Department of Defense
Legacy Resource Management Program

04-231

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY: A HISTORIC CONTEXT AND DATABASE FOR THE MILITARY- INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX IN THE STATE OF TEXAS

Marsha Prior, Scott D. Murdock, and Julian W. Adams/
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Huntsville Center

September 2005

This document is unclassified and may be released to the public

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY: A HISTORIC CONTEXT AND DATABASE FOR THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX IN THE STATE OF TEXAS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Geo-Marine, Inc. (GMI), is currently developing a state-wide historic context and database for historic resources in Texas that relate to the military-industrial complex. This project is funded under the Legacy Resource Management Program, awarded August 2004, in a cooperative agreement between GMI and the United States Army Corps of Engineers, Contract Number DACA87-04-H-0010.

Texas has a long and varied military history. It has been occupied by various Native American tribes, governed by Spain and Mexico, felt the presence of France, established as a republic, admitted to the United States, seceded to join the Confederacy, and re-admitted into the United States. From early forts, missions, and camps to modern, and sometimes technologically advanced, 20th century installations, military activities have had a tremendous impact on the state's landscape and built environment. The Legacy project to develop a historic context and database will provide tools for better understanding and appreciating the complexities of Texas' military past. Specifically, the context and database will: (1) allow all service branches to adopt a consistent approach to evaluating historic resources; (2) provide a data source that will reduce costs during base/installation closures; (3) provide a database, context, and electronic copies of documents pertaining to military historic resources that will reduce the cost of future inventory and evaluation efforts; (4) allow for knowledgeable evaluation of existing historic resources; (5) bring to light data gaps, issues, or concerns related to military historic resources, and (6) allow cultural resources personnel and historic preservationists from civilian agencies/organizations to understand and appreciate military historic resources that have passed into the civilian sector and for which they are now responsible. In broader terms, the historic context and database will provide pertinent information for cultural resources managers, historic preservationists, scholars, and the general public at large.

The research design for the Texas military project consists of four steps for developing the context and database. These four steps include: (1) literature review [including historical studies, cultural resources management documents; National Register nominations, etc]; (2) archival

research; (3) data analysis; and (4) data entry and write-up. The project is to be completed within two broad phases. The first phase is devoted, primarily, to data collection and developing the initial database. The information gleaned from this first phase is critical to Phase II, which focuses on the historic context and assessing the National Register eligibility status of the state's historic military properties.

2.0 PHASE I: DEVELOPING THE DATABASE AND DATA COLLECTION

2.1 DEVELOPING THE DATABASE

The database developed for this project is designed to provide pertinent information on the majority of known Texas military installations from the 1600s to the present. This includes places and facilities, such as early missions, that have an associated military purpose, though it may not have been their primary or sole purpose. Excluded are small, typically un-manned, facilities such as communication or navigational sites.

Capturing the history of any given military installation into a database can be a challenging task. Through the course of time, military installations are activated and inactivated, and often change names, missions, and commands in the process. New installations are established and old ones abandoned. These changes in and of themselves provide important clues to military activity, shifts in strategy, and economics. An installation with a history of activation and inactivation hints at military needs. The use and re-use of an installation implies a suitable or advantageous location, and that the buildings and infrastructure can be adapted to varying uses. Changes in mission, purpose, and command reflect technological advancements and shifting strategies. To capture the multitude of changes, the following key information is entered for each installation:

- Master name (generally the current or most common name)
- Current Active or Inactive Status
- Owner (current or most recent military branch, or other owner of the installation)
- Location (distance from nearby city)
- Latitude and Longitude coordinates (if known)
- Link to on-line TerraServer aerial image or topographic map (if available)

In addition, each installation is linked to a time frame (however many are appropriate) in order to trace military activity throughout the years. The time frames used for this project are as follows:

- Colonial (1600-1835)
- Republic of Texas (1836-1844)
- Frontier/Pre-Civil War (1845-1860)
- Frontier/Secession and Civil War (1861-1865)
- Frontier/Post Civil War (1866-1899)
- Modernization (1900-1913)
- World War I (1914-1918)
- Inter War (1919-1940)
- World War II (1941-1945)
- Cold War/New National Security Strategy (1946-1949)
- Cold War/Korean Conflict (1950-1953)
- Cold War/Doctrine of Massive Retaliation (1954-1960)
- Cold War/Doctrine of Flexible Response (1961-1963)
- Cold War/Vietnam Conflict and New Arms Race (1964-1971)
- Cold War/Détente (1972-1980)
- Cold War/Reagan and Glasnost (1981-1991)
- Recent (1992-present)

Pertinent data are then entered for each installation under the appropriate time frames. Data that are entered include the following:

- Name (as it was known during specific time frame)
- Subordinate Status (if the installation was a sub-base or annex to another installation)
- Purpose
    - Arsenal, Ammunition Plant, or Ordnance Works
    - Communications Site
    - Guard armory or Reserve Center
    - Housing Annex
    - Industrial Plant
    - Major Airfield
    - Major Installation, Base, Fort, or Camp
    - Major Naval Installation
    - Minor Airfield or Auxiliary Field
    - Minor Installation, Fort, Camp, Mission, or Outpost
    - Missile Site
    - Radar Site
    - Space Program Facility
- Owner (military branch or other owner of installation)
- Command (military major command, if known)
- Acres (if available)
- Runway (if applicable and available)
- System (association with specific system or mission, if applicable)

- Atlas F Missile
- Ammunition Storage
- Air Warning
- Filter Center
- Flight Strip
- Gap Filler Radar
- Glider Training
- Ground Wave Emergency Network (GWEN)
- Intermediate Field
- Joint Surveillance System (JSS)
- Lanham Act Housing
- Long Range Navigation (LORAN)
- Modification Center
- National Guard
- Nike Missile
- Mexican Border Outpost
- Prisoner of War Camp
- Radar Bomb Scoring
- Reserve Recovery
- Reserve Training
- Small Arms Range
- Space Surveillance System
- State Owned Property
- Special Weapon Storage
- Tethered Aerostat Radar System (TARS)
- British Flying Training

Information from the database can, thus, be sorted by time period to note fluctuations in military undertakings, providing a broad overview of Texas military activity over the course of time and the specific missions that Texas supported. The characteristics of the database that are discussed above are critical to charting the history of the military in Texas—what took place when, where, and why. An equally important element to this project, however, is to denote the associated built environment and to assess the status of efforts to manage the state's military cultural resources. Information on cultural resources reports and historic properties documentation (including National Register nominations and Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record [HABS/HAER]) for each installation is also entered into the database. Data from cultural resources documents that is entered into the database include the following:

- Report title
- Author(s)
- Year prepared
- Extent of documentation (single building, partial installation, complete installation)
- Preparing company
- Client or customer

- Service branch (Air Force, Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard)
- Component (active, National Guard, reserves)
- Master name of installation
- City or location
- Report type (inventory/evaluation, HABS/HAER, Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP), Historic overview/context, National Register nomination, etc.)
- Time periods considered
- Information on National Register/Landmark district (if applicable)
- Properties recommended or nominated as National Register eligible

For each property in the report that is identified as National Register eligible or nominated, the following, more detailed information is added to the database:

- Building number and name
- Functional class (using Army and Air Force functional classes if applicable)
- Specific use
- Property type
  - Administrative
  - Ammunition Storage
  - Control Tower
  - Docks, Wharfs, or other Ship Facility
  - Education or Training Facility
  - Fortification
  - Hangar
  - Housing
  - Industrial Building
  - Medical
  - Missile Launch or Control Facility
  - Parade Ground or other landscape feature
  - Readiness or Alert Facility
  - Recreation Facility
  - Religious Building
  - Stables
  - Storage Building or Warehouse
  - Testing Building
  - Tower
  - Other
- Year constructed
- Plan designation/number (if applicable and if known)
- Exterior building materials
- Roof form
- Architect (if known)
- Architectural style
- Office of Historic Preservation number (if applicable)
- Theme association (if identified in report)

- Criteria for evaluation (A, B, C, or D)
- Criterion consideration for evaluation (a, b, c, d, e, f, g)
- National Register listing information (if applicable, e.g., year listed, individual or contributing to district)
- Historic district name (if applicable)
- National Historic Landmark (include name if applicable)
- HABS/HAER documentation (if applicable)
- Comments and additional information

Appendix A contains the first sheet of each database to provide an example of the information that has been entered for each military installation and its eligible properties.

2.2 DATA COLLECTION

Data for populating the database have been collected through various means, including literature reviews and archival research. Basic information collected thus far comes from both primary and secondary sources, maps, photographs, and web sites.

Archival research was conducted at several sites, beginning with the National Archives and Records Administration, Southwest Region, in February 2005. Records were sought to provide information on the history and location of various installations, primarily World War II defense plants, Navy facilities, and camps for German prisoners of war. Approximately 100 property disposal files were reviewed. During follow-up visits in May and June 2005, additional property disposal files were reviewed.

The Texas State Archives, Austin, Texas, was visited April 2005. Research focused on state-owned Texas National Guard properties, using the real estate holding files of the Texas Military Facilities Commission. These files provided information on numerous National Guard armories across the state. Research at Camp Mabry, Austin, Texas, was also conducted in April 2005, and yielded an inventory spreadsheet of currently active National Guard properties, a draft survey of historic National Guard armories, and other documents pertaining to historic Camp Mabry and Camp Maxey.

An on-site visit to the Texas Historical Commission (THC) occurred in September 2005 to collect information, meet with two THC officials, and discuss use of materials at the THC library. During this research effort, a visit was also made to the Texas State Archives and Texas State Library to review card catalogs that are not available electronically.

Archival research conducted for the first phase of this project concentrated on lesser known military installations such as the National Guard facilities and World War II defense plants. By adding such entities into the database, along with basic information on better known installations (e.g., Army forts, Army air fields, Air Force bases, and Naval facilities), GMI historians were able to gain a broad view of military activity during the early stages of the project. This information has been particularly useful in considering the role of Texas in U.S. military strategy, themes, and the relationship between military preparedness and the built environment.

2.3 OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS

2.3.1 Historical Summary

Pertinent data on 1,358 individual military installations have been collected, thus far, and is presented in Tables 1-3. Table 1 presents the number of installations by major category type; Table 2 examines functional types of military installations by time period; and Table 3 shows the owner (associated service branch, country, or organization) by time period. Together, these three tables demonstrate the ebb and flow of military activity throughout Texas history, showing the events which prompted concerted efforts for specific types of defensive or offensive strategies.

Although Spain was the first European nation to lay claim to the territory now known as Texas, it was France that established the first permanent military installation. Fort St. Louis was founded by Rene Robert Cavelier, Sieur de La Salle, on the Texas Coast in 1685. Along with a number of colonists, approximately 100 soldiers accompanied La Salle (THC n.d.).

The French presence along the Texas coast was short-lived, but had a significant impact upon future military establishments. By 1869, all members of Fort St. Louis had abandoned the fort, died, or were captured by Native Americans. Nevertheless, the Spanish feared further French

Table 1
Types of Texas Military Installations

Type of Installation	Number of Installations
Arsenal, Ammunition Plant, or Ordnance Works	12
Communications Site	2
Guard Armory or Reserve Center	219
World War II Worker Housing Area	15
Industrial Plant	89
Major Airfield*	83
Major Installation, Base, Fort, or Camp*	24
Major Naval Installation*	4
Minor Airfield or Auxiliary Field*	256
Minor Installation, Fort, Camp, Mission, or Outpost	420
Missile Site	29
Radar Site	43
Space Program Facility	1
Special Weapons Facility	2
Supply or Storage Depot	20
Weapons or Training Range	139
Total Installations Documented	**1,358**

*The use of the terms "Major" and "Minor" refer to the size of the installation or number of personnel associated with that installation, not the role, impact, or significance that the installation had upon Texas military history.

encroachment and were particularly concerned with the settlements and posts that the French were establishing in neighboring Louisiana. To protect its claim, the Spanish implemented a two-pronged system consisting of missions and presidios. Franciscan missionaries tried to convert local Native American populations to Catholicism, and at the same time, imposed a sedentary, agrarian lifestyle. Presidios were garrisoned forts that often accompanied the missions to provide protection (Faulk 2001; THC n.d.; Wright 2001).

Throughout the colonial period (under both Spanish and Mexican authority), the Texas Republic, and the early years in the Union, Texas military installations increased by significant numbers in response to various threats and the bid for Texas independence. The most significant rise in number during the 19th century, however, occurred with Secession and the Civil War, the period between 1861 and 1865. During this time, Texas claimed at least 97 military installations, though most were small camps and forts. Few Civil War battles actually occurred on Texas soil, thus,

Table 2
Purpose or Function of Installation by Time Period

Type of Installation	1600-1835	1836-1844	1845-1860	1861-1865	1866-1899	1900-1913	1914-1918	1919-1940	1941-1945	1946-1949	1950-1953	1954-1960	1961-1963	1964-1971	1972-1980	1981-1991	1992-present
Arsenal, Ammo Plant, Ordnance Wks		1	2	3	3	2	2	2	9	8	9	9	7	5	5	4	4
Communi-cations Site															1	2	2
Guard Armory or Reserve Center								3	3	12	36	97	103	113	107	110	175
Wartime Defense Housing									12	6	6	4	2	1	1		
Industrial Plant							5	1	84	10	4	4	5	5	4	4	4
Major Airfield						1	13	10	76	31	36	36	28	25	21	20	19
Major Installation, Base, Fort, Camp				1	2	4	8	6	22	9	11	11	10	10	10	9	9
Major Naval Installation									2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3
Minor Airfield or Auxiliary Field							12	11	173	46	54	35	25	53	42	10	8

Table 2 (cont'd)

Type of Installation	1600-1835	1836-1844	1845-1860	1861-1865	1866-1899	1900-1913	1914-1918	1919-1940	1941-1945	1946-1949	1950-1953	1954-1960	1961-1963	1964-1971	1972-1980	1981-1991	1992-present
Minor Installation, Fort, Camp, Mission, or Outpost	20	24	56	97	44	12	193	12	36	12	10	16	14	12	12	13	24
Missile Site												28	29	29			
Radar Site											1	28	23	13	6	6	8
Space Program Facility													1	2	2	1	1
Special Weapons Facility										1	2	2	2	2	1	1	1
Supply or Storage Depot		1				1	9	2	9	5	3	3	2	2	1	1	
Weapons or Training Range						1	3	2	122	26	12	13	7	7	3	2	4

Key to Time Periods:

1600-1835 – Colonial Period
1836-1844 – Republic of Texas
1845-1860 – Frontier Era, Pre-Civil War
1861-1865 – Frontier Era, Secession and the Civil War
1866-1899 – Frontier Era, Post Civil War
1900-1913 – Modernization
1914-1918 – World War I
1919-1940 – Interwar Period
1941-1945 – World War II
1946-1949 – Cold War, the New National Security Strategy
1950-1953 – Cold War, the Korean War
1954-1960 – Cold War, Doctrine of Massive Retaliation
1961-1963 – Cold War, Doctrine of Flexible Response
1964-1971 – Cold War, Vietnam War and New Arms Race
1972-1980 – Cold War, Détente
1981-1991 – Cold War, Glasnost
1992-present – the Recent Era

Table 3
Military Owner by Time Period

Owner	1600-1835	1836-1844	1845-1860	1861-1865	1866-1899	1900-1913	1914-1918	1919-1940	1941-1945	1946-1949	1950-1953	1954-1960	1961-1963	1964-1971	1972-1980	1981-1991	1992-present
Air Force (including antecedents, reserves)						1	35	25	321	102	101	121	89	71	41	32	32
-- Air Force to Army												2			1	1	
-- Air Force to Army to TX Army Natl Guard													1	1			
-- Air Force to Navy									1	1				1			
Army (including Reserves)	2	3	58		48	19	206	18	68	22	23	42	42	61	43	13	74
-- Army to Air Force							2	2	2		1	2		1	1	1	1
-- Army to TX Army Natl Guard										2	1			2			
Coast Guard																1	1
Confederacy				78													
-- Confederacy to Union				3													
Defense Plant Corp.									108	9							
Dept of Energy (DOE; includes Atomic Energy Commission)										1	3	3	2	1	1	1	1

Table 3 (cont'd)

Owner	1600-1835	1836-1844	1845-1860	1861-1865	1866-1899	1900-1913	1914-1918	1919-1940	1941-1945	1946-1949	1950-1953	1954-1960	1961-1963	1964-1971	1972-1980	1981-1991	1992-present
-- DOE to Air Force														1			
-- DOE to Army													1				
Marine Corps									2								2
Mexican Government	3																
-- Mexican Govt to Republic of Texas	2	21															
National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)													1	1	1	1	1
Navy (including Reserves)							1		42	15	15	19	16	22	18	16	20
-- Navy to Air Force											1						1
Spanish Government	12																
TX Air National Guard										2	3	3	3	3	3	3	4
TX Army National Guard (includes antecedents)					1	1	1	4	4	14	38	96	105	115	108	115	124

Table 3 (cont'd)

Owner	1600-1835	1836-1844	1845-1860	1861-1865	1866-1899	1900-1913	1914-1918	1919-1940	1941-1945	1946-1949	1950-1953	1954-1960	1961-1963	1964-1971	1972-1980	1981-1991	1992-present
-- TX Army Natl Guard to Air Force														1	1	1	1
Union				4													
-- Union to Confederacy				16													

Key to Time Periods:

1600-1835 – Colonial Period
1836-1844 – Republic of Texas
1845-1860 – Frontier Era, Pre-Civil War
1946-1949 – Cold War, the New National Security Strategy
1950-1953 – Cold War, the Korean War
1954-1960 – Cold War, Doctrine of Massive Retaliation

there was limited need for fortifications. Most vulnerable were the Texas coast and the southern border. Confederate troops were able to thwart Union attempts to capture Corpus Christi, but cannon and fortifications at Galveston failed to prevent Union naval forces from taking Galveston in 1862. Within three months, however, the Confederates had recaptured the coastal city. Union forces captured Brownsville in south Texas in 1863; Confederate forces were successful in recapturing the city in 1864. Palmito Ranch, near Brownsville, was the site of the last Civil War land battle in 1865 (Faulk 2001; Hunt 2001; Smith 2000; Wooster 2001).

The number of military installations dropped significantly after the Civil War, with a large number of forts transferring back to the U.S. Army once Texas was readmitted to the Union. Upon reacquiring its properties, Army campaigns took up where they had left off—extending the frontier westward and engaging in Indian campaigns to free the land for European-American settlement. At least 49 military installations (with 46 being forts and camps) existed from the end of the Civil War until the twentieth century (Smith 2000).

Advancements in flying technology, which took place in the early twentieth century, introduced a whole new development in military strategy that southern Texas, with its temperate climate and flat terrain, was able to support. One of the earliest military flying training missions occurred in Texas in 1910. Lt Benjamin D. Foulois reported to Fort Sam Houston in San Antonio, and with the Army's first aircraft—the Military Flyer—tested the potential for aircraft to support combat troops (AETC HO 1993:1-2; Prior and Salo 2003:13).

Military interest in air power took on a greater urgency when the United States entered World War I. In need of training over 10,000 pilots to support European allies, the U.S. Army set up training schools and airfields across the nation. Texas was home to at least 13 major airfields, 12 minor airfields, and a balloon station. Texas also supported the World War I military effort in other ways. Eight major forts/camps, 193 minor forts/camps, nine supply/storage depots, three training ranges, five industrial plants, and two ammunition plants provided the Army with necessary personnel and weapons (AETC HO 1993:1-2; Maurer 1987).

At war's end, the overall number of installations in Texas quickly declined. At greatest risk for closure were minor installations that had been established to meet wartime demands; their numbers were drastically reduced from 193 to 12. Supply and storage depots, also no longer

critical, were reduced from nine to two. The number of airfields that existed between World War I and World War II, however, indicate the military's interest in continued development in aviation. World War I had proven the benefits of air power, and Texas remained an ideal location for training pilots and mechanics. After World War I, four airfields were eventually closed, leaving ten major airfields and 11 minor airfields open during the interwar period.

With World War II came another intense level of military activity, and the types of installations established in Texas demonstrate, again, the military's investment in aviation and Texas' role in supporting that interest. Whereas at least 201 (eight major and 193 minor) forts/camps and 25 major/minor airfields supported the World War I effort, the ratio between forts/camps and airfields was reversed for World War II. Texas claimed at least 249 airfields of varying size while 22 major and 36 minor forts and camps were established. Texas also provided World War II support through the 108 industrial plants that were operated under the Defense Plant Corporation.

Within a few years after World War II ended, two significant military events occurred. The United States Air Force was established in 1947 as an independent service branch and the Cold War commenced. The Air Force, as the primary delivery system for Cold War weapons (nuclear bombs and missiles) played a major role in Cold War technological development and military strategy. Although there was certainly a reduction in the number of military installations after World War II, tension between the United States, Soviet Union, and China, prompted the U.S. to maintain constant vigilance. In Texas, a number of military installations with long-term standard purposes (i.e., major and minor forts/camps, airfields, weapons training ranges, supply/storage depots, arsenal/ammunition plants or ordnance works, and industrial plants) continued to support U.S. military efforts. During the Cold War, however, technological developments in nuclear strategy were highly influential in military plans, and this shift is visible in the types of installations established in Texas. For the first time, Texas could claim radar sites, missile sites, special weapons facilities, and a civilian-run, state-of-the-art space program facility.

Because the Cold War was such an extensive period (1946-1991), for the purpose of this project, it has been divided into seven phases to help track the impact of shifting political strategies, technological developments, and major conflicts such as that with Korea and Vietnam. For example, during the years 1954 thru 1960 the U.S. and Soviet Union each embarked on a policy

of massive retaliation with nuclear missiles. In response, the U.S. established missile sites at various key locations. In Texas, a total of 13 Atlas F intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) for offensive purposes, and 8 sets of Nike missile facilities for defensive purposes were deployed. Texas was also the site for special weapons facilities throughout the Cold War period.

Radar, a World War II development became increasingly important during the early years of the Cold War. The first Air Defense radar site in Texas was established in the early 1950s. Texas was also host to the fourth and last Perimeter Acquisition Vehicle Entry Phased-Array Warning System (PAVE PAWS) in the country. This massive radar system was activated in 1987 at Eldorado Air Force Station in south Texas to detect enemy objects up to 3,000 miles away (Garrett 2002:13-14, 37; Salo and Prior 2003:25; Weitze 2002; Winkler 1997:54-56).

As nuclear missiles began to supplant bombs, the number of precision bombing ranges declined in Texas. The highest number of ranges had occurred during World War II, with approximately 122 weapons or training ranges. During the early years of the Cold War, 26 ranges were in existence, but that number steadily decreased as the need for bombers declined. By the end of the Cold War, only two stand-alone ranges were in operation.

Throughout its history, Texas' military activities have reflected the state's unique history, as well as national trends. Presently, military installations in Texas remain an important component to U.S. military operations while reflecting current trends and concerns. With 19 major airfields, 9 major bases and forts, three naval installations, and numerous minor installations, Texas plays an important role in contributing to U.S. military needs. Of interest is the significant number of guard armories and reserve centers that have increased throughout the Cold War and now number 175. This strategy provides the military with trained personnel for a minimum cost who are available for duty when needed.

2.3.2 Architectural Summary

To date, 1,883 National Register eligible or listed properties have been entered into the database. These properties include headquarters buildings, barracks, mess halls, hospitals, storage depot watchtowers, aircraft control towers, and landscape features. They range in construction dates

from 1878 to 1989. Information has been gathered from several types of reports, including building inventory evaluations, integrated cultural resources management plans (ICRMPs), and National Register nominations.

Of the 1,883 properties entered into the database, thus far, 611 are contributing properties to National Historic Landmark districts and 225 properties are contributing to National Register districts. Various property types are represented among these historic properties. Housing is the most heavily represented, followed by munitions storage. The munitions storage properties entered into the database are all nuclear storage facilities located at Lackland AFB. The category noted as "Other" includes a number of miscellaneous buildings and structures that are not easily classified, or their specific function is difficult to decipher (e.g., flagpoles, photo labs, Red Cross office, loading docks, etc.). Property types and the number falling under each type are listed below:

Administrative: 27
Ammunition/Magazine Storage: 5
Control Tower: 1
Education or Training Facility: 23
Hangar: 22
Housing: 1,026
Garage: 180
Industrial: 24
Medical: 26
Munitions Storage: 112
Readiness or Alert: 2
Recreation: 32
Religious: 4
Stable: 39
Storage/Warehouse: 65
Testing: 5
Tower: 12
Other: 278

Since the architectural style is not always noted in reports, it is difficult to assess trends or make definitive statements at this time. Of the 1,883 properties, architectural style is noted for only 579 buildings. The following styles and number within each category are as follows:

Craftsman: 29
Spanish Colonial Revival/Spanish Renaissance Revival: 321
Mediterranean Revival: 3
Art Deco: 19
Art Moderne: 50
International/Modern: 10
Identified as "Utilitarian" in appearance: 147

The most predominant architectural style to surface during this early stage of data collection is the Spanish Colonial Revival/Spanish Renaissance Revival. This style was used at both Randolph Air Force Base and Fort Sam Houston and reflects the Army's efforts to use styles and materials associated with specific regions.

3.0 FUTURE RESEARCH

Information gathered for the database provides a glimpse into trends, significant developments, and themes that apply specifically to Texas military history. In a more general sense, the information reflects the broader history of military development for the entire United States and demonstrates the role of Texas in contributing to military developments at the national level.

Phase I research has focused on collecting data and building a database that will provide useful information for developing the historic context, assessing the current status of cultural resources assessments for the military built environment and landscape, and tracking National Register eligible military properties. Data collection and database updates will be ongoing throughout the project to include additional installations as they become known and to supply information currently missing for those 1,358 installations already entered into the database. Additional information is particularly needed for coastal defense installations, reserve centers, World War II defense plants associated with the Defense Plant Corporation, and World War II Navy outlying fields. Information on National Register eligible properties and the status of building inventories/assessments is also needed for several installations. Sources and contacts for acquiring some of the missing data have been identified and will be pursued during the second phase of this project. Finding aids for the National Archives and Records Administration, Southwest Region, for example, indicate that the repository holds records on reserve centers, the Defense Plant Corporation (for World War II defense plants), and outlying Naval installations.

In addition to augmenting the database, the objective of Phase II is to further analyze the data collected, develop the historic context, assess and summarize the current status of buildings/structures inventories, and track National Register-eligible military properties. The historic context provides the background for understanding the significance of eligible and potentially eligible properties. Certain themes to surface during the early stages of this project are

closely tied to chronological eras and include Missions and Presidios, support for the Confederate cause, fortifications and Indian campaigns, contributions to the development of aviation, World War II defense plants and prisoner of war camps, missile sites, advanced radar systems, nuclear storage, and the civilian development of space technology.

Research for developing the historic context will continue with a literature review of secondary sources, archival research for primary sources; informal interviews; and continued dialog with cultural resources personnel and scholars.

4.0 REFERENCES

Air Education and Training Command History Office (AETC HO)
1993 *Fifty Years of Training.* History and Research Office, Air Training Command, Randolph Air Force Base, Texas.

Faulk, O. B.
2001 *Handbook of Texas Online*, s.v. "Presidios," http://www.tsha.utexas.edu/handbook/online/articles/PP.uqp9.html (accessed September 12, 2005).

Garrett, J. V.
2002 *A Brief History of Goodfellow Air Force Base and the 17th Training Wing*. 17th Training Wing History Office, Goodfellow Air Force Base, Texas.

Hunt, J. W.
2005 *Handbook of Texas Online*, s.v. "Palmito Ranch, Battle Of," http://www.tsha.utexas.edu/handbook/online/articles/PP/qpf1.html (accessed September 12, 2005).

Maurer, M.
1987 *Aviation in the U.S. Army, 1919-1939.* Office of Air Force History, United States Air Force, Washington, D.C.

Prior, M., and E. Salo
2003 *Air Education and Training Command: Training the Peacemakers during the Cold War Era (1945-1991).* United States Air Force Air Education and Training Command Cold War Context Series Reports of Investigations Number 1. Prepared for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District. Geo-Marine, Inc., Plano, Texas.

Salo, E., and M. Prior
2003 *Goodfellow Air Force Base: Cold War-Era Buildings and Structures Inventory and Assessment.* United States Air Force Air Education and Training Command Cold War Context Series Reports of Investigations Number 9. Prepared for Weston Solutions, Inc. Geo-Marine, Inc., Plano, Texas.

Smith, T. T.
2000 *The Old Army in Texas: A Research Guide to the U.S. Army in Nineteenth-century Texas.* Texas State Historical Society, Austin.

Texas Historical Commission (THC)
n.d. "Fort St. Louis Archeological Project." http://www.thc.state.tx.us/lasalle/lasfsl.html. Accessed September 13, 2005.

Weitze, K. J.
2002 PAVE PAWS radar, Beale AFB, Yolo County, California. Historic American Engineering Record Level II Written Historical and Descriptive Data.

Winkler, D. F.
1997 *Training to Fight: Training and Education during the Cold War*. U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratories Special Report 97/99. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Construction Engineering Research Laboratories, Champaign-Urbana, Illinois.

Wooster, R. A.
2001 *Handbook of Texas Online*, s.v. "Civil War," http://www.tsha.utexas.edu/handbook/online/articles/CC/qdc2.html (accessed September 12, 2005).

Wright, R. E.
2001 *Handbook of Texas Online*, s.v. "Spanish Missions," http://www.tsha.utexas.edu/handbook/online/articles/SS/its2.html (accessed September 12, 2005).

APPENDIX A