Appendix S

Historic Resources Evaluation Memorandum
November 4, 2019
Project Number 17-04453

City of Seaside
Attn: Kurt Overmeyer
Community and Economic Development Department
440 Harcourt Avenue
Seaside, California 93955

Subject: Historic Resources Evaluation Memorandum for Hammerhead Barracks at Fort Ord, Monterey County, California

Dear Mr. Overmeyer:

This report presents the findings of a historical resource evaluation of eight hammerhead bunkers at Ford Ord located in Seaside, Monterey County, California (subject property). The City of Seaside retained Rincon Consultants, Inc. (Rincon) to determine whether the subject property qualifies as a historical resource under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The present study included background and archival research, an intensive-level survey of the subject property, and preparation of this memorandum. All work was completed in compliance with CEQA and applicable local regulations.

Regulatory Setting

PRC §5024.1, Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines, and PRC §§21083.2 and 21084.1 were used as the basic guidelines for this historical resources evaluation. CEQA (§21084.1) requires that a lead agency determine if a project could have a significant effect on historical resources. A historical resource is one listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) (§21084.1), included in a local register of historical resources (§15064.5[a][2]), or any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that a lead agency determines to be historically significant (§15064.5[a][3]). Resources listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are automatically listed in the CRHR.

National Register of Historic Places

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 established the NRHP as “an authoritative guide to be used by Federal, State, and local governments, private groups and citizens to identify the Nation’s cultural resources and indicate what properties should be considered for protection from destruction or impairment.” (CFR 36 CFR 60.2) The NRHP recognizes properties that are significant at the national, state, and local levels and may include districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects. Resources eligible for listing in the NRHP must meet one of the following criteria:

Criterion A: Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;

Criterion B: Is associated with the lives of persons who are significant in our past;
Criterion C:  Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; and/or

Criterion D:  Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

In addition to meeting one of the criteria listed above, an NRHP-eligible property must retain historic integrity. Integrity is defined in National Register Bulletin 15 as the “ability of a property to convey its significance.” To assess integrity, the National Park Service recognizes seven aspects or qualities that, considered together, define historic integrity. To retain integrity, a property must possess several, if not all, of these seven qualities, which are defined in the following manner in National Register Bulletin 15:

Location:  The place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred;

Design:  The combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property;

Setting:  The physical environment of a historic property;

Materials:  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;

Workmanship:  The physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history or prehistory;

Feeling:  A property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time; and

Association:  The direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property.  

California Register of Historical Resources

The criteria for listing properties in the CRHR were developed in accordance with previously established eligibility criteria for the NRHP. The California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) regards “any physical evidence of human activities over 45 years old” as meriting recordation and evaluation. According to Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5024.1(c) (1–4), a resource may be considered historically significant if it retains integrity and meets at least one of the following criteria. A property may be listed in the CRHR if it meets one or more of the following Criteria and must “retain enough of their historic character or appearance to be recognizable as historical resources and to convey the reasons for their significance.”

Criterion 1:  Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;

Criterion 2:  Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

Criterion 3:  Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of installation, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or

3 California Office of Historic Preservation. Technical Assistance Series #7 How to Nominate a Resource to the California Register of Historical Resources. 2011.
Criterion 4: Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Activities that adversely alter the significance of a resource listed in or eligible for listing in the CRHR have a significant effect on the environment under CEQA. Impacts to historical resources from the proposed project are thus considered significant if the project would physically destroy or damage all or part of a resource, change the character of the use of the resource or physical feature within the setting of the resource that contributes to its significance, or introduce visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the integrity of significant features of the resource.

City of Seaside

Chapter 17 Section 68 of the City of Seaside Municipal Code delineates the City’s policies on Historic and Cultural Resource Preservation and the procedures through which a resource would be designated a Historic Landmark by the City Council, as follows:

The Council may designate an improvement, natural feature, or site as an historic landmark and any area within the City as an historic district in compliance with this section, based on the Council’s evaluation of the age of the affected structures, distinguishing characteristics, distinct geographical area, familiar visual feature, significant achievement, and/or other distinctive feature.

In addition, the Historic Preservation Element of the City of Seaside General Plan contains the following goals and policies relating to cultural resources that are relevant and/or applicable to the current Project:

Goal COS-5. Protect high sensitivity archaeological resources, architecturally significant buildings, and historic places.

Policy COS-5.1. Identify and conserve archeological, architectural, and historic resources within Seaside.

Implementation Plan COS-5.1.1 Assess and Mitigate Impacts to Cultural Resources. Continue to assess development proposals for potential impacts to sensitive historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Implementation Plan COS-5.1.1a. For structures that potentially have historic significance, require that a study be conducted by a professional archaeologist or historian to determine the actual significance of the structure and potential impacts of the proposed development in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. The City may require modification of the project and/or mitigation measures to avoid any impact to a historic structure, when feasible.

Methods

Archival and Background Research

Archival research was completed in September and October 2019 and focused on the review of a variety of primary and secondary source materials relating to the history and development of the subject property and its surroundings. Sources included, but were not limited to, historic maps and photographs, contemporary newspaper articles, and written histories of the area. The following is a list of sources consulted in order to conduct research pertaining to the subject property.
• Historic aerial photographs, USGS topographic maps, and city directory listings compiled by Environmental Data Research (EDR), Inc.
• Historic aerial photographs accessed digitally via Nationwide Environmental Title Research (NETR) Online, Inc. and the University of California, Santa Barbara Map & Imagery Lab
• Historic newspaper articles accessed digitally via newspapers.com
• Historic photographs accessed using the Online Archive of California (OAC) and Calisphere (University of California)
• Fort Ord Reuse Authority

Intensive-Level Field Survey
Rincon conducted a historical resources field survey of the subject property on October 2, 2019. The survey consisted of a visual inspection of the eight subject buildings on the property to assess overall condition and integrity, and to identify and document any potential character-defining features. Observations were recorded using detailed notes and digital photographs. The built features were recorded and evaluated on California Department Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 series forms, which are included as an attachment.

Brief Historical Context

Fort Ord
The history of Fort Ord aligns closely with the military events of the early and mid-twentieth century. Facing increased threats abroad in the face of World War I, the United States grew increasingly attentive to its military holdings and purchased large swaths of land across the country to train and accommodate a burgeoning number of soldiers. From 1916 to 1918, numerous camps were established to prepare troops for combat. In 1917, the military purchased the 15,000-acre Gigling Reservation located just north of Monterey to establish the artillery training field known as the Gigling Field Artillery Range (Foundling and Warner 2008). Construction at the base continued after the cessation of World War I in 1918, further securing the fort’s role as a new major military base on the west coast. In 1933, the camp was renamed “Fort Ord” after Major General Edward Ortho Cresap Ord, a 19th First Lieutenant of the Presidio of Monterey and surveyor of land that would later become the city of Los Angeles (Foundling and Warner 2008).

In the mid-twentieth century, international and national pressures forced the military to expand its resources at Fort Ord. The onset of World War II exacerbated these efforts and in 1940, the San Francisco Examiner reported that the camp was set to receive an additional 3,800 officers, bringing the military garrison to 27,000 men and “making it the greatest regular Army post on the Pacific Coast” (San Francisco Examiner 1940). Between 1940 and 1941, a transfer of thousands of additional personnel from the California and North Dakota National Guards further increased the fort’s active population (Coster 1940). The fort also increased its land holdings in this period; in 1940, over 5,000 acres were added to the fort to accommodate the influx of personnel stationed at Fort Ord. As evidenced in a 1940 photograph, temporary lodgings housed many of the camp’s recent arrivals (Foundling and Warner 2008; Figure 1). A second, likely contemporaneous photograph shows a close-up of these tents (Figure 2).
Figure 1  Fort Ord, Temporary Housing in 1940

Source: Calisphere: University of California

Figure 2  Fort Ord, Detail of Temporary Housing

Source: Calisphere: University of California
Many celebrated infantry divisions trained at the fort before fighting abroad during World War II. Famous troops included the Third Division, notorious for blazing “a victorious path from Africa, through Italy and France, into Germany,” and named the “best damned fighting outfit in the war” by General George S. Patton Jr; the Seventh Division, which fought the Japanese in Attu, the Marshalls, and Okinawa and which the war department dubbed one of the “hottest” units in the Pacific; and the 43rd Division, famous for defeating the Japanese on Luzon in the Philippines (Finnerty 1945).

Three years after the culmination of World War II, another significant event occurred at Fort Ord. In 1948, Executive Order 9981 officially desegregated the United States military. This order was a momentous event for Fort Ord, which became the first integrated training division (MacGregor 2001). A month after its passage, The Californian ran a story that claimed the fort was one of three “colored troop training center[s] in the United States” (The Californian 1948). As a result of this desegregation, the number of black military personnel and their families nearly doubled the population of Seaside in less than a decade (McKibben 2009).

In the 1950s, Cold War tensions compelled the U.S. to again focus on the military and, as a result, an unprecedented number of military personnel were retained for duty (ACHP 2006). To accommodate this increase, the Army designated Fort Ord a permanent post and began a new phase of construction at the fort. Shortly after construction of the subject hammerhead buildings in 1958, the Army requested $124 million from Congress to replace all the World War II temporary wood buildings at the fort with concrete block and reinforced concrete buildings. Although the new construction phase was focused on housing, the fort also received general site improvements including the construction of taxiways, aircraft parking areas, aircraft fuel storage areas, a control tower, a hangar, and a fire and rescue station during this period (San Francisco Examiner 1958).

During the Vietnam War, the fort became the chief training center in the nation (Foundling and Warner 2008). The fort was closed to outsiders in 1969 in response to increased public dissent regarding the Vietnam War. In 1970, over 3,000 demonstrators were threatened with gunfire when attempting to protest at the fort (Foundling and Warner 2008).

By the 1990s, the cost of operating the fort had reached a prohibitively high level, and in 1994 the fort was officially closed. Since that time the fort has remained vacant.

Hammerhead Barracks

The subject Hammerhead-style barracks at Fort Ord were constructed circa 1955, during the Cold War period of growth. Aerials from this period show the construction of the barracks as well as the fort’s general expansion in the mid-twentieth century. Aerials from 1938 and 1956 show the location of the barracks prior to and after their construction, respectively (Figure 3; Figure 4).
Figure 3  Aerial of Fort Ord Prior to Construction of Hammerhead Barracks (1938)

Source: UCSB

Figure 4  Aerial of Fort Ord After Construction of Hammerhead Barracks (1956)

Source: UCSB
The 1950s was a period of growth for the military as the Cold War increased pressure on advancing technologies and weaponry. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) recognizes how building designs reflected this expansion:

The DoD maintained a standing force of unprecedented size during the Cold War; the Army retained almost 900,000 personnel during the 1950s. Faced with the task of providing adequate housing for that many soldiers, the Army reverted to the use of standardized plans for permanent construction of UPH. As reported to Congress: “The use of standardized plans saves in design costs, saves time in initiation of work, and provides uniformity throughout the Army. Where such plans are used, the only additional design work necessary at a specific site is to adapt the structure to the local terrain and existing utilities systems.” (U.S. Congress, House. Hearings Before the Committee on Armed Services, Military and Naval Construction, 82nd Congress, 2nd Session, p. 3966)

Cold War Era sleeping facilities were predominantly provided in squad rooms with partial partitions. Dormitory style rooms were provided for the top four grades of enlisted personnel, at Service schools with substantial out-of-classroom study, and where there was shift-type work. In the 1950s, accommodating all company functions in a single building was the prime consideration in the design of barracks. Hammerhead and H-style barracks consolidated troop housing, dining facilities, and administration facilities into one building. (ACHP 2006).

The design of the Hammerhead barracks was popular between 1951 and 1957 and their siting was often removed from other buildings, reflecting a shift towards vehicular travel around the fort (Delgado-Howard 2018). The eight subject buildings were constructed circa 1955 as part of approximately 31 buildings total, which were designed to accommodate thousands of enlisted men (Santa Cruz Sentinel 1955). The barracks were concrete and featured attached kitchen and dining hall facilities (Musser 2016).

In 1971, the Secretary of Defense awarded the army $25 million to study and improve service members living conditions in a program known as Project VOLAR (Delgado-Howard 2018). This project considered Fort Ord as well as Fort Carson in Colorado and Fort Benning in George. It was likely a result of this program that the subject barracks at Fort Ord were transformed from an open floorplan into dorm-style housing. Since the closure of Fort Ord, approximately 22 of the original 31 barracks have been demolished.

Findings

The field survey and archival research conducted for this study identified the eight hammerhead buildings as dating to circa 1955. These eight buildings are collectively referred to as the subject property in the following narrative. They were collectively recorded and evaluated on California Department of Parks and Recreation 523 series forms (DPR forms), which are attached to this memorandum and summarized below.

Physical Description

The subject property consists of eight hammerhead barracks built circa 1955 and renovated in the 1970s. Situated in four rows of two along a north-south axis, the eight 18,000-square-foot barracks are identical in shape and design. Overall, the buildings feature concrete exteriors and flat roofs with slightly projecting eaves. Built of reinforced concrete, each barracks is comprised of two ells: a three-story
rectangular dormitory wing, or “handle,” and a perpendicularly placed “L”-shaped kitchen/mess hall wing, or “head.” The name “hammerhead” is derived from the building’s shape, which resembles a hammer.

The buildings’ “handles” are four stories tall, including a basement, and are characterized by their relatively uniform and unornamented façades. The north and south façades are broken into slightly recessed bays, the verticality of which sharply contrasts with the buildings’ otherwise low forms. These elevations have an emphasis on light with ribbons of three-light windows (Figure 5; Figure 6). These windows feature a single transom light above a two-light awning window. Doorways along this façade are recessed and accessible through a large metal-framed doorway with double transom windows. Doors are typically metal and industrial (Figure 7).

The heads of the buildings are one-story in height and feature large three-over-three light awning windows with metal surrounds (Figure 8). Single-hung metal windows are also visible along some elevations. Concrete pilasters slightly project along these elevations and the handle is accessible via concrete stairways with metal hand railings (Figure 9). The heads of the buildings connect to the handles via bays with large four-over-six awning windows (Figure 10). The ends of the handles are relatively nondescript and feature no windows and a minimal eave overhang (Figure 11).

The center of the property is defined by a looping road that provides access to the buildings from the north and south; smaller thruways allow access between individual buildings. The central island of the property features numerous mature trees as well as two tennis courts. According to aerials, three identical groupings of eight hammerhead barracks were located immediately north of the extant barracks. These buildings were demolished in 2016 (NETR 2019). Only one additional full hammerhead is extant north of the subject buildings, identified as “Student Services.” Additionally, three ends or “heads” of hammerhead buildings are shown as extant in GoogleEarth imagery; it is unclear if they are still standing at the time of this report.

The below photographs of Building HH4442 reflect the cohesive and uniform design that characterizes all eight buildings. The buildings are in poor condition and have sustained damage due to their vacancy and general deferred maintenance.
Figure 5  North Elevation, Handle, HH4442

Figure 6  South Elevation, Handle, HH4442
Figure 9  Northeast Corner, Head, HH4442

Figure 10  East and South Elevations, Head, HH4442
Historical Evaluation

Evaluation of the subject property was informed by the *California Historic Military Buildings and Structures Inventory Volume II: Historic Context* and the ACHP’s Public Comment regarding Unaccompanied Personnel Housing during the Cold War.

The *California Historic Military Buildings and Structures Inventory Volume II* identifies various themes, property types, and registration requirements for Colonial- to Cold War-era military properties. This context only identifies Cold War-era buildings that are significant as industrial or administrative purposes; however it provides some broader perspective on military buildings constructed during this period. Completed in 2000, Cold War-era resources were just reaching the 50-year age requirement for designation when the context was completed:

The modern architecture of military buildings, like modern architecture generally, is difficult to appreciate in context, because it is a relatively new phenomenon. Nonetheless, the better examples of this style on military bases rank with the better examples of civilian design. Caution should be exercised, however, in evaluating modern architecture as it has been expressed in military design. The two examples that have been found to qualify in this regard, the Michelson Laboratory and Building A33, have two advantages that will rarely be duplicated: both are highly significant under Criterion A and they are 50 years old or nearly 50 years old (the Michelson Laboratory was completed in 1948, Building A33 is 1950-51). The buildings qualify for the National Register primarily on the basis of the scientific work that was accomplished there; architectural significance is secondary.
Figure 7  Typical Doorway

Figure 8  North Elevation, Head, HH4442
In 2003, the Army completed a study in support of analyzing UPH, *Unaccompanied Personnel Housing (UPH) During the Cold War (1946-1989)*. In 2006, the ACHP issued a Program Comment regarding the 2,524 Cold War era unaccompanied housing buildings that were constructed from 1946 to 1974. This program provided guidance for public agencies on how to meet requirements established in Section 106 of the NHPA regarding properties that may be eligible for listing in the NRHP. This Program Comment defined the term UPH as “all buildings and structures, listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, that were designed and built as UPH in the years 1946-1974, regardless of use” (ACHP 2006). The ACHP also identified specific considerations for the significance of UPH dating to the Cold War:

> The historic significance of Cold War UPH lies in their association with developing trends associated with the build-up of the military to support the Cold War. As the size of the military increased, and Congress placed limits on funding available for housing, the Military Departments developed standardized barracks plans to meet the needs of its unaccompanied enlisted personnel. The development of permanent housing for a large standing military of enlisted personnel reflects the response to the Cold War, and therefore the properties are potentially significant as a class of resources under Criterion A of the National Register Criteria for their association with the events, activities, and patterns of the Cold War build-up, though properties may not be individually eligible (ACHP 2006).

**Individual Eligibility**

The eight hammerhead barracks at Fort Ord are recommended individually ineligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, or for designation as a City of Seaside Historical Landmark pursuant to any applicable designation criteria.

The subject resource was constructed circa 1955 at the height of the Cold War. Unlike the examples provided in the *California Historic Military Buildings and Structures Inventory Volume II*, the subject buildings were not directly associated with scientific work that made a dramatic difference to the state of military affairs during the Cold War. However, it does appear that the subject buildings are associated with the general build-up of the military to support war efforts in the mid-twentieth century. These hammerhead barracks were eight of approximately 31 Cold War-era barracks at Fort Ord. According to GoogleEarth imagery, of these 31 barracks, only one full hammerhead building to the north identified as “student services,” three “heads” of original buildings, and the subject eight hammerheads are still extant. As recognized by the ACHP, UPH significance must be considered within the larger context of the fort as a “class of resources under Criterion A” and they likely “may not be individually eligible.” Additionally, while Fort Ord was the site the first integrated training division, this event occurred in 1948 prior to construction of the subject buildings and there is no information to suggest they are directly associated with it. For this reason, the buildings are recommended ineligible for listing as individual resources pursuant to Criteria A/1 in the NRHP, CRHR, or for designation as a City of Seaside Historical Landmark pursuant to Criteria A/1 for their association with military growth during the Cold War.

Research did not suggest that the subject resource is associated with an important person who made demonstrably important contributions to local, state, or national history. Although the barracks were constructed after the fort was racially integrated in 1938, the archival record did not suggest that these buildings were significant with any persons associated with this desegregation. While many notable military personnel trained and taught at Fort Ord during its active period, it appears that most events that encompassed such person’s significance happened while completing active military duty in other
parts of the world. For this reason, the buildings are recommended ineligible for listing as individual resources pursuant to Criteria B/2 in the NRHP, CRHR, or for designation as a City of Seaside Historic Landmark for an association with notable persons.

The subject resource was not designed by a notable architect and is not a significant early example of hammerhead barrack design. The eight buildings date to circa 1955 whereas hammerhead barracks were completed from 1951 to 1957. Therefore, the subject buildings were not a prototype, nor early example, of this type of barrack design. Rather, the buildings were completed at the height of its popularity and are eight of the 2,524 UPH buildings constructed between 1946 and 1974 (ACHP 2006). Moreover, the ACHP acknowledges that most significant UPH buildings are notable for their association with events, rather than architecture. The subject buildings do not represent the work of a master nor do they possess high artistic values. For this reason, the buildings are recommended ineligible for listing as individual resources pursuant to Criteria C/3 in the NRHP, CRHR, or for designation as a City of Seaside Historic Landmark for distinctive design or construction.

A review of available evidence and records search results did not indicate the property might yield information important to history or prehistory. For this reason, the buildings are recommended ineligible for listing as individual resources pursuant to Criteria D/4 in the NRHP, CRHR, or for designation as a City of Seaside Historic Landmark for information potential.

Historic District Eligibility

Previous evaluations that considered the entirety of the Fort Ord base were completed at the time of its decommission in the 1990s. Between 1993 and 1994, five reports recorded the results of archaeological and historic resource surveys for Fort Ord. These reports identified a number of properties eligible for listing in the NRHP, including Henneken’s Ranch and the Windmill Site (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1995). As later recorded in the Fort Ord Reuse Plan EIR, the Army and California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) concluded that “Stilwell Hall and 35 structures in the East Garrison area were the only former Fort Ord properties eligible for listing on the NRHP” (EMC Planning Group Inc. and EDAW Inc. 1997). As such, there is no evidence to suggest the subject buildings contribute to any historic district.

Conclusions

As detailed above, the subject property was found ineligible for federal, state, or local designation under any applicable designation criteria and is therefore not considered a historical resource under CEQA. Should you have any questions concerning this study, please do not hesitate to contact any of the undersigned.

Sincerely,

Rincon Consultants, Inc.

Alexandra Madsen, MA
Architectural Historian

Steven Treffers, MHP
Senior Architectural Historian
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California DPR 523 Series Forms
P2. Location: □Not for Publication ■Unrestricted
   *b. USGS 7.5' Quad: Seaside
   *c. Address: Fort Ord, Reservation Road
   *e. Other Locational Data: N/A

*P3a. Description:
The subject property consists of eight hammerhead barracks built circa 1955 and renovated in the 1970s. Situated in four rows of two along a north-south axis, the eight 18,000-square-foot barracks are identical in shape and design. Overall, the buildings feature concrete exteriors and flat roofs with slightly projecting eaves. Built of reinforced concrete, each barrack is comprised of two ells: a three-story rectangular dormitory wing, or “handle,” and a perpendicularly placed “L”-shaped kitchen/mess hall wing, or “head.” The name “hammerhead” is derived from the building’s shape, which resembles a hammer.

The buildings’ “handles” are four stories tall, including a basement, and are characterized by their relatively uniform and unornamented façades. The north and south façades are broken into slightly recessed bays, the verticality of which sharply contrasts with the buildings’ otherwise low forms. These elevations have an emphasis on light with ribbons of three-light windows. These windows feature a single transom light above a two-light awning window. Doorways along this façade are recessed and accessible through a large metal-framed doorway with double transom windows. Doors are typically metal and industrial.

The heads of the buildings are one-story in height and feature large three-over-three light awning windows with metal surrounds. Single-hung metal windows are also visible along some elevations. Concrete pilasters slightly project along these elevations and the handle is accessible via concrete stairways with metal hand railings. The heads of the buildings connect to the handles via bays with large four-over-six awning windows. The ends of the handles are relatively nondescript and feature no windows and a minimal eave overhang.

*P3b. Resource Attributes: HP34. Military Property

*P4. Resources Present:
   ■Building □Structure □Object □Site □District □Other

*P5a. Photo: (See Continuation Sheet page 4)

P5b. Photo:

*P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources:
   ■historic c. 1955

*P7. Owner and Address:
   City of Seaside
   Community and Economic Development Department
   440 Harcourt Avenue
   Seaside, California 93955

*P8. Recorded by:
   Alexandra Madsen and Steven Treffers
   Rincon Consultants, Inc.
   250 East 1st Street Suite 1400
   Los Angeles, CA 90012

*P9. Date Recorded:
   October 31, 2019

*P10. Survey Type: Intensive Survey

*P11. Report Citation: (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter “none”):
B1. Historic Name: Hammerhead Barracks
B2. Common Name: Hammerhead Barracks
B3. Original Use: Barracks
B4. Present Use: Vacant
B5. Architectural Style: No Discernible Style

B6. Construction History:
The subject Hammerhead-style barracks at Fort Ord were constructed circa 1955, during the Cold War period of growth. Aerials from this period show the construction of the barracks as well as the fort’s general expansion in the mid-twentieth century.

B7. Moved? □ No □ Yes □ Unknown Date: N/A Original Location: N/A

B8. Related Features: N/A

B9a. Architect: Unknown
b. Builder: Unknown

B10. Significance: Context/Theme N/A Area: N/A Period of Significance: N/A Property Type: N/A Applicable Criteria N/A

Fort Ord

The history of Fort Ord aligns closely with the military events of the early and mid-twentieth century. Facing increased threats abroad in the face of World War I, the United States grew increasingly attentive to its military holdings and purchased large swaths of land across the country to train and accommodate a burgeoning number of soldiers. From 1916 to 1918, numerous camps were established to prepare troops for combat. In 1917, the military purchased the 15,000-acre Gigling Reservation located just north of Monterey to establish the artillery training field known as the Gigling Field Artillery Range (Foundling and Warner 2008). Construction at the base continued after the cessation of World War I in 1918, further securing the fort’s role as a new major military base on the west coast. In 1933, the camp was renamed “Fort Ord” after Major General Edward Ortho Cresap Ord, a 19th First Lieutenant of the Presidio of Monterey and surveyor of land that would later become the city of Los Angeles (Foundling and Warner 2008).

In the mid-twentieth century, international and national pressures forced the military to expand its resources at Fort Ord. The onset of World War II exacerbated these efforts and in 1940, the San Francisco Examiner reported that the camp was set to receive an additional 3,800 officers, bringing the military garrison to 27,000 men and “making it the greatest regular Army post on the Pacific Coast” (San Francisco Examiner 1940). Between 1940 and 1941, a transfer of thousands of additional personnel from the California and North Dakota National Guards further increased the fort’s active population (Coster 1940). The fort also increased its land holdings in this period; in 1940, over 5,000 acres were added to the fort to accommodate the influx of personnel stationed at Fort Ord. As evidenced in a 1940 photograph, temporary lodgings housed many of the camp’s recent arrivals (Foundling and Warner 2008). A second, likely contemporaneous photograph shows a close-up of these tents. (See Continuation Sheet page 5)

B11. Additional Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes): N/A

*B12. References:
(See Continuation Sheets, pp. 8-10)

B13. Remarks: N/A

*B14. Evaluator: Alexandra Madsen, MA and Steven Treffers, MHP

*Date of Evaluation: October 31, 2019

(See Continuation Sheet page 5)
The center of the property is defined by a looping road that provides access to the buildings from the north and south; smaller thruways allow access between individual buildings. The central island of the property features numerous mature trees as well as two tennis courts. According to aerials, three identical groupings of eight hammerhead barracks were located immediately north of the extant barracks. These buildings were demolished in 2016 (NETR 2019). Only one additional full hammerhead is extant north of the subject buildings, identified as "Student Services." Additionally, three ends or "heads" of hammerhead buildings are shown as extant in GoogleEarth imagery; it is unclear if they are still standing at the time of this report.

P5a. Photo:

North Elevation, Head of H4442.

East and South Elevations, Head of H4442.
Fort Ord Continued

Many celebrated infantry divisions trained at the fort before fighting abroad during World War II. Famous troops included the Third Division, notorious for blazing “a victorious path from Africa, through Italy and France, into Germany,” and named the “best damned fighting outfit in the war” by General George S. Patton Jr; the Seventh Division, which fought the Japanese in Attu, the Marshalls, and Okinawa and which the war department dubbed one of the “hottest” units in the Pacific; and the 43rd Division, famous for defeating the Japanese on Luzon in the Philippines (Finnerty 1945).

Three years after the culmination of World War II, another significant event occurred at Fort Ord. In 1948, Executive Order 9981 officially desegregated the United States military. This order was a momentous event for Fort Ord, which became the first integrated training division (MacGregor 2001). A month after its passage, The Californian ran a story that claimed the fort was one of three “colored troop training center[s] in the United States” (The Californian 1948). As a result of this desegregation, the number of black military personnel and their families nearly doubled the population of Seaside in less than a decade (McKibben 2009).

In the 1950s, Cold War tensions compelled the U.S. to again focus on the military and, as a result, an unprecedented number of military personnel were retained for duty (ACHP 2006). To accommodate this increase, the Army designated Fort Ord a permanent post and began a new phase of construction at the fort. Shortly after construction of the subject hammerhead buildings in 1958, the Army requested $124 million from Congress to replace all the World War II temporary wood buildings at the fort with concrete block and reinforced concrete buildings. Although the new construction phase was focused on housing, the fort also received general site improvements including the construction of taxiways, aircraft parking areas, aircraft fuel storage areas, a control tower, a hangar, and a fire and rescue station during this period (San Francisco Examiner 1958).

During the Vietnam War, the fort became the chief training center in the nation (Foundling and Warner 2008). The fort was closed to outsiders in 1969 in response to increased public dissent regarding the Vietnam War. In 1970, over 3,000 demonstrators were threatened with gunfire when attempting to protest at the fort (Foundling and Warner 2008).

By the 1990s, the cost of operating the fort had reached a prohibitively high level, and in 1994 the fort was officially closed. Since that time the fort has remained vacant.

Figure 1 Fort Ord, Temporary Housing

Hammerhead Barracks

The 1950s was a period of growth for the military as the Cold War increased pressure on advancing technologies and weaponry. The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) recognizes how building designs reflected this expansion:

The DoD maintained a standing force of unprecedented size during the Cold War; the Army retained almost 900,000 personnel during the 1950s. Faced with the task of providing adequate housing for that many soldiers, the Army reverted to the use of standardized plans for permanent construction of UPH. As reported to Congress: “The use of standardized plans saves in design costs, saves time in initiation of work, and provides uniformity throughout the Army. Where such plans are used, the only additional design work necessary at a specific site is to adapt the structure to the local terrain and existing utilities systems.” (U.S. Congress, House. Hearings Before the Committee on Armed Services, Military and Naval Construction, 82nd Congress, 2nd Session, p. 3966)

Cold War Era sleeping facilities were predominantly provided in squad rooms with partial partitions. Dormitory style rooms were provided for the top four grades of enlisted personnel, at Service schools with substantial out-of-classroom study, and where there was shift-type work.
In the 1950s, accommodating all company functions in a single building was the prime consideration in the design of barracks. Hammerhead and H-style barracks consolidated troop housing, dining facilities, and administration facilities into one building. (ACHP 2006).

The design of the Hammerhead barracks was popular between 1951 and 1957 and their siting was often removed from other buildings, reflecting a shift towards vehicular travel around the fort (Delgado-Howard 2018). The eight subject buildings were constructed circa 1955 as part of approximately 31 buildings total, which were designed to accommodate thousands of enlisted men (Santa Cruz Sentinel 1955). The barracks were concrete and featured attached kitchen and dining hall facilities (Musser 2016).

In 1971, the Secretary of Defense awarded the army $25 million to study and improve service members living conditions in a program known as Project VOLAR (Delgado-Howard 2018). This project considered Fort Ord as well as Fort Carson in Colorado and Fort Benning in Georgia. It was likely a result of this program that the subject barracks at Fort Ord were transformed from an open floorplan into dorm-style housing. Since the closure of Fort Ord, approximately 22 of the original 31 barracks have been demolished.

Evaluation

Evaluation of the subject property was informed by the California Historic Military Buildings and Structures Inventory Volume II: Historic Context and the ACHP’s Public Comment regarding Unaccompanied Personnel Housing during the Cold War.

The California Historic Military Buildings and Structures Inventory Volume II identifies various themes, property types, and registration requirements for Colonial- to Cold War-era military properties. This context only identifies Cold War-era buildings that are significant as industrial or administrative purposes; however it provides some broader perspective on military buildings constructed during this period. Completed in 2000, Cold War-era resources were just reaching the 50-year age requirement for designation when the context was completed:

The modern architecture of military buildings, like modern architecture generally, is difficult to appreciate in context, because it is a relatively new phenomenon. Nonetheless, the better examples of this style on military bases rank with the better examples of civilian design. Caution should be exercised, however, in evaluating modern architecture as it has been expressed in military design. The two examples that have been found to qualify in this regard, the Michelson Laboratory and Building A33, have two advantages that will rarely be duplicated:

*both are highly significant under Criterion A and they are 50 years old or nearly 50 years old (the Michelson Laboratory was completed in 1948, Building A33 is 1950-51). The buildings qualify for the National Register primarily on the basis of the scientific work that was accomplished there; architectural significance is secondary.*

In 2003, the Army completed a study in support of analyzing UPH, Unaccompanied Personnel Housing (UPH) During the Cold War (1946-1989). In 2006, the ACHP issued a Program Comment regarding the 2,524 Cold War era unaccompanied housing buildings that were constructed from 1946 to 1974. This program provided guidance for public agencies on how to meet requirements established in Section 106 of the NHPA regarding properties that may be eligible for listing in the NRHP. This Program Comment defined the term UPH as “all buildings and structures, listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, that were designed and built as UPH in the years 1946-1974, regardless of use” (ACHP 2006). The ACHP also identified specific considerations for the significance of UPH dating to the Cold War:

*The historic significance of Cold War UPH lies in their association with developing trends associated with the build-up of the military to support the Cold War. As the size of the military increased, and Congress placed limits on funding available for housing, the Military Departments developed standardized barracks plans to meet the needs of its unaccompanied enlisted personnel. The development of permanent housing for a large standing military of enlisted personnel reflects the response to the Cold War, and therefore the properties are potentially significant as a class of resources under Criterion A of the National Register Criteria for their association with the events, activities, and patterns of the Cold War build-up, though properties may not be individually eligible (ACHP 2006).*
The eight hammerhead barracks at Fort Ord are recommended individually ineligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, or for designation as a City of Seaside Historical Landmark pursuant to any applicable designation criteria.

Research did not suggest that the subject resource is associated with an important person who made demonstrably important contributions to local, state, or national history. Although the barracks were constructed after the fort was racially integrated in 1938, the archival record did not suggest that these buildings were significant with any persons associated with this desegregation. While many notable military personnel trained and taught at Fort Ord during its active period, it appears that most events that encompassed such person’s significance happened while completing active military duty in other parts of the world. For this reason, the buildings are recommended ineligible for listing as individual resources pursuant to Criteria A/1 in the NRHP, CRHR, or for designation as a City of Seaside Historical Landmark pursuant to Criteria A/1 for their association with military growth during the Cold War.

A review of available evidence and records search results did not indicate the property might yield information important to history or prehistory. For this reason, the buildings are recommended ineligible for listing as individual resources pursuant to Criteria C/3 in the NRHP, CRHR, or for designation as a City of Seaside Historical Landmark for distinctive design or construction.

The subject resource was not designed by a notable architect and is not a significant early example of hammerhead barrack design. The eight buildings date to circa 1955 whereas hammerhead barracks were completed from 1951 to 1957. Therefore, the subject buildings were not a prototype, nor early example, of this type of barrack design. Rather, the buildings were completed at the height of its popularity and are eight of the 2,524 UPH buildings constructed between 1946 and 1974 (ACHP 2006). Moreover, the ACHP acknowledges that most significant UPH buildings are notable for their association with events, rather than architecture. The subject buildings do not represent the work of a master nor do they possess high artistic values. For this reason, the buildings are recommended ineligible for listing as individual resources pursuant to Criteria B/2 in the NRHP, CRHR, or for designation as a City of Seaside Historical Landmark for an association with notable persons.

A review of available evidence and records search results did not indicate the property might yield information important to history or prehistory. For this reason, the buildings are recommended ineligible for listing as individual resources pursuant to Criteria D/4 in the NRHP, CRHR, or for designation as a City of Seaside Historic Landmark for information potential.

Historic District Eligibility

Previous evaluations that considered the entirety of the Fort Ord base were completed at the time of its decommission in the 1990s. Between 1993 and 1994, five reports recorded the results of archaeological and historic resource surveys for Fort Ord. These reports identified a number of properties eligible for listing in the NRHP, including Henneken’s Ranch and the Windmill Site (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1995). As later recorded in the Fort Ord Reuse Plan EIR, the Army and California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) concluded that “Stilwell Hall and 35 structures in the East Garrison area were the only former Fort Ord properties eligible for listing on the NRHP” (EMC Planning Group Inc. and EDAW Inc. 1997). As such, there is no evidence to suggest the subject buildings contribute to any historic district.
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