian Supply (Sill 1947:290).
- 22 June Germany invades the Soviet Union (Operation Barbarossa) (Arnold-Forster 1973:127). Germany, Romania, Italy, Finland, and Hungary declare war on the Soviet Union (Esposito 1965:395).
- 28 June Congress authorizes \$10.4 billion for U.S. Army in 1942 (Young 1981:107).
- 1 July Facilities built to this date are valued at \$9.9 billion (Sill 1947:290).
- 10 July Roosevelt requests a total of \$8.093 million for maritime commission and Navy activities (Young 1981:113).
- 2 August First U.S. Lend-Lease shipments to the Soviet Union leave the U.S. (Young 1981:116).
- 12 August Roosevelt and Churchill sign Atlantic Charter at Placentia Bay, Newfoundland, agreeing on general ideals; also discuss ways of guaranteeing Soviet Union survival (Snyder 1965:188-189).
- Congress narrowly approves extension of draft service time from 1 year to 30 months (Young 1981:115).
- 19 September Roosevelt requests additional \$5.985 million for Lend-Lease (Young 1918:121).
- 27 September Fourteen Liberty Ships are launched in the U.S. (Young 1981:122).



- 9 October Roosevelt asks Congress to approve arming of merchant ships; to nullify parts of the Neutrality Act (Young 1981:123). Non-essential public or private construction is forbidden by the Supply Priorities and Allocations Board (Sill 1947:291).
- 31 October German U-boats torpedo and sink the U.S. destroyer *Reuben James*, causing the deaths of 100 men aboard ship.
- 6 November Roosevelt announces \$1 billion in future Lend-Lease loans to the Soviet Union (Young 1981:125).
- 17 November Congress partially repeals the 1939 Neutrality Act, sanctions the arming of American merchant ships; and permits U.S. vessels to transport cargo to belligerents in war zones (Snyder 1965:190-191).
- 18 November British Eighth Army begins winter offensive (Operation Crusader) into Libya (Keegan 1989:330).
- 7 December Japanese naval planes attack the U.S. Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbor. Japanese forces assault the Philippines, Hong Kong, and Malaya (Calvacoressi and Wint 1985:896).
- 8 December The United States and Great Britain declare war on Japan. One day later, China issues a war declaration against Japan and Germany (Calvacoressi and Wint 1985:896).
- 11 December Italy and Germany declare war on the U.S.; United States declares war on Axis (Snyder 1965:546).
- 18 December First War Powers Act authorize President Emergency authority to form and rearrange executive agencies, write defense contracts, and manage trade (Sill 1947:291).
- 22 December First Washington Conference begins (Snyder 1965:546).

## **1942**

- 1 January United Nations declaration is signed. Thirty-Four per cent of total defense construction (\$17 billion) is completed (Sill 1947:291).

- 7 January Roosevelt requests \$59 billion in appropriations for 1943. 1942 production levels are set at 60,000 planes, 45,000 tanks, and 8 million T. of shipping; 1943 levels are established at 125,000 planes, 75,000 tanks, and 11 million T. of shipping (Young 1981:142).
- 16 January Supply priorities and allocations board is dissolved; War Production Board is created (Sill 1947:291).
- 21 January German forces under Rommel counter-attack against the British 8th Army in Libya (Keegan 1989:331).
- 7 February Additional \$24 billion is allocated for the Navy (Sill 1947:291).
- 15 February Japanese troops conquer Singapore (Calvacoressi and Wint 1985:897).
- 5 March Army, Maritime Commission, and Lend-Lease \$5 billion appropriation is approved (Sill 1947:292).
- 27 March Second War Powers Act authorizes powers to seize property and enforce priorities and rationing (Sill 1947:292).
- 28 March Congress approves additional Army and Navy appropriations for \$19 billion (Sill 1947:292).
- April Allies initiate partial convoy system for convoys traveling east from the U.S. (Young 1981:151).
- 9 April Limitation order L-41 stops building not essential to public safety and health (Sill 1947:292).
- 18 April Carrier-based American planes, under Colonel James Doolittle, bomb Tokyo (Keegan 1989:271).
- 6 May Battle of the Coral Sea begins. Aircraft carrier *Lexington* is lost. Battle prevents Japanese troop landings in Papua New Guinea, and confines the Japanese Army gains to northern New Guinea island (Keegan 1989:272).
- American and Filipino forces at the fortress of Corregidor in the Philippines surrender to Japanese (Young 1981:155).
- 8 May German troops begin summer offensive by invading the Kerch Peninsula in the Russian Crimea (Keegan 1989:223).
- 10 May Remaining American forces in the Philippines surrender (Young 1981:156).
- 4 June Japanese forces begin to retreat in the Battle of Midway, a decisive American victory marking the zenith of Japanese military advances in the Pacific (Esposito 1965:390).
- 6 June Japanese forces begin their invasion of Kiska & Attu in the Aleutian Islands in Alaska (Young 1981:160).
- 25 June Eisenhower appointed Commander-in-Chief of Allied forces in Europe (Esposito 1965:390).

Roosevelt and Churchill begin the Second Washington Conference. Allied shipping, war output, aid to China, siphoning of German strength from the Eastern Front, and the planned invasion of North Africa are discussed (Snyder 1965:546,554).

- 1 July \$24.1 billion in facilities are complete (Sill 1947:293).
- 22 July Congress approves Army appropriation of \$43 billion (Sill 1947:293).
- 29 July The joint British and American Production and Resources Board to determine material allotments and industrial priorities is established (Young 1981:166).
- 7 August U.S. Marines land at Guadalcanal in the first major Allied landings of the war (Keegan 1989:291).
- 12 August Churchill and Stalin meet at the Moscow Conference (Calvacoressi and Wint 1985:898).
- 17 August The U.S. Eighth Air Force makes the first all-American bombing raid on Europe (Young 1981:169).
- 19 August Combined British/Canadian/American sea-borne raid against Dieppe, France, is the first major armed Allied ground incursion against Europe following Dunkirk (Esposito 1965:378).
- 17 September U.S. Atomic research is placed under military control, with General Leslie Groves as Director. These activities are the precursor to the Atomic Research and Production Program known as the Manhattan Project (Young 1981:173).
- 6 October U.S. and Soviet representatives initial a Lend-Lease Agreement for delivery of additional 4.4 million T. of material from the U.S. by July 1943 (Young 1981:174).
- 14 October 4.25 million-man level reached by the U.S. Army; 7.5 million-man goal set for the end of 1943 (Sill 1947:293).
- 20 October Congress enacts a tax bill to raise \$6.881 billion (Young 1981:176).
- Eight government agency chiefs receive word that priority assistance to most nonmilitary Federal construction will be ended (Sill 1947:293).
- 23 October The Second Battle of El Alamein starts in North Africa.
- 2 November Government announces a controlled materials plan for steel, copper, and aluminum distribution (Sill 1947:293).
- 8 November Operation Torch begins with Allied amphibious landings in Morocco and Algeria (Calvacoressi and Wint 1985:898).

- 11 November Germany occupies Southern France and Tunisia (Calvacoressi and Wint 1985:899).  
French resistance in Morocco ends (Snyder 1965:288).
- 12 November The minimum draft age is lowered from 20 to 18 years of age (Young 1981:184).
- 16 November German reinforcements arrive to stop the advance of Allied forces in North Africa (Keegan 1989:341).
- 18 November German offensive in USSR stops at Stalingrad (Keegan 1989:231); Soviets launch counter-offensive against Germany (Snyder 1965:304).
- 23 November Soviet forces surround the German Sixth Army at Stalingrad (Keegan 1989:234).
- 31 December Critical construction programs are accelerated by the release of Program Determination 236 (Sill 1947:294).

### **1943**

- 1 January 66 per cent of total, or \$32 billion in war facilities construction is completed (Sill 1947:294).
- 6 January \$100 billion + war budget submitted by President Roosevelt for Fiscal Year 1944 (Sill 1947:294).
- 7 January President Roosevelt declares U.S. 1942 production levels of 48,000 military planes and 56,000 tanks have been achieved; announces that doubling of 1943 output goals (Sill 1947:294).
- 12 January The Soviet Army begins advancing westward across the Don River (Goodenough 1982:98).
- 14 January Roosevelt and Churchill hold the Casablanca Conference to discuss invasion of Sicily; a possible 1944 cross-Channel invasion; and heightened efforts in the anti-submarine war. Roosevelt issues his "Unconditional Surrender" declaration (Snyder 1965:554).
- 27 January First USAAF raid into Germany against Wilhelmshaven (Young 1981:197).
- 2 February German Sixth Army surrenders at Stalingrad (Calvacoressi and Wint 1985:899). The Soviet Army retakes Kursk (Calvacoressi and Wint 1985:899).
- 14 February German forces drive Allied lines in North Africa back through the Kasserine Pass (Snyder 1965:296).
- March German U-Boats sink 72 ships in North Atlantic convoys (Young 1981:202).
- 6 March Roosevelt appoints a committee to investigate U.S. industrial manpower difficulties (Young 1981:203).
- 10 April The \$125 billion U.S. public debt ceiling is raised to \$210 billion (Sill 1947:294).
- 11 March American Lend-Lease agreements are continued for an additional year (Young 1981:204).

- 20 March British offensive in North Africa breaks through the Mareth Line, and drives German forces towards Tunisia (Keegan 1989:342).
- 4 May Allies launch final offensive in Tunisia (Esposito 1965:380).
- 11 May U.S. forces begin retaking the Aleutian Islands (Arnold-Forster 1973:307).
- Roosevelt and Churchill hold the Third Washington Conference (Trident) to discuss increased pressure on Italy; elevated air warfare against Germany; heightened war against Japan in the Pacific; and invasion of France (Snyder 1965:554).
- 13 May Remaining German and Italian military forces in North Africa surrender to the Allies (Keegan 1989:343).
- 22 May Allied forces gain a decisive edge in the Battle of the Atlantic, as German Admiral Doenitz commands German submarines to cease operations against convoys in the North Atlantic, due to mounting U-Boat losses (Young 1981:212).
- 26 May One Million Ton Landing Craft Program funds allocated (Sill 1947:294).
- 17 June Funds for one million additional tons of naval auxiliary and amphibious craft are appropriated (Sill 1947:294).
- 26 June \$27.4 billion in 1944 appropriations are given to the Navy (Sill 1947:295).
- 1 July \$37.6 billion in facilities are complete. Armed Forces receive additional \$59 billion for new construction (Sill 1947:295).
- 10 July The Allies begin the invasion of Sicily (Operation Husky) (Calvacoressi and Wint 1985:900).
- 15 July Roosevelt creates a new Office of Economic Warfare (Young 1981:219).
- 14 August New draft regulations take effect in the U.S. (Young 1981:223).
- 17 August Churchill and Roosevelt hold the Quebec Conference (Quadrant) where they rearrange the Southeast Asia Command and resolve to invade France (Snyder 1965:554).
- 3 September British Eighth Army crosses from Sicily onto the Italian mainland; Italian government signs a secret armistice (Esposito 1965:381).
- 8 September Italian navy vessels and aircraft surrender to the Allies following the formal armistice announcement (Esposito 1965:381).
- 9 September Allied invasion force lands at Salerno, Italy (Arnold-Forster 1973:308).
- 25 September U.S. and Free French representatives in Algiers sign agreement to provide the Free French with Lend-Lease material (Young 1981:230).

- 18 October Foreign ministers of the three major Allied powers meet at the Moscow Conference through November 1. These officials agree on postwar security and cooperation with China; advisory councils' synthesis for Italy and Europe; a democratic government for Austria; and retribution against war criminals (Snyder 1965:555).
- 21 November The U.S. Army and Marine forces land on Makin and Tarawa Atolls (Keegan 1989:302).
- 22 November Roosevelt, Churchill, and Chiang Kai-shek conduct the Cairo Conference through November 26, to discuss liberating Korea; giving Manchuria to China; and consensus on conducting military activities in China against the Japanese (Snyder 1965:555).
- 28 November Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin convene the Teheran Conference; they concur on an invasion date for Western Europe; issue a declaration concerning Iran; and talk about assistance for Tito and Yugoslav partisans (Snyder 1965:555).
- 14 December Soviet forces begin their winter offensive (Esposito 1965:381).

## **1944**

- 1 January \$41.7 billion, or 84 per cent of war construction jobs, are completed (Sill 1947:295).
- 16 January Eisenhower appointed Supreme Commander of Allied Expeditionary Forces in Europe (Esposito 1965:382).
- 19 January 86,000 plane 1943 U.S. production level noted by the War Production Board; 100,000 heavier plane 1944 program planned (Sill 1947:296).
- 1 February U.S. Marines invade Kwajalein Atoll in the Marshall Islands (Esposito 1965:392).
- March The P-51 Mustang Long-Range Escort Fighter arrives in the European Theater of Operations to allow U.S. Eighth Air Force bombers to pursue raids against Continental Europe with much lower losses (Keegan 1989:430).
- 4 June American troops enter Rome (Calvacoressi and Wint 1985:902).
- 6 June Allies launch invasion of Occupied France at Normandy (Operation Overlord) (Arnold-Forster 1973:310).
- 15 June U.S. Marine Forces invade Saipan (Arnold-Forster 1973:310).  
U.S. conducts its first B29 raid against Japan (Snyder 1965:548).
- 19 June U.S. carrier-based planes defeat a Japanese naval force in the Battle of the Philippine Sea, and decimate the ranks of Japanese military pilots (Snyder 1965:452).
- 22 June Navy Department receives \$27.6 billion in appropriations; War Department receives \$49 billion in allocations six days later (Sill 1947:296).
- 1 July 44 Allied countries attend Bretton Woods Conference. They reach consensus on an International Monetary Fund, and establish an International Bank for reconstruction and development (Snyder 1965:555).

\$44.2 billion in war projects have been completed (Sill 1947:296).

21 July American forces invade Guam (Esposito 1965:393).

10 August U.S. military forces overcome the last organized Japanese resistance on Guam (Esposito 1965:393).

15 August The Allies conduct amphibious landings in southern France (Operation Anvil/Dragoon) (Snyder 1965:548).

21 August The United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union meet at Dumbarton Oaks to assemble preliminary plans for what eventually became the United Nations (Snyder 1965:325).

25 August Allies enter Paris (Snyder 1965:548).

10 September Churchill and Roosevelt hold the Second Quebec Conference to discuss strategies for finishing the European war, and future strategy for the Pacific theatre (Snyder 1965:554).

17 September Operation Market Garden, an airborne effort to take and hold bridges across the Rhine, begins with landings by British and American parachute troops. Two bridges are secured; almost one British division is lost (Keegan 1989:437-438).

17 October Design, fabrication, and use of materials for houses restrictions are partially lifted by the War Production Board and National Housing Agency (Sill 1947:298).

23 October Soviet forces enter East Prussia (Arnold-Forster 1973:312). The Battle of Leyte Gulf, greatest naval battle in history, begins in the Philippines. American naval forces inflict massive defeat on Japanese Navy marking the end of serious Japanese naval opposition in the Pacific War (Pemsel 1983:145).

24 November Mariana Islands serve as the base for the first U.S. B-29 raids against Tokyo (Esposito 1965:393).

Significant elevation of mortar shell and small arms ammunition production programs is announced (Sill 1947:298).

16 December The Battle of the Bulge begins as German military forces launch an attack through the Ardennes Forest in Belgium and Luxembourg (Snyder 1965:548). American domestic reconversion efforts will be momentarily halted due to this battle (Sill 1947:298).

## 1945

1 January 95 per cent (\$46.9 billion) in war construction projects are completed (Sill 1947:298).

9 January U.S. forces invade Luzon in the Philippines (Arnold-Forster 1973:313).

4 February Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill meet at Yalta. They plan strategies for Germany's defeat; announce a policy for liberated Europe; suggest formation of a new Polish government; establish a new Yugoslavian government; establish frameworks for discussions between foreign ministers; approve the convening of a conference in

- San Francisco to prepare a United Nations Charter; and give the Kurile Islands and South Sakhalin to the Soviets in return for help against Japan (Snyder 1965:556).
- 19 February U.S. Marines invade Iwo Jima (Snyder 1965:549).
- 7 March U.S. First Army crosses Remagen Bridge over the Rhine (Snyder 1965:549).
- 26 March Japanese resistance ends on Iwo Jima (Arnold-Forster 1973:313).
- 1 April U.S. Marines land at Okinawa (Snyder 1965:549).
- 10 April U.S. Army halts construction of 12 new tank plants (Sill 1947:299).
- 12 April Roosevelt dies; Harry Truman becomes president (Snyder 1965:549).
- 17 April New reconversion policy and War Production Board consent for a \$35,000,000 Construction Program for Automobile Industry Reconversion and a \$50,000,000 Machine Tool Program (Sill 1947:299).
- 25 April United Nations Conference in San Francisco begins. Participants sign a Charter for World Security; agree on Statutes of International Justice; and develop a United Nations Organization (Snyder 1965:556).
- 26 April 15 per cent cutback in military orders is declared (Sill 1947:299).
- 30 April Hitler commits suicide in Berlin (Snyder 1965:549).
- 2 May Berlin surrenders to the Soviets. Remaining German forces in Italy surrender to the Allies (Snyder 1965:549).
- 5 May The War Department announces a 2 million man discharge from the armed services. 400,000 troops remain in Germany, and 6 million still are fighting against Japan (Young 1981:346).
- 7 May Allies accept Germany's unconditional surrender (Snyder 1965:549).
- 8 May V-E Day celebrated (Snyder 1965:548).
- 29 May Amendment made to L-41 eases limitations on construction in U.S. (Sill 1947:299).
- 26 June San Francisco Conference attendees sign the World Security Charter (Snyder 1965:549).
- 29 June President Truman agrees to the plans for invasion of the Japanese home islands (Young 1981:350).
- 1 July War construction projects worth \$49.1 billion are completed (Sill 1947:299).
- 16 July First atomic bomb detonation occurs at Alamogordo, New Mexico (Esposito 1965:394).
- 17 July Truman, Attlee, Churchill, and Joseph Stalin meet at Potsdam (Snyder 1965:556), and issue the Potsdam Declaration. They agree on a Council of Ministers; economic and political guidelines to determine the treatment of Germany during the Allied governing period; achieve consensus on reparations; compose a position on Poland; and issue a declaration of peace with the former German satellites (Snyder 1965:556).



- 6 August USAAF drops the world's first atomic bomb on Hiroshima (Snyder 1965:549).
- 8 August The Soviet Union issues war declaration against Japan (Snyder 1965:549).
- 9 August USAAF drops an atomic bomb on Nagasaki (Snyder 1965:549).
- 12 August Soviet troops cross into northern Korea (Esposito 1965:395).
- 14 August Japan surrenders unconditionally (Snyder 1965:549).
- 15 August V-J Day is celebrated (Young 1981:353).
- 1945-1946 Army Procurement Program is lowered from \$29 billion to \$6.5 billion (Sill 1947:300).
- 20 August Most War Production Board controls on U.S. manufacturing activity are lifted (Young 1981:354).
- 2 September Official signing of Japanese surrender takes place on the Battleship *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay (Esposito 1965:397).
- 18 September Elimination of limitations on building and construction (Sill 1947:300).
- November The Nuremburg Trials for Nazi officials begin (Young 1981:354).

## **1946**

- January The United Nations General Assembly conducts its first meeting (Young 1981:355).
- March Winston Churchill delivers 'Iron Curtain' speech regarding the Soviet Union in Fulton, Missouri (Young 1981:355).
- April Unrestricted civil war between Communist and Nationalist forces in China begins (Young 1981:355).
- May Allied forces begin the trial of major Japanese war criminals (Young 1981:355).
- 16 July Peace conference in Paris begins, extending through October 15 (Esposito 1965:398).

## **APPENDIX IV**

### **LIST OF MILITARY PROPERTIES WITH DOCUMENTED ASSOCIATION WITH WORLD WAR II LISTED IN THE NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES BETWEEN 1993 AND APRIL 1997\***

#### **CALIFORNIA**

Mare Island Historic District (Boundary Increase), Solano County

#### **DELAWARE**

Building 1301, Dover Air Force Base, Kent County

#### **FLORIDA**

World War II JB--2 Launch Site, Okaloosa County

World War II JB--2 Mobile Launch Site, Okaloosa County

#### **IOWA**

Camp Dodge Pool District, Polk County

#### **ILLINOIS**

US Army Aircraft C-53-DO-41-20124, McLean County

Scott Field Historic District, St. Clair County

#### **INDIANA**

Camp Edwin F. Glenn, Marion County

Fort Benjamin Harrison Historic District, Marion County

Fort Benjamin Harrison Historic District (Boundary Increase), Marion County

B-17G "Flying Fortress" No. 44-83690, Miami County

#### **MASSACHUSETTS**

Winter Island Historic District and Archeological District, Essex County

Fort Devens Historic District, Middlesex County

## NORTH CAROLINA

US Naval Ordnance Testing Facility Assembly Building, Topsail Beach, Pender County

US Naval Ordnance Testing Facility Control Tower, Topsail Beach, Pender County

## NEBRASKA

Sioux Ordnance Depot Fire & Guard Headquarters, Cheyenne County

Lincoln Army Air Field Regimental Chapel, Lancaster County

Second-Generation Norden Bombsight Vault, Red Willow County

## TEXAS

NAS Chase Field Multiple Property Nomination, Bee County

Randolph Field Historic District, Bexar County

Fort Ringgold Historic District, Starr County

Camp Mabry Historic District, Travis County

## VERMONT

Fort Ethan Allen Historic District, Chittenden County

## WASHINGTON

Aircraft Warning Service Observation Tower, Clallam County

Fort Ward Historic District (Boundary Increase), Kitsap County

Naval Auxiliary Air Station--Arlington, Snohomish County

## WEST VIRGINIA

Camp Bartow Historic District, Pocahontas County

\*Compiled from list supplied by John Burns, National Register Database Coordinator, April 1997).

---

i. Diane Shaw Wasch, Perry Bush, Keith Landreth, and James Glass, *World War II and the U.S. Army Mobilization Program: A History of 700 and 800 Series Cantonment Construction* (Washington, D.C.: United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Cultural Resources, HABS/HAER, 1993) and John Garner, *World War II Temporary Military Buildings: A Brief History of the Architecture and Planning of Cantonments and Training Stations in the United States* (Champaign, Illinois: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Construction Engineering Research Laboratory, 1993).

ii. These figures are based on an analysis of the real property inventories of the service branches performed by the U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratory (Keith Landreth, personnel communication, October 22, 1992). These inventories are included in Appendix II of this report.

iii. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, "Archeology and Historic Preservation: Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines," *Federal Register* 48, no. 190 (29 September 1983).

iv. "Archeology and Historic Preservation: Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines," *Federal Register*, 44717.

v. Deborah Cannan, et al., "National Historic Context for Department of Defense Installations, 1790-1940" (MS, R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates Inc., 1995; Wasch et al., *World War II and the U.S. Army Mobilization Program*; Garner, *World War II Temporary Military Buildings*; Katherine Grandine, et al., "Support and Utility Structures and Facilities (1917-1946) Overview, Inventory, and Treatment Plan" (MS, prepared by R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc., 1995); Brooke V. Best, et al., "Navy Cold War Guided Missile Context" (MS, prepared by R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc., 1995).

vi. U.S. Department of Defense, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Environment, *Legacy Resource Management Program*, Report to Congress, September 1991, 3.

vii. Russell F. Weigley, *History of the United States Army* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984), 415-420, 599.

viii. Kenneth J. Hagan, *This People's Navy: The Making of American Sea Power* (New York: The Free Press, 1991), 284-285.

ix. Alan R. Millett, *Semper Fidelis: The History of the United States Marine Corps* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1980), 319-343.

x. Maurice Matloff, *American Military History* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969), 497-498.

xi. John D. Millett, *The Organization and Role of the Army Service Forces* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 23-41.

xii. Millett, *Army Service Forces*, 124-131.

xiii. Millett, *Army Service Forces*, 37.

xiv. Lenore Fine and Jesse A. Remington, *The Corps of Engineers: Construction Within the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office: 1972), 471-472.

xv. Russell F. Weigley, *History of the United States Army* (Bloomington: Indiana University

---

Press, 1984), 429-431; Lenore Fine and Jesse A. Remington, *The Corps of Engineers: Construction in the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972), 152-243.

xvi. R. Elberton Smith, *The Army and Economic Mobilization* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1959), 437.

xvii. Kenneth J. Hagan, *This People's Navy: The Making of American Seapower* (New York: The Free Press, 1991), 289-290.

xviii. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases in World War II* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1947), 1: 171-175; *Authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to Proceed with the Construction of Certain Public Works, and for Other Purposes*, House Report 85, 77th Congress, 1st Session (February 17, 1941); *Authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to Proceed with the Construction of Certain Public Works, and for Other Purposes*, Senate Report 616 77th Congress, 1st Session (July 28, 1941).

xix. Smith, *The Army and Economic Mobilization*, 437.

xx. Donald M. Nelson, *The Arsenal of Democracy: The Story of American War Production* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1946), *passim*.

xxi. John Garner, *World War II Temporary Military Buildings: A Brief history of the Architectural Planning of Cantonments and Training Stations in the United States*, (U.S. Army Construction Engineering Laboratory, Champaign, Illinois, 1993); Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 42-73 and *passim*.

xxii. Garner, *World War II Temporary Military Buildings*, 55-59.

xxiii. Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 519-520, 593.

xxiv. Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 522-561.

xxv. War Production Board, *The Facilities and Construction Program of the War Production Board and Predecessor Agencies* (Washington: War Production Board, 1945), 83.

xxvi. Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 553-554.

xxvii. Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 605.

xxviii. Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 603-613, 650-701; Harry C. Thomson and Lida Mayo, *The Ordnance Department: Procurement and Supply* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960), 146-147.

xxix. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 290, 306-307, 347-348, 366-367.

xxx. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 351-352; J. D. Gerrard-Gough, *The Grand Experiment: Narrative of the Naval Ordnance Test Station During the Second World War and the Immediate Postwar Years* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1978), *passim*; Buford Rowland and William B. Boyd, *U.S. Navy Bureau of Ordnance in World War II* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1953), 18-19.

---

xxxi. R. Elberton Smith, *The Army and Economic Mobilization* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1959), 437; Robert H. Connery, *The Navy and Industrial Mobilization in World War II* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951), 344-345.

xxxii. Leatrice R. Arakaki and John R. Kuborn, *7 December 1941: The Air Force Story* (Hickam AFB: Pacific Air Forces Office of History, 1991), 17-25; National Register of Historic Places, Hickam Field (MS, National Park Service, Washington, D.C., 1984).

xxxiii. Gwenfread Allen, *Hawaii's War Years* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1950), 225-230.

xxxiv. Emanuel R. Lewis, *Seacoast Fortifications of the United States: An Introductory History* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1970), 119; Allen, *Hawaii's War Years*, 225-230.

xxxv. Allen, *Hawaii's War Years*, 229-231.

xxxvi. Allen, *Hawaii's War Years*, 230-231.

xxxvii. D. Colt Denfeld, *The Defense of Dutch Harbor Alaska From Military Construction to Base Clean-up* (Anchorage: Alaska District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1987), 30-34.

xxxviii. Stetson Conn, Rose C. Engleman, and Byron Fairchild, *Guarding the United States and Its Outposts* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1964), 223-255; Denfeld, *Defense of Dutch Harbor*, 34-37.

xxxix. Sandra M. Faulkner, *Naval Operating Base, Dutch Harbor and Fort Mears, Unalaska Island* (Anchorage: National Park Service, 1987), 15-18.

xl. National Register of Historic Places, Sitka, Kodiak Island, Dutch Harbor, and Cape Field (MS, National Park Service, Washington, D.C. 1984); Faulkner, *Naval Operating Base, Dutch Harbor and Fort Mears*, 25-27.

xli. Samuel Elliot Morrison, *History of Naval Operations in World War II*, Vol. 7, *Aleutians, Gilberts, and Marshalls, June 1942 - April 1944* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1951), 4-65.

xlii. Conn, Engleman, and Fairchild, *Guarding the United States and Its Outposts*, 48.

xliii. Conn, Engleman, and Fairchild, *Guarding the United States and Its Outposts*, 47-50; Lewis, *Seacoast Fortifications*, 115-125.

xliv. Kenneth J. Hagan, *This People's Navy* (New York: The Free Press, 1991), 279, 281-283; United States Navy, Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases in World War II* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1947), 1: 1.

xlv. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 169.

xlvi. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 8, 169.

xlvii. James H. West, "A Short History of the New York Navy Yard, 1941" (MS, Navy Department Library, Washington Navy Yard), 40.

---

xlvi. Arthur S. Barksdale, "History of the Norfolk Navy Yard in World War II, 1945" (MS, Navy Department Library, Washington Navy Yard), 59.

xlix. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 170.

i. Ben Moreell's Correspondence, Bureau of Yards and Docks, 1939-1942, V. 8, Letter to Senator Maloney, November 27, 1940 (MSS, Naval Construction Battalion Center, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Port Hueneme, California).

ii. Ben Moreell's Correspondence, Bureau of Yards and Docks, 1939-1942, V.10, Letter to Senator Carl Hayden, March 15, 1941.

iii. Mighetto and Youngmeister, *Historical Survey of Mare Island Naval Complex, Intermediate Inventory* (Berkeley, California: Mighetto & Youngmeister, 1985), passim; "The Industrial History of Charleston Navy Yard, 1939-1945, [1945]" (MS, Navy Department Library, Washington Navy Yard), 18; West, "A Short History of the New York Navy Yard, 1941," 35; Caroline Gallacci and August Gene Grulich, "Puget Sound Naval Shipyard Shore Facility Properties in Bremerton, Washington" (MS, National Park Service, Washington, D.C., 1986), 8.5.

liii. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases in World War II*, 1:169-175.

liv. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 171.

lv. Ben Moreell's Correspondence, Bureau of Yards and Docks, 1939-1942, V. 7, Memo to Various Addressees, October 7, 1940.

lvi. Ben Moreell's Correspondence, Bureau of Yards and Docks, 1939-1942, V. 6, Memo to Chief of Naval Operations, May 22, 1940.

lvii. Ben Moreell, "The Navy Construction Program," *The Constructor* (July 1941), Ben Moreell Personal Papers, Papers and Articles, V. 1, 1938-1942, NAVCECOS Library, Port Hueneme, California.

lviii. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 8-11.

lix. Paolo E. Coletta, ed., *Navy and Marine Corps Bases, Domestic* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1985), 451.

lx. Ben Moreell, "Huge Navy Shore Construction Program Represents \$7,250,000,000 Expenditure," *Construction* (January 1945), Ben Moreell Personal Papers, Papers and Articles, V. 7, 1944-1945, NAVCECOS Library, Port Hueneme, California.

lxi. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases in World War II*, 2: 124.; Lili Rethi, *United States Naval Dry Dock Construction from Drawings by Lili Rethi* (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Yards and Docks, 1941), 1.

lxii. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 174-175.

lxiii. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1:171, 176, 191; Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Bureau News Memorandum*, 237. November 1, 1941, D-1001. Copy located at Naval Construction Battalion Center, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Port Hueneme, California.

lxiv. C.A. Trexel and A. Amirikian, "Welded Caissons for Naval Dry Docks," *The Welding*

---

*Journal* (March 1943), Ben Moreell Personal Papers, Papers and Articles, V. 47, 1943, NAVCECOS Library, Port Hueneme, California.

Ixv. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases in World War II*, 1:192-193, 198-200; Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Navy Department-Bureau of Yards and Docks-1949, Shipbuilding and Docking Facilities* (Washington, D.C.: Navy Department, 1949), Drydock Folder, Norfolk Naval Shipyard Museum, Portsmouth, Virginia.

Ixvi. Ben Moreell, "Huge Navy Shore Construction Program Represents \$7,250,000,000 Expenditure," *Construction* (January 1945), Ben Moreell Personal Papers, Papers and Articles, V. 7, 1944-1945, NAVCECOS Library, Port Hueneme, California.

Ixvii. West, "A Short History of the New York Navy Yard," 32; Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 178,195-197.

Ixviii. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 198-200.

Ixix. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 179, 186-187.

Ixx. Thaddeus V. Tuleja, *A Short History of the New York Navy Yard* (New York: New York Navy Yard, [1959]), 17; Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 175.

Ixxi. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 19.

Ixxii. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 177, 190, 195-196.

Ixxiii. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 188.

Ixxiv. Ben Moreell, "Navy Shore Construction Reaches Peak," *The Constructor* (July 1943), Ben Moreell Personal Papers, Papers and Articles, V. 4, 1943.

Ixxv. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 18.

Ixxvi. Bureau of Yards and Docks, "Navy War Program, Bureau of Yards and Docks, Summary of Progress," 11, Copy found in Ben Moreell Personal Papers, Military Miscellaneous Correspondence of Particular Historical Value, 1917-, NAVCECOS Library, Port Hueneme, California.

Ixxvii. Address by Ben Moreell on the Occasion of an Indoctrination Course for Educators Participating in the Navy's V-12 Program New York City, NY (August 27, 1943), Ben Moreell Personal Papers, Papers and Articles, V. 3, 1943, NAVCECOS Library, Port Hueneme, California.

Ixxviii. Coletta, *Navy and Marine Corps Bases, Domestic*, 451; Barksdale, "History of the Norfolk Navy Yard in World War II," 25.

Ixxix. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 204; "History of the Fifth Naval District, 1939-1945, 1946," Appendix, Vol. 3, 22 (MS [Naval Administrative Histories of World War II, No 112], Navy Department Library, Washington Navy Yard); Coletta, *Navy and Marine Corps Bases, Domestic*, 384.

Ixxx. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 206.

Ixxxi. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 376-377.



---

Ixxxii. Diane Shaw Wasch, et al., *World War II and the U.S. Army Mobilization Program: A History of 700 and 800 Series Cantonment Construction* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Defense and the U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service).

Ixxxiii. "Permanent Quarters for Defense Forces," *Engineering News-Record* 24 (October 1940); "FWA Starts Defense Housing at Ft. Knox," *Engineering News-Record* (9 January 1941).

Ixxxiv. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1:261 - 277.

Ixxxv. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1:277.

Ixxxvi. Observation based upon intensive architectural surveys by R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc., at Ft. Meade, Ft. Knox, and Aberdeen Proving Ground under separate contracts.

Ixxxvii. Kurt Gabel, *The Making of a Paratrooper: Airborne Training and Combat in World War II* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1990), 99-100.

Ixxxviii. Maurer Maurer, *Aviation in the U. S. Army, 1919-1939* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1987), 325-332 and passim; Martin Caidin, *Air Force: A History of American Air Power* (New York: Bramhall House, 1966), 68 and passim.

Ixxxix. Jerold E. Brown, *Where Eagles Land: Planning and Development of U.S. Army Airfields, 1910-1941* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1990), 99-101.

xc. Robert Mueller, *Air Force Bases: Active Air Force Bases Within the United States of America on 17 September 1982* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1989), iii. The figure is imprecise because Mueller does not list installations that have closed following WWII.

xc. Brown, *Where Eagles Land*, 101.

xcii. Mueller, *Air Force Bases*, 157, 221, 345, 411, 577.

xciii. Wesley F. Craven and James L. Cate, *The Army Air Forces in World War II*, vol 1, *Plans and Early Operations, January 1939 to August 1942* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948), 111.

xciv. Michael H. Levy, *The Pursuit of Excellence: A History of Lowry Air Force Base, 1937-1987*, (Lowry AFB: History Office, Lowry Technical Training Center, 1987), 17-20.

xcv. Lenore Fine and Jesse A. Remington, *The Corps of Engineers: Construction in the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1992), 133, 556; Craven and Cate, *Plans and Early Operations*, 113; United States Army Air Corps Memorandum, *Instructions to Members of the Airfield Site Selection Board*, dated July, 1941, U.S. Air Force Historical Research Center, Maxwell AFB, Alabama.

xcvi. Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 440-476.

xcvii. Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 443-444.

xcviii. Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 476.

xcix. A. Timothy Warnock, *The Battle Against the U-Boat in the American Theater* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1993), passim; Craven and Cate, *Plans and Early Operations*, 514-533.

- 
- c. Warnock, *Battle Against the U-Boat in the American Theater*, 23.
- ci. Mueller, *Air Force Bases*, 411, 579, 311.
- cii. Mary C. Welborne, "Construction for the Army Air Forces in the Continental United States and Foreign Countries, 1939-1945" (MS, U.S. Air Force Historical Research Center, Maxwell AFB, Alabama, [undated draft copy as Air War College Project]), 3.
- ciii. Transcript of Interview with Major D. Nelson, Plans and Design Branch, Taken on November 6, 1945, U.S. Air Force Historical Research Center, Maxwell AFB, Alabama.
- civ. Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 614-649.
- cv. Wesley F. Craven and James L. Cate, *The Army Air Forces in World War II*, vol. 5, *The Pacific: Matterhorn to Nagasaki, June 1944 to August 1945* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), 703-709.
- cvi. Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 703.
- cvii. Mueller, *Air Force Bases*, iii.
- cviii. Hagan, *This People's Navy*, 272-275, 306, and passim; Ronald Spector, *Professors of War: The Naval War College and the Development of the Naval Profession* (Newport: Naval War College Press, 1977), 147-150; *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1:227.
- cix. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 227.
- cx. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 227; "Aviation Shore Establishments" (MS [Naval Administrative Histories of World War II, number 58], Navy Department Library, Washington Navy Yard), passim.
- cxii. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 233-234; "Aviation Shore Establishment," 327.
- cxiii. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 236-238.
- cxiiii. Samuel Elliot Morrison, *History of Naval Operations in World War II*, Vol. 1 *Battle of the Atlantic* (Boston: Little Brown, 1948), 237-251; "Aviation Shore Establishments," 336-343; Warnock, *Battle Against the U-Boat*, 26.
- cxv. Martin L. Levitt, "The United States Navy and Lighter-Than-Air Aviation" (Ph.D. diss., Temple University, 1990), 142-155, and passim.
- cxvi. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 251-256.
- cxvii. Morrison, *Battle of the Atlantic*, 250-251; Levitt, "The United States Navy and Lighter-Than-Air Aviation," 173-180.
- cxviii. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 257-260.
- cxix. Harry C. Thomson and Lida Mayo, *The Ordnance Department: Procurement and Supply*, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960) 363-365.
- cx. Thomson and Mayo, *Procurement and Supply*, 380-382.

- 
- cxx. Thomson and Mayo, *Procurement and Supply*, 378.
- cxxi. Erna Risch, *The Quartermaster Corps: Organization, Supply and Services* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1953), 1: 332-334.
- cxxii. Risch, *Organization, Supply, and Services*, 1: 333-334.
- cxxiii. Risch, *Organization, Supply and Services*, 1: 338-342.
- cxxiv. Risch, *Organization, Supply and Services*, 1: 335.
- cxxv. John D. Millett, *The Organization and Role of the Army Service Forces* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1954), 300-302.
- cxxvi. George R. Thompson et al., *The Signal Corps: The Test* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1957), 515; Blanche D. Coll, Jean E. Keith and Herbert H. Rosenthal, *The Corps of Engineers: Troops and Equipment* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1958), 530-531.
- cxxvii. Leo P. Brophy and George J. B. Fisher, *The Chemical Warfare Service: Organizing for War* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1959), 122-123.
- cxxviii. Ogden Air Logistics Center, History Office, *History of Hill Air Force Base* (Hill Air Force Base: Air Force Logistics Command 1988), 5.
- cxxix. Lois E. Walker and Shelby E. Wickam, *From Huffman Prairie to the Moon: The History of Wright-Patterson Air Force Base* (Wright-Patterson AFB: Air Force Logistics Command, 1986), 264-266.
- cxix. Robert Mueller, *Air Force Bases*, 504, 547; Robins Air Force Base Heritage Committee, *A Pictorial History of Robins Air Force Base* (Wright-Patterson AFB: Air Force Logistics Command, 1982), 9-17.
- cxixi. Walker and Wickam, *From Huffman Prairie to the Moon*, 270-274; [Ann K. Hussey], *A Brief History of Kelly Air Force Base* (Kelly AFB: San Antonio Air Logistics Office, 1988), 4-5.
- cxixii. Ogden Air Logistics Center, *History of Hill Air Force Base*, 10-14, 156. In 1955, the former Ogden Arsenal was transferred to Hill AFB, which provided Hill AFB with an exceptionally high number of permanent structures from the World War II era.
- cxixiii. Ogden Air Logistics Center, *History of Hill Air Force Base*, 25-34,
- cxixiv. William R. Wheeler, *The Road to Victory: A History of Hampton Roads Port of Embarkation in World War II* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1946), *passim*.
- cxixv. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 291-301.
- cxixvi. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 298-305.
- cxixvii. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 300.
- cxixviii. National Archives and Records Administration, RG 156, Entry 646A, Box 777, History of Ordnance Research and Development in World War II.

- 
- cxviii. NARA, RG 156, Entry 646A, Box 776, Ordnance Proving Grounds, 5, 42.
- cxix. R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc.'s "Cultural Resource Management Plan, Aberdeen Proving Ground" (MS, Draft Report, prepared for Baltimore District Corps of Engineers, 1993).
- cxli. NARA, RG 156, Entry 646A, Box 776, Ordnance Proving Grounds, 22-36.
- cxlii. Army Communications-Electronics Command, Historical Office, *A Concise History of Fort Monmouth, New Jersey* (Fort Monmouth: Communications-Electronics Command, 1985), 11-12, 19-20, 27-32; Building Technology Inc., *Historic Properties Report: Fort Monmouth, New Jersey and Sub-installations Charles Wood Area and Evans Area* (MS, Ft. Monmouth, New Jersey, 1984), 75-87.
- cxliii. Walker and Wickam, *From Huffman Prairie to the Moon*, 146-163.
- cxliv. Brophy and Fisher, *Organizing for War*, 132-135.
- cxlv. Risch, *Organization, Supply, and Services*. 77; United States Congress, Senate. Armed Services Committee, *Hearings ... on a Bill to Authorize the Construction of a Research Laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1948).
- cxlvi. [David I. Hedrick], "U.S. Naval Proving Ground, Dahlgren, Virginia," (MS [Naval Administrative Histories of World War II, No. 132], Navy Department Library, Washington Navy Yard), passim; Kenneth G. McCollum, ed., *Dahlgren* (Dahlgren: Naval Surface Weapons Center, 1977), passim; R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc., "Architectural Investigations Undertaken in Conjunction with the Base Realignment of Dahlgren Division, Naval Surface Warfare Center" (MS, prepared for Department of the Navy, Atlantic Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, 1993).
- cxlvii. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases in World War II*, 351; "Buildings with Non-Magnetic Properties," *Engineering News-Record* (25 October 1945), 10-11.
- cxlviii. Coletta, *Navy and Marine Corps Bases, Domestic*, 239-242; Albert B. Christman, *Sailors, Scientists and Rockets: Origins of the Navy Rocket Program and the Naval Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern* (Washington, D.C.: Naval History Division, 1971), passim.
- cxlix. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 352-353; J. D. Gerrard-Gough and Albert B. Christman, *The Grand Experiment at Inyokern: History of the Naval Weapons Center, China Lake*, (Washington, D.C.: Naval History Division: 1978), 28-39, 129-152.
- cl. Gerrard-Gough and Christman, *The Grand Experiment*, 82-122; Coletta, *Navy and Marine Corps Bases, Domestic*, 241.
- cli. Coletta, *Navy and Marine Corps Bases, Domestic*, 72-73; "Innovations dot Navy's ship model testing basin," *Engineering News-Record* (10 July 1941):4-5; Maryland Historical Society, *Maryland in World War II* (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1950), 1: 190-194.
- clii. Coletta, *Navy and Marine Corps Bases, Domestic*, 213-221, 254-258.
- cliii. Clarence M. Smith, *The Medical Department: Hospitalization and Evacuation, Zone of Interior* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1956), 15-24, 68-75.
- cliv. Smith, *Hospital and Evacuation*, 74-76, 304-313.

- 
- clv. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 355-371.
- clvi. Army Times, *Guide to Army Posts* (Harrisburg: Stackpole Books, 1966), 75-76; Smith, *Hospitalization and Evacuation*, 304-313.
- clvii. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 355, 359.
- clviii. Thompson et al., *The Signal Corps: The Test*, 429; "Navy Communications" (MS [Naval Administrative Histories of World War II, No. 16] Navy Department Library, Washington Navy Yard), 42.
- clix. Coletta, *Navy and Marine Corps Bases, Domestic*, 567; Maryland Historical Society, *Maryland in World War II*, 220, 233.
- clx. Allen, *Hawaii's War Years*, 228.
- clxi. George R. Thompson and Dixie R. Harris, *The Signal Corps: The Outcome* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966), 592-593 and passim.
- clxii. Francis Walton, *Miracle of World War II: How American Industry Made Victory Possible* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1956), 185-186.
- clxiii. Harry C. Thomson and Lida Mayo, *The Ordnance Department: Procurement and Supply*, C. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office 1960), 19.
- clxiv. Robert H. Connery, *The Navy and the Industrial Mobilization in World War II* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1951), 348.
- clxv. Thompson and Mayo, *Procurement and Supply*, 105.
- clxvi. Lenore Fine and Jesse A. Remington, *The Corps of Engineers: Construction in the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972), 310.
- clxvii. Thomson and Mayo, *Procurement and Supply*, 104-105.
- clxviii. Levin Campbell, *The Industry-Ordnance Team* (New York: Whittlesey House, 1946), 35-39.
- clxix. Campbell, *The Industry-Ordnance Team*, 255.
- clxx. Thomson and Mayo, *Procurement and Supply*, 115.
- clxxi. Rodney Carlisle, *Powder and Propellants: Energetic Materials at Indian Head, Maryland, 1890-1990* (Washington, D.C.: United States Navy, 1990), 75-76. The Navy Administrative Histories of World War II offer some of the most detailed discussions of specific installations. Some of the most useful monographs in this series include "Selected Ammunition Depots" [Number 127], "Ordnance Plants" [Number 128], and "Miscellaneous Activities" [Number 132], MS, Navy Department Library, Washington Navy Yard.
- clxxii. Thomson and Mayo, *Procurement and Supply*, 108-109.
- clxxiii. Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 317.
- clxxiv. National Archives and Record Administration, RG 156, Entry 646, Louisiana

---

Ordnance Plant.

- clxxv. NARA, RG 77, Completion Reports, Lone Star Ordnance Plant, 143 and passim.
- clxxvi. Fine and Remington, Construction in the United States, 327-335, 530, 536.
- clxxvii. [William P. Vogel], Kingsbury: A Venture in Teamwork (New York: Todd & Brown Inc., 1946), 22-25, 69, and passim; NARA RG 156, Entry 646, Radford Ordnance Works, Vol. 1, 81.
- clxxviii. [Vogel], Kingsbury, passim; RG 77, Completion Reports, Radford Ordnance Works, Ravenna Ordnance Plant, Lone Star Ordnance Plant, Kankakee Ordnance Works.
- clxxix. Fine and Remington, Construction in the United States, 333-334; "Igloos for Munitions Storage," Engineering News-Record (18 September 1941):4-5; Francis MacLeay, "Concrete Beehive for Munitions Storage," Engineering News-Record (26 March 1942):74-74.
- clxxx. E. R. Woodward "Significance of Ammonia in the National Defense," Chemical and Metallurgical Engineering (February 1941):117-118.
- clxxx. Campbell, The Industry Ordnance Team, 83, 124-25; Thomson and Mayo, Procurement and Supply, 121-123; NARA, RG 156, Entry 646, Elwood Ordnance Plant, Vol 100; William Voight, comp. "Ordnance War Administration History," Series II Study No 11, "GOCO Facilities Directory" (MS (microfiche), AMCCOM Historical Office, Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois); NARA, RG 156, Entry 646, Elwood Ordnance Plant, Vol 100; see also maps of Ravenna Ordnance Plant, MS Ravenna Army Ammunition Plant.
- clxxxii. "Ordnance Plants" [Naval Administrative History 128], 204-233.
- clxxxiii. NARA, RG 156, Entry 646, Redstone Arsenal, passim.
- clxxxiv. Thomson and Mayo, Procurement and Supply, 128-129, 150-151; see also the various histories of ordnance activities in RG 156, Entry 646, cited elsewhere in this report.
- clxxxv. Thomson and Mayo, Procurement and Supply, 130-132.
- clxxxvi. Thomson and Mayo, Procurement and Supply, 189-207.
- clxxxvii. Fine and Remington, Construction in the United States, 341.
- clxxxviii. "Industry Ordnance Record of Production in World War II," Army Ordnance, 27 (November-December 1945):426.
- clxxxix. Thomson and Mayo, Procurement and Supply, 104.
- CXC. James V. Murray and John Swantek, The Watervliet Arsenal: A Chronology of the Nation's Oldest Arsenal, (Watervliet: Pubic Affairs Office, 1993), 208-211; National Register of Historic Places Nomination Forms, Watervliet Arsenal & Rock Island Arsenal, MSS, National Park Service, Washington D.C.
- CXCI. Murray and Swantek, The Watervliet Arsenal, 208-211; [John C. Kacharian], "Conservation, Development, Preservation Plan: The Historic Preservation Plan: Basic Information

---

and Inventory," Vol. 1 (MS, Directorate of Engineering and Housing, Watervliet Arsenal, 1986).

CXCii. Thomas J. Slattery, Rock Island Arsenal: An Arsenal for Democracy (Rock Island Arsenal: US Army Armament, Munitions, and Chemical Command, 1992), 7, 19-21.

CXCiii. Buford Rowland and William B. Boyd, U.S. Navy Bureau of Ordnance in World War II (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1953), 257; see also F. Taylor Peck, "A History of the Naval Gun Factory, Washington D.C." (Ph.D. diss., Georgetown University, 1950), 345-445.

CXCiv. "Ordnance Plants" [Naval Administrative History 128]; "Miscellaneous Activities" [Naval Administrative History 132].

CXCv. Rowland and Boyd, Navy Bureau of Ordnance in World War II, 252-253; "Ordnance Plants" [Naval Administrative History 128] 2: 249-270, 282-304.

CXCvi. "Ordnance Plants" [Naval Administrative History 128], 2: 332-365.

CXCvii. Thomson and Mayo, Procurement and Supply, 222-223.

CXCviii. RG 407, AG Central Decimal File, 352 (4-1-32); Russell F. Weigley, History of the United States Army (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984), 411.

CXCix. Thomson and Mayo, Procurement and Supply, 224.

CC. "Chrysler Builds a Tank Arsenal," Engineering News-Record (10 April 1941):10-42; Thomson and Mayo, Procurement and Supply, 228-229; Campbell, The Industry-Ordnance Team, 220-222.

CCi. "Chrysler Builds a Tank Arsenal," 41-42.

CCii. "Chrysler Builds a Tank Arsenal," 40.

CCiii. MacDonald and Mack, "Historic Properties Report: Detroit Arsenal" (MS, Building Technology Inc., Silver Spring, 1984), 22-25; "Chrysler Builds a Tank Arsenal," 40-42.

CCiv. Wesley W. Stout, Tanks Are Mighty Fine Things (Detroit: Chrysler Corporation, 1946), 21-23.

CCv. Thomson and Mayo, Procurement and Supply, 230, 242, 253.

CCvi. NARA, RG 156, Entry 646, Lima Ordnance Depot.

CCvii. Thomson and Mayo, Procurement and Supply, 240.

CCviii. Jeffery K. Smart, U.S. Army Chemical Research, Development and Engineering Center Historical Highlights (Edgewood Arsenal: Chemical Research, Development and Engineering Center, 1988), 4-6.

CCix. Smart, Historical Highlights, 6-9.

---

CCX. Leo P. Brophy, Wyndham D. Miles and Rexmond C. Cochrane, *The Chemical Warfare Service: From Laboratory to Field* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1959), 253-254.

CCXi. Brophy, Miles, and Cochrane, *From Laboratory to Field*, 255-257; Leo P. Brophy and George J. B. Fisher, *The Chemical Warfare Service: Organizing for War* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1959), 120-121.

CCXii. Brophy, Miles, and Cochran, *From Laboratory to Field*, 254-255.

CCXiii. Rowland and Boyd, *Navy Bureau of Ordnance*, 90-91 and *passim*.

CCXiv. Paolo E. Coletta, *United States Navy and Marine Corps Bases, Domestic* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1985), 217-219.

CCXv. Coletta, *Navy and Marine Corps Bases, Domestic*, 254-258; Lisa Poole, *Torpedo Town, U.S.A.: A History of the Naval Undersea Warfare Engineering Station, 1914-1989* (Keyport, Washington: Diamond Anniversary Publishing, 1989).

CCXvi. Coletta, *Navy and Marine Corps Bases, Domestic*, 219, 254-255; Rowland and Boyd, *Navy Bureau of Ordnance in World War II*, 125-126; "Naval Torpedo Station Newport" [*Naval Administrative History Number 130*].

CCXvii. Rowland and Boyd, *Navy Bureau of Ordnance* 126-128; "Ordnance Plants" [*Administrative History 128*] 119-123; "Naval Torpedo Station, Newport" [*Naval Administrative History 130*].

CCXviii. "Permanent Plant for Torpedoes," *Architectural Record* (April 1944):68-73.

CCXix. "Bureau of Ordnance Miscellaneous" [*Naval Administrative History 132*], 77-207.

CCXX. "Ordnance Plants" [*Naval Administrative History 128*], 1: 1-142.

CCXXi. "Ordnance Plants" [*Naval Administrative History 128*], 2: 282-304.

CCXXii. Martin Caidin, *Air Force: A History of American Air Power* (New York: Bramhall House, 1966), 80, 82.

CCXXiii. Irving B. Holley Jr., *Buying Aircraft: Materiel Procurement for the Army Air Forces* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972), 490.

CCXXiv. U.S. Air Force Historical Studies Division, *Legislative History of the AAF and USAF 1941-1945* (Maxwell AFB: Air University, 1955), 16.

CCXXv. Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 481.

CCXXvi. USAF Historical Studies Division, *Legislative History of the AAF and USAF*, 17.

CCXXvii. USAF Historical Studies Division, *Legislative History of the AAF and USAF*, 17.



---

CCXXVIII. United States Army Service of Supply, "Report to the Congress, 1942" (MS, U.S. Air Force Historical Research Center, Maxwell AFB).

CCXXIX. "Building Bomber Assembly Plants." *Engineering News-Record* (October 1942):133-136.

CCXXX. Service of Supply, "End of Year Report to Congress, 1942," 170.

CCXXXI. Robert Mueller, *Air Force Bases, Active Air Force Bases Within the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1989), 63, 105, 405, 453; personal communication, Keith Kilner, Carswell AFB, September 17, 1993.

CCXXXII. William F. Trimble, *Wings for the Navy: A History of the Naval Aircraft Factory, 1917-1956* (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1990), 234-309.

CCXXXIII. D'Ann Campbell, *Women at War with America: Private Lives in a Patriotic Era* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984), 111-137.

CCXXXIV. Karen Anderson, *Wartime Women: Sex Roles, Family Relations, and the Status of Women During World War II* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1981), 44-49.

CCXXXV. Martha J. Ziegler, *Women's Employment in Artillery Ammunition Plants, [Women's Bureau Bulletin Number 192-2]* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1942), 4-12; NARA, RG 156, Entry 646, Lone Star Ordnance Plant, Vol. 2; [Vogel], *Kingsbury*, 63-68; Chester W. Gregory, "The Problem of Labor During World War II: The Employment of Women in Defense Production," (Ph.D. diss., Ohio State University, 1969), 161-178.

CCXXXVI. Zeigler, *Women in Artillery Ammunition Plants*, 15-16; Campbell, *Women at War with America*, 124-125.

CCXXXVII. Gregory, "Problem of Labor During World War II," 121-160; Shelia T. Litchman, "Women at Work, 1941-1945: Wartime Employment in the San Francisco Bay Area," (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Davis, 1981), *passim*; Dorothy K. Newman, *Employing Women in Shipyards, [Women's Bureau Bulletin Number 192-6]* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1944), *passim*.

CCXXXVIII. Arnold S. Lott, *A Long Line of Ships: Mare Island's Century of Naval Activity in California* (Annapolis: Naval Institute Press, 1954), 224.

CCXXXIX. Neil Wynn, *The Afro-American and the Second World War* (London: Elek, 1976), 39-44; Richard Polenberg, *War and Society: The United States, 1941-1945* (New York: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1972), 102-105.

CCXL. *Minnesota Times* (Twin Cities), 15 October 1945; [Vogel], *Kingsbury*, 68-70; "Ordnance Plants" [*Naval Administrative History* 128], 230-233.

CCXLI. Kathryn Blood, *Negro Women War Workers, [Women's Bureau Bulletin Number 205]* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1945), *passim*.

CCXLII. Polenberg, *War and Society*, 139.

---

CCXliii. Charles D. Mosher, *The Scioto Ordnance Plant and the Marion Engineer Depot* (Marion: Marion County Historical Society, 1987), 29; Louise M. Reh, *Nipsic to Nimitz: A Centennial History of Puget Sound Naval Shipyard* (Bremerton: Federal Managers' Association, 1991), 106-109.

CCXliv. Federal Public Housing Authority, *Public Housing: The Work of the U.S. Federal Public Housing Authority* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1946), 4-11.

CCXlv. NARA, RG 156, Entry 646, *Histories of Ordnance Facilities, Radford Ordnance Works*, 175-186.

CCXlvi. Polenberg, *War and Society*, 139-153.

CCXlvii. Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 393-407, 456; Thomson and Mayo, *Procurement and Supply*, 372-373.

CCXlviii. Patricia L. Dooley, "Gopher Ordnance Works: Condemnation, Construction, and Community Response," *Minnesota History* 49 (Summer 1985):215-228.

ccxlix. Gene Gurney, *The Pentagon* (New York: Crown Publishers, 1964), 3-5.

ccl. Lenore Fine and Jesse Remington, *The Corps of Engineers: Construction in the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972), 431.

ccli. Gurney, *The Pentagon*, 4-6.

cclii. Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 435-437.

ccliii. Gurney, *The Pentagon*, 9; Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 511.

ccliv. For a history of the Pentagon, see Alfred Goldberg, *The Pentagon: The First Fifty Years* (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Secretary of Defense, 1992).

cclv. Vincent C. Jones, *Manhattan: The Army and the Atomic Bomb* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1985), 13-15, 28-31; F. G. Gosling, *The Manhattan Project: Science in the Second World War* (Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Energy, 1990), 9.

cclvi. Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 650-653.

cclvii. Leslie Groves, *Now It Can Be Told: The Story of the Manhattan Project* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962), 8-17 and passim.

cclviii. Jones, *Manhattan*, 9-10, 28.

cclix. Jones, *Manhattan*, 28-30, 184-191.

cclx. Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 657, 666.

cclxi. Gosling, *The Manhattan Project*. 21-24; Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 672, 684, 692.

cclxii. Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 666 and passim.

---

cclxiii. Groves, *Now It Can Be Told*, 111-112; Gosling, *The Manhattan Project*, 24; Jones, *Manhattan*, 156-168.

cclxiv. Jones, *Manhattan*, 28-30, 184-191.

cclxv. Jones, *Manhattan*, 331-332; Gosling, *The Manhattan Project*, 32; Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 666.

cclxvi. Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 688 and passim.

cclxvii. Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 682-683.

cclxviii. Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 693-701.

cclxix. Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 668.

cclxx. Lenore Fine and Jesse A. Remington, *The Corps of Engineers: Construction in the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972), 309-335.

cclxxi. Rodney Carlisle, *Powder and Propellants: Energetic Materials at Indian Head Maryland, 1890-1990* (Washington, D.C.: United States Navy, 1990), 75-76.

cclxxii. A. Bailey, *Explosives, Propellants and Pyrotechnics* (London: Brassey's, 1989), 11-17.

cclxxiii. E. R. Woodward, "Significance of Ammonia in the National Defense," *Chemical and Metallurgical Engineering*, February 1941, 117-119; War Assets Administration, *The Disposal of Synthetic Ammonia Plants* (Washington, D.C.: War Assets Administration, 1946); Levin H. Campbell *The Industry-Ordnance Team* (New York: Whittlesey House, 1946), 259-260.

cclxxiv. Carlisle, *Powder and Propellants*, 22-23; see also the HAER documentation for Picatinny Arsenal, MS Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division, [14 Dov V 2-c]; War Department, *Military Explosives [TM 9-2900]* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1940), 6-31.

cclxxv. War Department, *Military Explosives [TM 9-2900]*, August 1940, 37-38.

cclxxvi. NARA, RG 156, Entry 646, Radford Ordnance Works, Box A148.

cclxxvii. Constance M. Green, Harry Thomson, and Peter C. Roots *The Ordnance Department: Planning Munitions for War* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1955), 351-352.

cclxxviii. C. G. Storm, "Military Smokeless Powder," *Army Ordnance* 21 (July-August 1940):20-23.

cclxxix. Green, Thomson, and Roots, *Planning Munitions for War*, 353-355.

cclxxx. Berkeley R. Lewis and C.R. Rosa, "History of the Ordnance Department in World War II, Monograph #4, Ammunition" MS (microfiche), AMCCOM History Office, Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, pp. 27-28.

---

cclxxxii. Carl R. Dutton, "Military High Explosives," *Army Ordnance* 20 (May-June 1940):389-393.

cclxxxiii. Harry C. Thomson and Lida Mayo, *The Ordnance Department: Procurement and Supply* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960), 135.

cclxxxiv. Thomson and Mayo, *Procurement and Supply*, 134-135.

cclxxxv. NARA, RG 156, Entry 646, *Volunteer Ordnance Works*, Volume 2.

cclxxxvi. NARA, RG 156, Entry 646, *Volunteer Ordnance Works*, Volume 2.

cclxxxvii. NARA, RG 156, Entry 646, *Volunteer Ordnance Works*, Volume 2.

cclxxxviii. NARA, RG 156, Entry 646, A119, *Louisiana Ordnance Plant*, 101-102.

cclxxxix. Buford Rowland and William B. Boyd, *U.S. Navy Bureau of Ordnance in World War II* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1954), 204-206.

ccxc. Rowland and Boyd, *Navy Bureau of Ordnance*, 202.

ccxc. For specific installations see the Completion Reports contained in NARA, RG 77.

ccxc. War Department, *Artillery Ammunition*, [TM 9-1901] (Washington, D.C.: War Department, 1944), 4-208.

ccxc. Harry Thomson and Lida Mayo, *The Ordnance Department: Procurement and Supply* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960), 129, 151-152.

ccxc. Thomson and Mayo, *Procurement and Supply*, 114- 115. After the war, shell forging equipment was added to some installations, including the Louisiana Ordnance Plant, see MacDonald and Mack, "Louisiana Army Ammunition Plant" (MS, Building Technology Inc., Silver Spring, Maryland, 1984).

ccxc. National Archives and Record Administration, RG 156, Entry 646, *Kansas Ordnance Plant*, Box A100, Volume I, 7-8.

ccxc. NARA, RG 156, Entry 646, *Kansas Ordnance Plant*, Box A 100, Volume 6; L.A. Quayle, "Volumetric Pouring Machine," *Mechanical Engineering* 67 (September 1945):599-606.

ccxc. NARA, RG 156, Entry 646, *Kansas Ordnance Plant*, Volume 110, part 4.

ccxc. For discussions of amatol, see the histories of *Kansas Ordnance Plant*, *Lone Star Ordnance Plant*, *Elwood Ordnance Plant*, and *Louisiana Ordnance Plant*, all contained in NARA, RG 156, Entry 646.

ccxc. Constance M. Green, Harry Thomson, and Peter C. Roots, *Planning Munitions for War* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1955), 367, 464; Benedict Crowell, *The Armies of Industry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1921), 183.

ccxc. For example, see RG 156, Entry 646, *Lone Star Ordnance Plant*, *Louisiana Ordnance Plant*, and *Cornhusker Ordnance Plant*.

---

ccc. Levin H. Campbell, *The Industry Ordnance Team* (New York: Whittlesey House, 1946), 83, 124-25; Thomson and Mayo, *Procurement and Supply*, 121-123; NARA, RG 156, Entry 646, Elwood Ordnance Plant, Vol 100; William Voight, comp. "Ordnance War Administration History," Series II Study No 11, "GOCO Facilities Directory" (MSS (microfiche) AMCCOM Historical Office, Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois); "Ordnance Plants," [Naval Administrative Histories of World War II Number 128] (MSS, Navy Department Library, Washington Navy Yard), 204-233.

ccci. NARA, RG 156, Entry 646, Lone Star Ordnance Plant, Volume 2.

cccii. *Field Artillery, Basic* (Harrisburg: Military Service Publishing Company, 1943), 674.

ccciii. *Field Artillery*, 643-644.

ccciv. NARA, RG 77, Completion Reports, Lone Star Ordnance Plant.

cccv. Berkeley R. Lewis and C. R. Rosa, "History of the Ordnance Department in World War II, Monograph #4, Ammunition (MS [microfiche] AMCCOM Historical Office, Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois), 11-13.

cccvi. Harry C. Thomson and Lida Mayo, *The Ordnance Department: Procurement and Supply* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960), 191-192.

cccvii. Thomson and Mayo, *Procurement and Supply*, 194-195.

cccviii. Thomson and Mayo, *Procurement and Supply*, 195-200.

cccix. Charles O. Herb, "Small Arms Ammunition from one of Remington's New Plants" in *Ordnance Production Methods*, ed. Charles O. Herb (New York: The Industrial Press, 1951), 2-17.

cccix. Herb, "Small Arms Ammunition," 18-21.

cccxi. Herb, "Small Arms Ammunition," 21-24.

cccxi. Thomson and Mayo, *Procurement and Supply*, 206.

cccxi. Thomson and Mayo, *Procurement and Supply*, 206-208.

ccciv. "Small Arms Ammunition Plants," *The Architectural Forum* (December 1942):61-91; Thomson and Mayo, *Procurement and Supply*, 204.

cccxi. Harry C. Thomson and Lida Mayo, *The Ordnance Department: Procurement and Supply*, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office: 1960), 360-361; National Park Service, Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record, "Historic Properties Report, Picatinny Arsenal" (MS, Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey, 1985), 29-31.

cccvi. Thomson and Mayo, *Procurement and Supply*, 361, 368; Lenore Fine and Jesse Remington, *The Corps of Engineers: Construction in the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972), 333.

cccvii. Thomson and Mayo, *Procurement and Supply*, 368-369, 378; National Archives and Record Administration, RG 156, Entry 646, Seneca Ordnance Depot and Letterkenny Ordnance Depot.

cccviii. Fine and Remington, *Construction in the United States*, 530-531; "Simplified

---

Design for Munitions Igloos," *Engineering News-Record* (4 November 1943):92-94; Francis R MacLeay, "Concrete Beehive for Munitions Storage," *Engineering News-Record* (26 March 1942):74-75.

cccix. Thomson and Mayo, *Procurement and Supply*, 366-368, 387-388.

cccxx. Thomson and Mayo, *Procurement and Supply*, 363-375.

cccxxi. Thomson and Mayo, *Procurement and Supply*, 378.

cccxxii. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases in World War II* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office), 1: 323-325.

cccxxiii. Robert L. Reid and Thomas E. Rodgers, *A Good Neighbor: The First Fifty Years of Crane* (Evansville: University of Southern Indiana, 1991), 47-49.

cccxxiv. Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 331.

cccxxv. "Selected Ammunition Depots" (MS [Naval Administrative Histories, No. 127], Navy Department Library, Washington Navy Yard), passim.

cccxxvi. Bureau of Yards & Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 327-331; Coletta, *Navy and Marine Corps Bases, Domestic*, 370-371.

cccxxvii. Robert L. Allen, *The Port Chicago Mutiny* (New York: Warner Books, 1989); Bureau of Yards and Docks, *Building the Navy's Bases*, 1: 331-338, 344-345.

cccxxviii. Levin H. Campbell, *The Industry-Ordnance Team* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1946), 39.

cccxxix. Grant Hildebrand, *Designing for Industry: The Architecture of Albert Kahn* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1974), 3.

cccxxx. Nikolaus Pevsner, *A History of Building Types: The A. W. Mellon Lectures in the Fine Arts, 1970* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976), 288; Kenneth Frampton, *Modern Architecture: A Critical History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 111.

cccxxxi. Pevsner, *A History of Building Types*, 286.

cccxxxii. Hildebrand, *Designing for Industry*, 3.

cccxxxiii. Richard Guy Wilson, Dianne H. Pilgrim, and Dickran Tashjian, *The Machine Age in America: 1918-1941* (New York: The Brooklyn Museum, 1986), 185.

cccxxxiv. Albert Halsey, "Factories," in *Forms and Functions of 20th Century Architecture*, ed. Talbot Hamlin (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952), 201.

cccxxxv. Reyner Banham, *A Concrete Atlantis: U.S. Industrial Building and European Modern Architecture 1900-1925* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1986), 8.

cccxxxvi. Henry-Russell Hitchcock, "The 'International Style' Twenty Years After," *Architectural Record* 110 (1952): 89-97.

cccxxxvii. Wilson, Pilgrim, and Tashjian, *The Machine Age*, 185.

- 
- cccxxxviii. Pevsner, *A History of Building Types*, 286.
- cccxxxix. Halsey, "Factories," 193.
- cccxl. Halsey, "Factories," 191.
- cccxli. Hildebrand, *Designing for Industry*, 91.
- cccxlii. Halsey, "Factories," 197.
- cccxlili. Halsey, "Factories," 197.
- cccxliv. Halsey, "Factories," 201.
- cccxlv. Banham, *A Concrete Atlantis*, 31.
- cccxlv. Halsey, "Factories," 197.
- cccxlvii. "Factory Buildings," *Architectural Record* 85 (June 1939): 99.
- cccxlviii. Talbot Hamlin, "Factories as Architecture," *Pencil Points* 21 (August 1940): 472.
- cccclix. Hamlin, "Factories as Architecture," 474.
- ccccli. Halsey, "Factories," 197.
- ccccli. "Small Arms Ammunition Plants: Smith, Hinchman, & Grylls, Inc. Architects & Engineers," *Architectural Forum* 77 (December 1942):76-77.
- ccccli. W. Hawkins Ferry, *The Legacy of Albert Kahn* (Detroit: The Detroit Institute of Arts, 1970; Detroit: The Wayne State University Press, 1987), 8-10.
- ccccliii. Ferry, *The Legacy of Albert Kahn*, 9.
- ccccliv. Ferry, *The Legacy of Albert Kahn*, 11.
- cccclv. Theodore A. Sande, "American Industrial Architecture from the Late 18th Century to the Mid-20th Century," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 35 (December 1976):271.
- cccclvi. Sande, "American Industrial Architecture," 271.
- cccclvii. Hildebrand, *Designing for Industry*, 60.
- cccclviii. Hildebrand, *Designing for Industry*, 60.
- cccclix. Hildebrand, *Designing for Industry*, 34.
- cccclx. Hildebrand, *Designing for Industry*, 39.
- cccclxi. Hildebrand, *Designing for Industry*, 91.
- cccclxii. Wilson, Pilgrim, and Tashjian, *The Machine Age*, 185.
- cccclxiii. Harry C. Thomson and Lida Mayo, *The Ordnance Department: Procurement and*

---

Supply (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1960), 104-105.

ccclxiv. Hildebrand, *Designing for Industry*, 197.

ccclxv. "Small Arms Ammunition Plants," 62.

ccclxvi. Albert Kahn, "Architecture in the National Defense Building Program," *Michigan National Architect* 15 (December 1941): 51.

ccclxvii. Lenore Fine and Jesse A. Remington, *The Corps of Engineers: Construction in the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972), 317.

ccclxviii. Albert Kahn, "Building Types Study: Industrial Buildings," *Architectural Record* 91 (January 1942): 69.

ccclxix. Kahn, "Industrial Buildings," 67.

ccclxx. Kahn, "Industrial Buildings," 67-72.

ccclxxi. Kahn, "Architecture in the National Defense Program," 52.

ccclxxii. MacDonald and Mack, "*Historic Properties Report: Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant New Brighton, Minnesota*" (MS, Building Technology, Inc., Silver Spring, Maryland, 1984), 19.

ccclxxiii. MacDonald and Mack, "Twin Cities", 21.

ccclxxiv. "Small Arms Ammunition Plants," 65.

ccclxxv. Smith, Hinchman, and Grylls, "Completion Report: Twin Cities Ordnance Plant", (MS, Twin Cities Army Ammunition Plant, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1942-1943), 17.

ccclxxvi. "Small Arms Ammunition Plants," 75.

ccclxxvii. MacDonald and Mack, "Twin Cities", 21.

ccclxxviii. "Small Arms Ammunition Plants," 70.

ccclxxix. MacDonald and Mack, "Twin Cities", 25.

ccclxxx. "Small Arms Ammunition Plants," 66.

ccclxxxi. Real Property Records (McAlester AAP, Minneapolis, Minnesota, August 10, 1993), 3.

ccclxxxii. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *National Register Bulletin 24: Guidelines for Local Surveys: A Basis for Preservation Planning* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1985): 12.

ccclxxxiii. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, *National Register Bulletin 15: How to Apply the National Register Criteria* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1991): 4 - 6.

ccclxxxiv. U.S. Department of the Interior, *National Register Bulletin 15*, 7-8.



- 
- ccclxxxv. U.S. Department of the Interior, *National Register Bulletin 15*, 5-6.
- ccclxxxvi. U.S. Department of the Interior, *National Register Bulletin 15*, 9.
- ccclxxxvii. U.S. Department of the Interior, *National Register Bulletin 15*, 9.
- ccclxxxviii. U.S. Department of the Interior, *National Register Bulletin 15*, 12.
8. U.S. Department of the Interior, *National Register Bulletin 15*, 12-13.
- cccxc. U.S. Department of the Interior, *National Register Bulletin 15*, 14-15.
- cccxc. U.S. Department of the Interior, *National Register Bulletin 15*, 18.
- cccxcii. U.S. Department of the Interior, *National Register Bulletin 15*, 20.
- cccxciii. U.S. Department of the Interior, *National Register Bulletin 15*, 20.
- cccxciv. U.S. Department of the Interior, *National Register Bulletin 15*, 45.
- cccxcv. U.S. Department of the Interior, *National Register Bulletin 15*, 46.
- cccxcvi. U.S. Department of the Interior, *National Register Bulletin 15*, 25-43.
- cccxcvii. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, History Division, *History and Prehistory in the National Park System and the National Historic Landmarks Program* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1987):1-10.
- cccxcviii. Emanuel R. Lewis, *Seacoast Fortifications of the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 1970).
- cccxcix. Katherine Grandine, et al., "Inventory, Evaluation, and Nomination of Military Installations: Naval Base Charleston" (MS, prepared by R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates, Inc., for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, 1994).