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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The United States Air Force is the executive agent for the Department of Defense (DoD) Cold War Initiative. As executive agent for this initiative, the Air Force produced Interim Guidance: Treatment of Cold War Historic Properties for U.S. Air Force Installations (Interim Guidance) in 1993. As a first step in updating the Interim Guidance, the Air Force, through the SRI Foundation and Statistical Research, Inc., organized a workshop in February 2006 in Tucson, Arizona, to develop strategies for more efficient and consistent management of Air Force Cold War-era resources. The results of this workshop will lead to DoD-wide guidance that can be used by all services.

The goals of the workshop were to recommend revisions to existing guidance and develop procedures for collecting the baseline data necessary to determine how to proceed with management of Cold War resources. Workshop participants identified four major topics related to achieving these goals:

- Data collection/synthesis
- Data repository/clearinghouse
- Interim Guidance update
- Executive-level briefing

Workshop participants divided into breakout groups, with each group identifying and creating products and tools to address these topics.

It is critical to determine what is, and is not known about DoD Cold War resources. The DoD must identify its Cold War resources to more efficiently and proactively integrate cultural resources management with its military mission. The data collection/synthesis breakout group focused on compiling and analyzing available data on Cold War-era cultural resources as an important step in developing a programmatic approach to the effective management of these resources. The group recommended that the Air Force initiate a test data call to select installations, followed by a visit to the installation by an experienced field team to fill data gaps. This exercise will assess and improve the data collection procedures before initiating a DoD-wide data call.

Storing the data and making it accessible to DoD managers is equally important. The data repository/clearinghouse group focused on providing guidance to develop a Cold War-era Historic Information Clearinghouse (CWHIC): a repository for Air Force, with later expansion to DoD-wide, Cold War-era historic property documentation. The CWHIC would provide paperless, Web-enabled access to critical information on Cold War cultural resources in a centralized and periodically updated Web site. It would consolidate all relevant documents in a single location, providing access to resources critical for determining historic significance. The site would be password accessible to all levels of the cultural resources community and would enhance and expedite consultations with state historic preservation officers (SHPO) and tribal historic preservation officers (THPO). The group recommended that research be conducted to determine the costs of implementation, operation, and maintenance of the electronic clearinghouse using existing systems, such as the Defense Environmental Network and Information Exchange (DENIX), as guides.

Solid guidance is necessary to ensure consistent inventory, evaluation, and management of historic Cold War
properties across all services. The Interim Guidance group began with an outline of the current guidance. They reworked and modified the outline, providing a detailed framework for revising the guidance. Because writing new guidance could not be completed during the workshop, the Air Force will complete the revision of the guidance in-house.

The fourth topic is an executive-level briefing on establishing a framework for future Air Force–level policy and for implementing the workshop recommendations for management of Cold War resources. It was deferred as a future task for Air Force cultural resources management to address.

The 2006 Cold War Workshop provided an action plan for Air Force and DoD cultural resources managers to pursue. The two topics that will not be handled in-house by the Air Force, data collection/synthesis and data repository/clearinghouse, have been submitted to the DoD Legacy Resource Management Program for funding and are the first step in addressing the recommendations provided in this report.
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INTRODUCTION

The Department of Defense (DoD) has long recognized a need for effective and consistent management of its Cold War assets and designated the Air Force as executive agent for the Cold War Initiative (DoD Instruction [DODI] 4715.3, Environmental Conservation Program, Enclosure 2, 1996). Building inventories and evaluations have been and continue to be a primary cultural resources priority area as large numbers of these Cold War resources began reaching the 50-year mark, and therefore may be potentially eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). As required by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), the DoD has to consider the effect of its activities on properties listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP (i.e., historic properties). Pursuant to Section 110 of NHPA, the DoD must also assume responsibility for the preservation of historic properties owned or controlled by the agency. In the early 1990s, the DoD designated the identification and protection of Cold War properties as one of its nine Legacy Resource Management Program focus areas. The Air Force produced the Interim Guidance: Treatment of Cold War Historic Properties for U.S. Air Force Installations in 1993 (U.S. Air Force 1993) (Appendix A) to guide these investigations. The guidance has been instrumental to the Cold War inventory process, but it is in critical need of an update to address issues and problems recognized since its creation.

In the decade following issuance of the Interim Guidance, preparation of general and command-wide historic contexts became the order of the day. A “historic context” is an organizational framework that organizes information about related properties, based on a given historical theme, geographic limit, and time period. Historic contexts identify the characteristics and qualities that a property must exhibit in order to be considered an important representation of the context’s theme, geographic limit, and time period. If a property exhibits these characteristics and qualities, it is most likely eligible for listing in the NRHP. The Interim Guidance and these historic contexts guided the individual installation cultural resources managers across the country as they began to inventory and evaluate the most exceptional properties, which was at that time an acceptable strategy. However, these projects operated in a vacuum, given that there were no mechanisms for sharing data across the DoD, or even within individual major commands (MAJCOMs). Individual installation managers made their own best interpretation and application of the guidance and regulations and developed their own inventory and evaluation processes or used those established by their MAJCOM. They applied the same principles they routinely applied to all historic properties, leading to inconsistent treatment of resources across the commands and services. The problem facing managers was not the lack of historic contexts, but the fact that there was no clear direction. The many historic contexts, although of high quality, were never coordinated and sometimes provided conflicting direction. There were meetings to address Cold War issues, and progress was made, but many issues remained outstanding. One primary issue is inconsistent inventory and evaluation strategies from installation to installation because of the lack of a DoD-wide reference list or a centralized repository of all Cold War documents (such as historic contexts and studies of particular property types).
In the mid-1990s, many Cold War properties began to hit the 50-year threshold. The NRHP evaluations of these properties could no longer be put on hold if they were not exceptionally important. As they did in the early 1990s, installation cultural resources managers once again had to manage this growing number of potentially NRHP-eligible Cold War properties—properties that have begun to constrain military missions. This problem continues to grow. In 2006, there are approximately 345,000 buildings in the DoD inventory, of which at least two-thirds are less than 50 years old. However, by the year 2025, about 230,000 buildings will be 50 years old (Sullivan 2006). At a conservative estimate of $2,000 per building for evaluation, and assuming only half of the buildings will be investigated, it could cost DoD over $230 million and many years to conduct initial documentation and NRHP-eligibility evaluations for 115,000 Cold War properties. The constraints on the military mission created by this growing number of potentially historic Cold War properties on DoD installations and the potential cost of continuing with current approaches to documentation and evaluation are approaching crisis proportions.

To address this situation, it has become necessary for the DoD to redirect the way it manages its Cold War resources. As a first step, the Air Force, as executive agent, will update the *Interim Guidance* to address the current military mission and priorities that have evolved since the original guidance was prepared. The Air Force, working with the SRI Foundation (SRIF) and Statistical Research, Inc. (SRI), organized a workshop to address this important first step. The workshop, conducted under Legacy Project #05-285, was held in Tucson, Arizona, on 7–9 February 2006. Workshop attendees consisted of DoD and private-sector participants with a variety of expertise in the Cold War arena (Appendix B). This expertise included inventorying and managing Cold War properties on military installations and carrying out environmental and historic preservation regulatory responsibilities. Workshop participants were brought up-to-date on the status of the DoD Cold War Initiative and the perceived issues within the program today. They identified and examined key issues, such as the lack of current program guidance and centralized databases, discussed successful approaches to addressing these issues, and developed action plans for the DoD to consider. Scott Thompson, SRI, took the lead in organizing the workshop and was a breakout group facilitator along with Terry Majewski and Marcy Gray of SRI. Terry Klein, SRIF, served as the workshop’s overall facilitator.

The DoD recognizes the need to inventory the large number of Cold War properties but also must establish guidance to ensure the task is completed in a consistent, timely, and cost-effective manner. The recommendations developed during the Tucson workshop will begin the task of streamlining the process, which in the long run will save DoD money and ensure protection of those properties that are truly unique and significant. SRI and SRIF, with the assistance from the workshop participants, will provide information to senior DoD management about this impending crisis and about ways to effectively address it. This will be accomplished by distributing this report on the workshop, presenting the results of the workshop at various DoD conferences and meetings, and initiating a number of Legacy projects to advance the workshop recommendations.
BACKGROUND

Summary of Air Force Cold War Studies


Cold War Task Area

The emphasis on managing Cold War resources began with the advent of the Legacy program (Public Law 101-511, Section 8120) in 1991, when the DoD recognized the wealth of unique and irreplaceable resources it owned that represent one of the most important events since World War (WW) II. The end of the Cold War, considered by some as the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and others as the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, coincided with the greatest organizational transformation of the Air Force since its creation in 1947. Confronted with a reduced military threat when the Soviet Union disappeared as an adversary of concern, the Air Force inactivated some distinguished commands, such as the Strategic Air Command, and established new ones. This period of transition and the rapid course of the major reorganization challenged the Air Force’s ability to identify and treat significant Cold War resources within mission-driven timeframes and processes. DoD cultural resources managers were operating under existing laws, regulations, and practices during the NRHP-evaluation process of these historic resources. The recent nature of the Cold War challenged even the most experienced cultural resources managers to find the proper course of action to identify and evaluate the associated properties. And they were not alone. The NRHP and other components of the national historic preservation program focused on “older” history, and none of its practitioners was prepared to deal with the rapid influx of eligible “younger” properties. Cold War resources were rapidly being lost as a consequence.

The Cold War Task Area is one of nine original Legacy program emphases with its objective to inventory, protect, and conserve the physical and literary property and relics of the DoD associated with the origins and development of the Cold War. For the first time, there was emphasis on the management of a large number of less-than-50-year-old properties. Ordinarily, properties less than 50 years old are not considered eligible for listing in the NRHP. These types of properties, however, can qualify for listing in the NRHP if the property is of exceptional importance. Unfortunately, there was no clear method to evaluate “exceptional importance” other than the general guidance provided in NRHP Bulletin 22, *Guidelines for Evaluating and Nominating Properties that Have Achieved Significance within the Last Fifty Years* (National Park Service [NPS] 1991).
Mr. Gary Vest (1992), deputy assistant secretary of the Air Force (Environment, Safety and Occupational Health), brought the lack of guidance to light in a 1992 memo to the Air Force Civil Engineer regarding management of Cold War properties threatened by an undertaking at Vandenberg Air Force Base (AFB), California. Mr. Vest (1992) stated “Personnel . . . are uncertain of their requirements under the National Historic Preservation Act. . . . There is no DoD or USAF-wide agreement concerning the eligibility of Cold War or Scientific and Technical assets for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. This is clearly an opportunity for the USAF to take the lead. Request you . . . develop a policy or programmatic agreement regarding Cold War materials” (this memorandum is provided as an attachment to Appendix A).

The Air Force did take the lead. In early 1993, in direct response to Mr. Vest’s challenge, Cold War Project Manager Dr. Rebecca Cameron (historian, Air Force History Support Office) and a group of DoD cultural resources managers formulated a plan for addressing the preservation of the military’s Cold War resources. Two management strategies were discussed at a number of workshops in the early 1990s. The first involved a long-term process of developing historic contexts and then inventorying and documenting individual facilities. The second included a “triage” approach to stem the almost daily loss of potentially significant Cold War resources. In the end, the Cold War planning group developed a two-phase approach using a combination of both strategies simultaneously. The two phases included site-specific documentation of the most significant Cold War–era properties and conducting broad national-theme and historic context studies of the prominent military weapons systems and missions that played a primary role in the Cold War and had a major impact on the American landscape.

Two reports outlined the process, methods, and goals of future Cold War studies. Dr. Paul Green (cultural resources manager, Headquarters [HQ] Air Combat Command [ACC]) authored Air Force Interim Guidance: Treatment of Cold War Historic Properties for U.S. Air Force Installations (U.S. Air Force 1993), and Dr. Cameron (1994) completed Coming in from the Cold: Military Heritage in the Cold War. In the mid-1990s, the Army published its own Cold War policy guidance, Interim Policy for Cold War Era Historic Properties (Advisory Council on Historic Preservation 1996; Guldenzopf 1995), with many similarities to the Interim Guidance. These reports opened the gate for a virtual flood of Legacy-funded national historic contexts in the mid- to late-1990s on subjects such as ballistic missiles, training and education programs, defense production facilities, communications and command centers, defensive radar networks, and fighter and bomber aircraft missions (for more on these, see Green 2006a). These guidance documents and national context reports led to what can be considered the third phase of the Cold War Task Area—command-specific historic contexts and building inventories.

The original DoD and Air Force reports provided guidance on how to treat Cold War properties, and national historic contexts provided the big-picture view of various programs. ACC (Lewis et al. 1995, for example; introductory and summary reports with 27 base-specific volumes), Air Mobility Command (AMC) (Weitz 1996, for example; 8 base-specific volumes), Air Education and Training Command (AETC) (Prior and Salo 2003), and Air Force Materiel Command (AFMC) (Weitz 2003) completed historic contexts and command-wide inventories that identified their command’s most significant contributions to the Cold War and the property types that supported these missions. These historic contexts tied specific installations into the broader Cold War, thus fulfilling the needs of installation cultural resources managers as they completed compliance-driven and proactive Cold War property inventories and evaluations across DoD. The Army also completed some large thematic studies, such as one on military-industrial properties (e.g., U.S. Army Environmental Center 1997). In addition, Army installations have their own individual projects, but reference data are not readily available (Jennifer Groman, personal communication 2006).

The Cold War has also been the topic of conversation at previous workshops. In 1996, The Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence (AFCEE) and Eglin AFB hosted a Cold War workshop that examined building inventory and historic context efforts, discussed deficiencies, and made recommendations for further work. AFCEE, ACC and the U.S. Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratory (USACERL) produced a newsletter from 1996 to 1998 stemming from the workshop that covered all aspects of Cold War projects and studies within DoD and the Department of Energy. The early issues also included a bibliography of work completed to that date. AFCEE also began a Cold War study database.
The focus of Cold War studies has moved away from preparation of large historic contexts and studies in favor of installation-specific inventories and evaluations. A few historic contexts and large projects have been completed recently, such as the AETC and AFMC Cold War contexts, and ACC’s Pilot Study on Cold War Documentation Preservation (Peyton et al. 2003). ACC is nearing completion on a study of Cold War facilities on former Air Force installations and is in the second phase of a command-wide assessment of Cold War–era facilities not evaluated during earlier studies. The Department of the Navy is currently completing a service-wide historic context study, and their initial themes under development are deterrence, sea control, intelligence, and research/development (Brian Lusher, personal communication 2006). Installation-specific inventories and evaluations continue as cultural resources managers comply with their Section 106 responsibilities for Cold War buildings turning 50 years old.

The Interim Guidance

The Interim Guidance remains the single most important document for the management of Air Force Cold War resources, even though it was created as an interim policy (see Appendix A). The Air Force consulted with other agencies and subject-matter experts to create the Interim Guidance. Air Staff initially distributed the document to Air Force MAJCOMs in June 1993, and in 1994, it was published as an appendix to Coming in from the Cold. The Interim Guidance established operational relevance and national significance as driving principles for determining NRHP eligibility of Air Force properties. State or local significance was considered for individual properties, but only as an exception to the rule. Paul Green (2006a:3), author of the Interim Guidance, states “We wanted Cold War historic properties to be ones that the average citizen could recognize as emblematic of that time and struggle. Less relevant were those routine support facilities that would have been present in the military with or without the Cold War: warehouses, barracks or dormitories, base commissaries and exchanges, hospitals, etc. Examples with particular and important characteristics directly related to the Cold War would be welcomed, of course.”

The Interim Guidance was the Air Force interim measure to accomplish the DoD Legacy program’s goal of ensuring that historically significant Cold War properties were identified, recorded, and if feasible, retained for study and public education. It was also a tool to help installation managers comply with Section 106 in terms of identifying NRHP-eligible Cold War resources. The Interim Guidance provided the following specific criteria for evaluating NRHP eligibility (emphases are in the original):

- Possess exceptional value or quality in illustrating the Cold War heritage of the United States
- Are directly associated with events that have made a significant contribution to, and are directly related with, or that outstandingly represent, the broad national pattern of United States Cold War history
- Are associated directly and importantly with the lives of persons nationally significant in the Cold War history of the United States
- Represent some great idea or ideal of the American people (e.g. “Peace through Strength”), or
- Embody the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural, engineering, technological, or scientific type specimen exceptionally valuable for a study of a period, style, method, or technique of construction, or represent a significant, distinctive and exceptional entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

The Interim Guidance also described the major historic property types expected to be identified during the inventory such as operational and support installations, combat weapons systems, training facilities, and intelligence facilities.

Summary

After over 10 years of effort, DoD cultural resources managers need to reevaluate their progress. Two things are apparent: many good studies have been completed, and the DoD would greatly benefit from compiling and synthesizing their findings. The current Cold War projects are often operating in a vacuum with no access to data from other commands or services. This leads to duplication of effort and NRHP evaluations and nominations that do not consider the “big picture.” A primary issue is the lack of a DoD-wide reference list of all Cold War documents such as historic contexts and specific property type studies. Although the Interim Guidance has
been instrumental in the initial stages of the Cold War inventory process, it must be updated and also modified to address some unresolved issues and problems. For instance, although it provides valuable recommendations dealing with Cold War property significance, installation managers must still consult with their state historic preservation officers (SHPO) on a case-by-case basis on issues of NRHP eligibility and evaluations of project effects. While there is nothing wrong with this approach, Section 106 consultation can be conducted in a more efficient and programmatic manner.

As the executive agent for the Cold War Initiative, the Air Force initiated the current workshop to develop a systematic approach to address these issues. The initial objectives were updating and finalizing the Interim Guidance as an example for the other services to follow, and initiating guidelines for creating a DoD-wide Cold War reference guide that will provide the data needed for future property inventories and evaluations. The final, and perhaps most important product will be an Air Force action plan for developing tools and approaches for identifying and managing Cold War–era historic properties DoD-wide in a cost- and time-efficient manner.

The following chapters of this report present the results and recommendations from the Tucson workshop.
WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES AND FORMAT

DoD cultural resources managers recognize that after over 10 years of intensive effort in the Cold War arena, there is still no centralized instruction to guide current efforts or a clear goal to reach. The purpose of the Tucson workshop was to identify action items and possibly create products or tools that would assist the Air Force in taking the lead in improving existing guidance (the Interim Guidance) and developing methods for more consistent and time- and cost-effective management of DoD Cold War resources.

As with many research-oriented projects, what is proposed at the beginning with the best of intentions is not always what comes out at the end. Air Force cultural resources managers have discussed the deficiencies and needs of the Cold War program for a decade, and many of the issues brought up at the beginning are still being faced today. The original project proposal was considered a needs assessment with two identified goals: (1) updating the Interim Guidance and (2) preparation of guidance for compiling a Cold War reference document.

Step 1 would consist of a 3-day workshop to update the Air Force Interim Guidance and provide a road map for the other services to complete their respective policies. Progress in the Cold War arena since 1992 would be reviewed, and the shape of the final guidance would be defined. This would lead to finalizing the other services’ and DoD’s policy in this area, highlighting results to date, gaps in coverage, if any, and future level of effort. Step 2 would address the complete lack of a comprehensive reference document for Cold War reports and projects. The second part of the project would determine a process to begin compiling what is expected to become a DoD Cold War reference document, using a small group of installations as test cases. The reference document was envisioned as an index of building categories, such as hangars or igloos, followed by an annotated bibliography of available reports on those subjects, with the final product being a sample reference document illustrating the proposed format with examples from the selected installations.

The project approach shifted slightly after initial planning discussions. Because so much Cold War work had been completed since publication of the Interim Guidance in 1993, enough information and research might be available to develop a national historic context of Air Force Cold War-era properties. This context would provide Air Force installation managers with “a clear framework and useful tool for evaluating the National Register eligibility of these categories of resources, and these evaluations would be conducted in a consistent manner. Ultimately, the historic context, endorsed by the NRHP program, could be used for establishing a nationwide NRHP eligibility process, whereby future evaluations would no longer be conducted on a case-by-case basis for Cold War Era properties” (Klein 2006:2).

Guidance would also be available to installation managers on how to apply this national historic context to their day-to-day Section 106 compliance activities. The 3-day workshop would provide the format for a panel of experts to begin developing this national historic context and additional guidance, the results of which could be used to update the Interim Guidance. A second product would be an action plan for the Air Force to develop tools and
approaches for identifying and managing DoD-wide Cold War resources.

With this in mind, the workshop began with the entire group discussing two general questions:

- What do we know about the Cold–War era and potential historic properties?
- What do we not know?

The answers to these questions led to a more specific question:

- How does what we know and do not know affect what we can do in terms of creating a national historic context (or subsets of a historic context), establishing a decision-making process and dealing with properties of state and local significance?

The group quickly determined that creating a national historic context was not appropriate at this time given the lack of guidance and knowledge about existing Cold War building data. Instead, the focus and new workshop goal shifted back to revising the guidance and collecting baseline data necessary to determine how to proceed with management of Cold War resources. Four major topics related to these goals were identified:

- Data collection/synthesis
- Data repository/clearinghouse
- *Interim Guidance* update
- Executive-level briefing

Workshop participants were divided into three breakout groups to identify and create appropriate products and tools for the first three subject areas. The executive-level briefing on service-level policy was put on hold as a future task for Air Force cultural resources management.

The first group was tasked with identifying methods for data collection/synthesis. They outlined the following approach:

I. Data call
   A. Types of information needed
      1. Goal: create Air Force Cold War building list using as much existing data as possible such as Air Staff historic building lists, base-specific lists, etc.
      2. Collate lists
      3. Use real property language

   4. Consider real estate transfers (i.e., property transferred into or out of the Air Force inventory)

B. Handling gaps in the information
   1. Data call to installations
   2. Field visits by data collection crew

C. Creating a bibliography
   1. Primary sources: inventory and evaluation reports
   2. Secondary sources: Integrated Cultural Resource Management Plans (ICRMP), programmatic agreements (PA), memorandums of agreement (MOA), historic contexts, installation histories etc.

II. Data synthesis
   A. Create format for organizing collected data
   B. Relate to Cold War events using NRHP criteria
   C. Coordinate with Air Force historians for joint project

The second group discussed creation of a data repository/clearinghouse, with four major recommendations:

I. Make information consistent in all documents: title, description, location, access restrictions, and keywords

II. Determine funding sources

III. Create an action plan that can be implemented by including it in DODI

IV. Create a mission statement defining
    A. Why the product is important,
    B. Where it will lead,
    C. How it will make everyone’s lives easier (systematically and programmatically),
    D. How it will “fulfill the mission,”
    E. Whether it can it relate to “force protection.”

The third group considered the *Interim Guidance* update. They reviewed the existing document and identified a series of proposed revisions to make it an easy-to-use guide:

- Define Cold War era, citing statutory (1945–1991) and historical (1946–1989) references.
• Define document purpose (tie into the NHPA and other appropriate laws and policies)
• Update legislative authority
• Update summary of activities, including key studies completed
• Update Cold War property definition (integrate with data call information discussed above and data collected since 1992)
• Describe historical significance determinations, including state and local significance
• Update thematic groups (from data call)
• Refine Cold War historic property categories and types, keeping current categories
• Recast the section listing the not exceptionally important property types
• Provide recommended actions
• Include a roles and responsibilities section

Based on these initial discussions, workshop participants used their knowledge and experience to create the following for each topical area:

• Mission statement
• Action plan
• Implementation strategy

The workshop products needed to have an immediate application to the historic preservation issues facing Air Force installation cultural resources managers and decision makers. From this standpoint, the workshop was a success because it met the final proposed workshop goal of an “action plan for the Air Force to take the lead in developing tools and approaches for identifying and managing Cold War era historic properties DoD-wide” (Klein 2006:2).

---

Defining the Cold War

The historical references are the seminal events first used by the Legacy program, i.e., Churchill’s 1946 Iron Curtain speech and the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. The statutory reference is the definition in law: Public Law 105-85, Sec. 1084, Commendation of Members of the Armed Forces and Government Civilian Personnel Who Served During the Cold War: Certificate of Recognition. (a) Findings—The Congress finds the following: (1) During the period of the Cold War, from the end of World War II until the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, the United States and the Soviet Union engaged in a global military rivalry. [This defines the Cold War, then, as 2 September 1945 to 26 December 1991.]
The three breakout groups focused on creating a mission statement, action plan, and implementation strategy for their assigned topics. Participants are listed for each breakout group, followed by their title at the time of the workshop. (A number of participants have changed jobs since the workshop, and their updated contact information is provided in Appendix B.)

**Data Collection/Synthesis**

**Breakout Participants (Affiliation)**

Rick Bryant (Air Force cultural resources manager)
Carol Heathington (Air Force cultural resources manager)
Brian Lusher (Navy HQ architectural conservator)
Kelly Nolte (contractor, architectural historian)
Marty Tagg (Air Force HQ cultural resources manager)
Scott Thompson (group facilitator; contractor, historian)
Jim Wilde (Air Force HQ cultural resources manager)

1. How many DoD properties are related to the Cold War?
2. How much inventory has been conducted to date (i.e., the number and types of buildings and structures)?
3. What data must be collected?
4. How will the data be collected?
5. How will gaps in the data and data collection process be addressed?
6. Once the data have been collected, how will it be made available to cultural resources managers?

Answering these questions requires a systematic approach for identifying, compiling, and analyzing available data on Cold War–era cultural resources. Recognizing the immense scope of such a task, the group recommended that the Air Force should focus first on properties under their jurisdiction that are associated with the Cold War, before implementing a DoD-wide data collection program.

As noted above, products of the data collection group included a mission statement, an outline for collecting and synthesizing data, and an action plan for accomplishing the group’s recommendations.

**Mission Statement**

The Air Force must identify its Cold War resources in order to more efficiently and proactively integrate cultural resources management with its military mission. Compiling and analyzing available data on Cold War–era
cultural resources is a critical first step in developing a programmatic approach to the effective management of these resources.

**Action Plan**

The first step is data collection. The group recommended a data call to Air Force installations requesting lists of buildings and structures constructed or used during the Cold War era (using the statutory dates of 1945–1991). This will help determine the number of extant Cold War-era properties and how much inventory has been conducted to date. The data call will be issued to the cultural resources manager and real property officer at each installation to ensure broad coverage and promote collaboration. Information requested will consist of primary data and synthesis materials on file at the Air Force installations.

**Air Force Building Database**

The Air Force completed entry of the historic status of all its facilities in its real property database on 30 September 2006. This was a big effort as there are over 16,000 facilities in ACC alone. Installations and MAJCOMs recorded historic status (i.e., NRHP eligibility) and included properties built or used during the Cold War era. This database should allow detailed queries to determine how many Cold War-era facilities remain unevaluated, how many are NRHP eligible or listed, and how many are ineligible and require no further action. There was clear guidance on what the historic status of each facility meant, so the data should be good if the guidance was followed. If the base did not have documentation of Air Force and/or SHPO concurrence for the NRHP-eligibility status, the property was left in the “unevaluated” category. In 2007, the Air Force will complete a quality check of the information (Paul Green, personal communication 2006).

Primary data obtained from real property records and historic building and structure inventories will consist of the following (provided in spreadsheet format):

- Facility number
- Nomenclature
- Function (both historical and current)
- NRHP-eligibility recommendation for each building or structure (eligible, ineligible, or unevaluated)

The data call will also solicit bibliographical information to include the following textual materials:

- Historic building and structure inventories
- Historic context studies
- NRHP-nomination packages
- Treatment documents
- Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record/Historic American Landscape Survey (HABS/HAER/HALS) documentation
- MOAs
- PAs
- Base master plans
- Building and district maintenance plans
- Installation histories
- ICRMPs

Respondents will provide bibliographical information in a spreadsheet format using the following suggested column headings:

- Installation
- Document type
- Title
- Date
- Author or preparer
- Location of document with link to digital library, if applicable
- Point of contact (POC)

Once the data are collected, phase two will be data synthesis. Initially, the data will go to the Air Staff cultural resources manager (HQ USAF). From there it will follow the regular chain of command from the Air Staff to MAJCOMs and finally to the installations. Air Staff will also forward the data to AFCEE. AFCEE, representing Air Staff, will coordinate the analysis and synthesis of the data.
Data analysis will include:

- Evaluating responses (i.e., how many bases responded to the data call)
- Identifying and categorizing property types
- Determining themes and commonalities

Gaps in the data and data collection process are expected, considering the probability that some installations may not respond to the data call. Furthermore, some bases may lack or have only a partial building inventory, or have unnumbered buildings and structures. To address these potential gaps, a field team formed by the Air Force will visit the bases to search for additional information.

After the data are collected and analyzed, the Air Force will synthesize the material and make it available to cultural resources managers through print, electronic, and Web-based media. Knowing what information is available on Cold War properties will help the Air Force determine which properties require additional documentation and what property types should be considered NRHP eligible.

**Implementation Strategy**

This implementation strategy will help the Air Force take the lead in developing a programmatic approach for identifying and managing Cold War cultural resources DoD-wide. Workshop participants Dr. Paul Green (HQ ACC) and Dr. Jim Wilde (HQ AFCEE) will task select Air Force installations with testing the data call procedure outlined above. Cultural resources managers and real property offices at the selected installations will receive a data call letter. The letter will include a suspense date for responding to the data call. Respondents will send the requested data to a designated POC at Air Staff, and then a working group of workshop participants (DoD personnel from installations and MAJCOMs and private-sector consultants) will analyze the data according to the procedures outlined above. If data gaps are identified, a field team will visit the installation and fill in the gaps. The purpose of this exercise is to assess the data collection procedures and make necessary changes before issuing a service-wide data call. The ultimate goal is to have participation DoD-wide.

---

**Example Air Force Data Call Letter**

The United States Air Force is the executive agent for the Department of Defense’s Cold War initiative. In the next 10 years, thousands of buildings and structures associated with the Cold War will become 50 years old, putting an enormous strain on dwindling budgets and staff in dealing with issues of NRHP eligibility. To facilitate more efficient and active management of Cold War resources, the Air Force must identify those resources that are eligible and ineligible for listing in the National Register, along with those that are unevaluated. In addition, the Air Force is creating a comprehensive data warehouse of Cold War histories, historic context studies, inventories, evaluations, and other important documents.

We request you complete the attached Excel spreadsheet, which is self-explanatory.

Please direct to [appropriate Air Force POC] . . .

---

**Data Repository/Clearinghouse**

**Breakout Participants (Affiliation)**

Marlesa Gray (group facilitator; contractor, historical archaeologist)
Paul Green (Air Force HQ cultural resources manager)
Katharine Kerr (DoD cultural resources management specialist)
Heidi Mowery (Air Force cultural resources manager)
Paige Peyton (contractor, cultural resources manager)
Marsha Prior (contractor, historian)
Julie Webster (Army research architect)

**Introduction**

The group’s first objective is to provide guidance on the development of a Cold War–era Historic Information
Clearinghouse (CWHIC). The proposed CWHIC would be a service-wide repository for documentation associated with Air Force Cold War–era historic properties. A second objective is to examine mechanisms for expanding the repository to serve all of DoD.

The breakout group considered several topics related to this objective:

I. Purpose of a repository
II. Repository format, location, and appropriate use of technology
III. Repository content
IV. Security, access rules, and degree of public involvement
V. Definition of the audience
VI. Implementation steps
VII. Operations and maintenance issues
VIII. Funding

Initial group discussions recommended the following:

I. The repository should be in an electronic format
II. At least one hard copy should also be archived (additional copies for circulation as available). Possible locations include:
   A. Maxwell AFB
   B. Cold War Museum
   C. Library of Congress (LOC)
   D. Smithsonian Institution
   E. National Archives and Records Administration (NARA)
   F. A university archive or library
   G. With a vendor or contractor

III. The types of information and documents in the repository (expanding on the Data Collection group’s recommended list) should include:
   A. PAs
   B. MOAs
   C. Current property inventories
   D. ICMPs
   E. Decision papers
   F. HABS/HAER/HALS documentation
   G. Cultural resources management reports
   H. Air Force policy memos (need a mechanism for determining what is current)
   I. DODIs
   J. NRHP nominations
   K. Mitigation plans
   L. Audiovisual materials
   M. Scopes of work (SOWs)
   N. Photos, plans, and maps
   O. Non-HABS/HAER/HALS recordation
   P. Blue line and architectural drawings
   Q. Oral histories (reference the currently ongoing LOC Veterans History Project)
   R. Real property documents or copies thereof

IV. Decide who should be the owner of these materials in the repository
   A. Consider security issues and access rules
   B. Include links and provide mechanisms for macro testing
   C. Consider maintenance issues

Ideally, the format of the repository would consist of three parts:

I. A database (with a search engine)
II. A document repository
III. An electronic bulletin board

Existing platforms, such as the Defense Environmental Network and Information Exchange (DENIX) or the ACC environmental Web page, should be considered for housing the CWHIC, if possible. This would allow for a test of the process without committing to a full build. Other concerns were the identification of a support agency and command and funding mechanisms.

Subsequent discussions examined specific issues concerning development of the repository. These discussions were focused mostly on the electronic repository (e-repository) but also touched on issues surrounding development of a hard copy repository or archive.

For the e-repository, discussions focused on four topics: format, content, implementation, and operations and maintenance.

I. Format
   A. Preferable to initially use existing outlets, such as DENIX (already partitioned) or ACC
   B. Need to include keywords, abstracts, and links to whole documents or Offices of Primary Responsibility (OPRs) (the intent is to provide links from the database to OPR
Web sites and/or email contacts in case the person doing the searching wants to follow up with the relevant OPR on the information included in the database

C. Do not try to build it all at once; start small and allow the repository to grow

D. Need for access designation (public, official use only, by permission only/classified) and access rules

II. Content
A. Decide if the repository should be prescriptive or voluntary
B. Include the documents listed above
C. Determine who will be the owner
D. Determine what can go onto the public site
E. Determine who will be the customers or audience

III. Implementation
A. Develop an action plan
B. There are two types of solutions
   1. Near-term (ACC)
   2. Permanent (DENIX or another venue)
C. Draft a policy letter
D. Draft a SOW for operations and maintenance

IV. Operations and maintenance
A. Establish procedures for classifying access designations
B. Need to regularly update links (macro-testing)
C. Establish procedures for adding documents
   1. Create a format (portable document format [pdf] preferred)
   2. Determine keywords (can we use existing National Archeological Database forms [NADB], Standard Form [SF] 298 Report Documentation Page form)
D. Address sponsorship of non-DoD documents

Discussions about a hard copy repository were less detailed and were focused primarily on format and location. Content of such a repository was not addressed.

I. Format
A. Archive (one copy of everything to be preserved, but not circulated)
B. Library (limited number of copies retained for distribution and use)
C. Parcel out by access designation

II. Additional potential locations
A. Pentagon Library (owned by Army)
B. University of Maryland National Trust Library (Legacy program archives)
C. Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC, overworked, not very accessible, will print for a fee)
D. Defense Threat Reduction Information Analysis Center (DTRIC)

The breakout group developed a mission statement; the outline for a SOW to implement, operate, and maintain an electronic repository; general guidelines for the creation and maintenance of a hard copy repository; and, most importantly, an action plan to execute the recommendations of the group. It was recognized that the action plan would have obvious connections with the action plans developed for the data call and the proposed revisions to the Interim Guidance.

Mission Statement
The CWHIC provides paperless, Web-enabled access to information on Cold War cultural resources in a centralized and updated Web site. It will provide access to resources critical to the cultural resources community at all levels. It will enhance and expedite consultations with SHPOs and tribal historic preservation officers (THPOs) by consolidating all relevant documents in a single location. CWHIC will support DoD’s contributions to Executive Order 13287, Preserve America, while sustaining the military’s mission. This concept can serve as a model for other agencies to meet their compliance requirements (e.g., an archaeological data repository).

Action Plan
I. The idea and mission of the electronic clearinghouse should be included in the executive briefing (i.e., fourth goal of this workshop). Discussions
about the clearinghouse should include references to Preserve America; Air Force compliance with NHPA Sections 106 and 110; the advantages of a paperless and Web-enabled repository; and the application of the Web-based clearinghouse concept, if successful, to other compliance requirements (e.g., an archaeological data repository under the auspices of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, Archaeological Resources Protection Act, etc.).

II. It is recommended that DoD retain control of the information system, possibly through the Legacy program, with the Air Force taking the lead on implementation, operations, and maintenance.

III. Responsibilities of the control entity, or its designated representative, will include:
   A. Decisions about the types of documents to be accepted in the clearinghouse
   B. Development of procedures for accepting documents
   C. Creation of format standards
   D. Sponsorship of non-DoD documentation
   E. Determination of access designations
   F. Development of requirements for keywords and abstracts
   G. Oversight of an information systems contractor
   H. Development of budgets for project implementation, operations, and maintenance

IV. It is recommended that briefings on the proposed clearinghouse begin in Fiscal Year (FY) 2007 and continue through FY08. At the same time, progress will be made on the collection of documents through, first, a test data call, then a full service-wide data call (see above discussion on data collection/synthesis). Funding for the clearinghouse will be sought in FY08 or FY09, with implementation to occur in FY09 or FY10.

V. It is recommended that research be conducted to determine the costs of implementation, operations, and maintenance of the electronic clearinghouse. Existing systems, such as DENIX, may be useful to serve as guides. It is recommended that the DoD OPR will create the budget and request the funding, including development costs. Based on knowledge of other systems, it is estimated that recurring operations and maintenance costs may range from $200,000 to $500,000 annually.

Implementation Strategy 1: Hard Copy Repository

I. Identify and engage an existing repository that adheres to NARA standards that will accept the hard copy documentation for this Cold War-era project
II. Create a mechanism to permanently archive one copy of all documentation (record copy)
III. Avoid violation of service-specific document retention schedules
IV. Specify security protocols
V. Ensure preservation of at least the following, either originals or good copies:
   A. Photos
   B. Maps
   C. Films
   D. Tapes
   E. Videos
   F. Drawings
   G. Real property cards
VI. If it is determined that the existing archives at Maxwell AFB should be used for the Cold War-era hard copy repository, pursue funding for a new building or adaptive reuse of an existing building.

Implementation Strategy 2: Electronic Repository

The following is an outline of a SOW for an electronic repository contractor to develop the e-repository for Cold War-era documentation:

I. General introduction and statement of need
   A. Background (use invitational letter for workshop)
   B. Objective: to create, maintain, and manage DoD Cold War-era documentation as it relates to cultural resources management in the appropriate electronic format
C. Components should include:
   1. Clearinghouse
   2. Searchable database
   3. Bulletin board

II. User community
   A. Primary users—in-service cultural resources managers
      1. Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD)
      2. Services
      3. MAJCOMs
      4. Installations
      5. Contractors
   B. Secondary users
      1. General public
      2. Non-DoD federal agencies
      3. SHPOs and THPOs

III. Tasks
   A. Clearinghouse format
      1. Create user interface of Cold War-era documents and reports
      2. Create protocols to control access based on directives from controlling entity
      3. Create links to other pertinent sources of information
      4. Create a help link
      5. Establish electronic standards for document inclusion
      6. Ensure compliance with all applicable DoD information management standards
      7. Create bulletin board
   B. Clearinghouse content
      1. Accept items from the authorized DoD entity
      2. Convert documents to established electronic format
      3. Upload documents to appropriate electronic location
   C. Bulletin board (to be determined)
   D. Operations and maintenance
      1. Available 24 hours per day/7 days per week/365 days per year
      2. Backup and redundancy measures built in

III. Tasks
   A. Clearinghouse format
      1. Create user interface of Cold War-era documents and reports
      2. Create protocols to control access based on directives from controlling entity
      3. Create links to other pertinent sources of information
      4. Create a help link
      5. Establish electronic standards for document inclusion
      6. Ensure compliance with all applicable DoD information management standards
      7. Create bulletin board
   B. Clearinghouse content
      1. Accept items from the authorized DoD entity
      2. Convert documents to established electronic format
      3. Upload documents to appropriate electronic location
   C. Bulletin board (to be determined)
   D. Operations and maintenance
      1. Available 24 hours per day/7 days per week/365 days per year
      2. Backup and redundancy measures built in

3. Disaster recovery plan
4. Hard drive space and number of hits
5. Ensure viability of electronic links (macro-testing)
6. Provide system management reports
7. Ensure a 10-year commitment
8. Ensure viability of medium and software and revise as technology changes
9. Ensure compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, Section 508 (29 USC 794d)

IV. Deliverables
   A. Draft concept plan
   B. Final concept plan
   C. Electronic draft (prototype) for review and beta testing
   D. Pre-final electronic system
   E. Final electronic system
   F. System management reports
      1. Quarterly reports—items added in last quarter
      2. Annual reports—annual inventory and summary of Web site activity

V. Schedule
   A. Draft concept plan—120 days after contractor’s notice to proceed
   B. Final concept—60 days after receipt of comments
   C. Prototype—60 days after receipt of comments
   D. Pre-final—60 days after receipt of comments
   E. Final—60 days after receipt of comments

VI. Professional qualifications
   A. 36 CFR 61, Appendix A (and Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation)
   B. Cold War-era expertise (not required but recommended)
Interim Guidance Update

Breakout Participants (Affiliation)
Julian Adams (contractor, architectural historian)
James Carucci (Air Force cultural resources manager)
Karlene Leeper (Air Force cultural resources manager)
Brian Lione (DoD deputy federal preservation officer)
Terry Majewski (group facilitator; contractor, historic preservation specialist)
Duane Peter (contractor, cultural resources manager)
Jane Yagley (Air Force HQ cultural resources manager)
Karen Weitze (contractor, historian)

Introduction
The Interim Guidance update breakout group focused on providing recommendations for updating the 1993 Interim Guidance so that it can be used as true guidance (instead of being considered “interim”). The starting point was an outline, which was then reworked by the group. Products of this group include a mission statement, an annotated outline for use in preparing new guidance, and an implementation strategy.

Mission Statement
The Interim Guidance: Treatment of Cold War Historic Properties for U.S. Air Force Installations offers detailed guidance to base commanders, unit commanders, and others charged with managing the historic Cold War heritage of the Air Force. The guidance document will be “guidance” instead of “interim guidance” and will include recommendations for the evaluation of Cold War-era resources and specific examples of Cold War evaluations that have been completed by others.

Action Plan: Annotated Outline for New Guidance
For ease in reading and comparing the current to the proposed guidance, the following section is presented in two columns with the Interim Guidance outline on the left and the working group recommendations on the right.
### Outline of Interim Guidance (1993) (adapted from Wilde 2005)

| Introduction | The Introduction is a critical part of the document and needs to catch the attention of the base commander. The following rewritten paragraphs are suggested: The Air Force is a child of the Cold War struggle between the former Soviet Union and the United States of America. The modern Air Force, born of the Army Air Corps in 1947, was nearly a stand-alone organization by the close of WW II, and several events that occurred between 1945 and 1947 could be used to date the “start” of the Cold War. As defined by DoD in reference to the Cold War service medal (Cold War Certificates Program), the global conflict between communism and democracy dates from 2 September 1945 to 26 December 1991. Once officially established as a separate service, the Air Force found itself the owner of a number of bases and facilities that had served the country for many years and in many different roles. Some Air Force squadrons occupied historic bases with infrastructure dating to the 1800s. As technology advanced, and the Air Force constructed facilities and weapon systems to deal with the changing geopolitical climate, the management of earlier (WW II and older) facilities became problematic. In the early 1990s, by the close of the Cold War, the U.S. Congress and DoD became concerned about preservation of the physical and intellectual products of the Cold War era. DoD cultural resources managers were tasked by Congress to identify, manage, and in some cases preserve our heritage of the great global conflict we know as the Cold War. This document offers detailed guidance to base commanders, unit commanders, and others charged with managing the historic Cold War heritage of the Air Force. Included here are recommendations for the evaluation of Cold War–era resources and specific examples of Cold War evaluations that have been completed by others. A tremendous amount of inventory work has been completed, yet more remains to be done. [Other statements should focus on why these resources are important, e.g., innovation and worldview-changing events during this period of time, and be tied in with exceptional criteria. It should be emphasized that history can serve mission support.] This guidance provides a framework for identifying and prioritizing what is important. Historical knowledge of the Cold War serves the Air Force. |

| Working Group Recommendations | |
## Outline of Interim Guidance (1993)  
(adapted from Wilde 2005)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Cold War: 1947–1989</td>
<td>I. Define Cold War era using Cold War Certificates Program (1945–1991). Explain why this date range was chosen and why it is difficult to bracket the date range.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| II. Interim Guidance  
  a. For Section 106 compliance  
  b. Not for comprehensive or general Cold War study | II. Define document purpose (document is “guidance” not “interim guidance,” tie into NHPA compliance requirements)  
  a. Refer to Section 106 and 110 of NHPA  
  Compliance not only with Section 106  
  b. Not for comprehensive or general Cold War study—focus is on Air Force properties |
| III. Congress November 1990  
  a. Tasked DoD to study Cold War  
  b. Identify significant properties for preservation  
  c. Air Force Action Memo (Vest 1992) directs Air Force installations to consult on actions that affect  
    i. Significant Cold War, or  
    ii. Highly technical, or  
    iii. Scientific facilities | III. Historical background (combine Part III and IV of Interim Guidance)  
  a. Tasked DoD to study Cold War  
  b. Identify significant properties for preservation  
  c. Air Force Action Memo (Vest 1992) directs Air Force installations to consult on actions that affect  
    i. Significant Cold War, or  
    ii. Highly technical, or  
    iii. Scientific facilities  
  d. [ADD] Legacy Update (current focus of Legacy: Public Law 104-201, Section 2694, 23 September 1996), refer to Vest (1992) memo (include as an appendix), also Grone (2004, 2006) Preserve America memos |
| IV. [OLD] DoD Cold War activities... (as of June 1993) [merge this information into Section III above]  
  a. [ADD] Sociopolitical timeline—Note milestones, technology, significant events recognized by public, and also lesser-known, important events (may be of regional-level interest)  
  b. Historic contexts—Note that initial contexts have been developed—but without much input from the historical community  
  c. Present pros and cons of developing a nationwide PA for managing Cold War resources and installation and command-specific PAs. For example, a nationwide agreement document would cross-cut all the services and allow streamlining with regard to this large body of resources |
### Outline of *Interim Guidance* (1993)  
(adapted from Wilde 2005)

#### IV. DoD Cold War activities (as of June 1993)
- Develop preliminary sociopolitical timeline
- Initial context development
- Expect an eventual nationwide PA for managing Cold War resources

#### V. Defining Cold War historic properties
- Buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts used or associated with:
  - Critical events or persons, March 1947–November 1989,
  - That possess “exceptional” historical importance to the nation, or
  - That are outstanding examples of technological, or
  - Scientific achievement
- Artifacts
  - Historic personal property
  - Air Force Museum cross-responsibility (editorial note)
- Documents

#### VI. Determining exceptional historic significance
- Focus on exceptional to the nation
- Exceptional to region, state, community, to be handled as regular Section 106 actions as resources become 50 years of age
- Thematic approach (specific themes to be determined)
- Two categories expected

### Working Group Recommendations

#### IV. [NEW] Cold War properties, projects, and products
- Provide examples of Cold War properties and an annotated list of completed projects and products
- Discuss NPS National Thematic Studies (e.g., “Man in Space”)
- Note that the Air Force took the lead in writing the original 1993 *Interim Guidance* and that some other services adopted this guidance to address their own Cold War cultural resources management compliance issues
- List Army/Navy/Marines examples of seminal Cold War studies
- Consider disposition of Cold War properties during Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) or BRAC-like activities

#### V. Defining Cold War historic properties
- Buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts used or associated with:
  - Critical events or persons during the Cold War era (use agreed-upon dates as discussed above),
  - That possess “exceptional” historical importance to the nation, or
  - That are outstanding examples of technological, or
  - Scientific achievement
- Consider artifacts and documents (archival materials and associated documentation from project research)
  - Artifacts
    1. Historic personal property
    2. Air Force Museum cross-responsibility (clearly define responsibilities of cultural resources managers for those items under the ownership/management of the Air Force Museum, such as for aircraft static displays, paintings, and “objects” such as helmets, medals, etc.)
  - Documents

#### VI. Determining [delete exceptional] historic significance
- For properties that are not yet 50 years old, identify properties of exceptional national importance but also consider exceptional regional importance (i.e., NRHP Criteria Considerations – Criterion g). Define property types at national and regional levels
### Outline of *Interim Guidance* (1993) (adapted from Wilde 2005)

1. Eligible for NRHP
2. National Historic Landmarks
3. Specific criteria
   1. Exceptional value or quality in illustrating Cold War heritage,
   2. Possess high degree of integrity, and
   3. Directly associated with significant events, or
   4. Directly identified with or represent broad pattern of Cold War history, or
   5. Associated directly with lives of significant persons, or
   6. Represent great idea (e.g., “Peace through Strength”), or
   7. Embody significant characteristics of architectural, technological, engineering, or scientific type, or
   8. Specific exceptional construction or style
4. Caveats:
   1. Nominations (evaluations) must demonstrate sufficient historical perspective; and
   2. Scholarly, comparative analysis; to
   3. Justify claim of exceptional significance
5. But, because sufficient historical contexts are years away (in 1993), Air Force proposes:
   1. To define initial set of property types and examples that meet the exceptional significance criteria,
   2. To continually evolve the list to eventually include all significant property types, and
   3. To develop contexts for interpreting Cold War history (editorial additions)

### Working Group Recommendations

- that are eligible for listing in the NHRP because of their exceptional importance.
- As resources become 50 years old, NRHP eligibility will be evaluated during regular Section 106 actions.
- Themes for evaluating significance (specific themes to be determined). Example themes:
  1. Use themes presented in Part 7.2 in *Interim Guidance*; focus on themes that can be illustrated by the Air Force material culture/historic properties. Themes should be partly defined by the properties already identified through existing surveys and databases.
  2. Rapidly changing Cold War-era technology and how used by Air Force, strategic planners, etc. Theme relates to history of technology, war-fighting, etc.
  3. Social impacts of Cold War in a broader societal context
- Two categories of significant properties expected
  1. Eligible for NRHP
  2. National Historic Landmarks
- Specific criteria required for representing Cold War-era themes:
  1. High value or quality in illustrating Cold War “heritage,”
  2. Possess high degree of integrity, and
  3. Directly associated with significant events, or
  4. Directly identified with or represent broad pattern of Cold War history, or
  5. Associated directly with lives of significant persons, or
  6. Represent important idea (e.g., “Peace through Strength”), or
  7. Embody significant characteristics of architectural, technological, engineering, or scientific type, or
  8. Specific exceptional construction or style
- Caveats: eligibility evaluations must provide sufficient historical perspective and scholarly, comparative analysis in order to justify claim of significance
- Air Force proposes:
  1. To define initial set of property types and examples that meet the significance criteria
### Outline of *Interim Guidance* (1993)
(adapted from Wilde 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VII. Air Force Cold War historic property categories and types (examples)</th>
<th>Working Group Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Operational and support installations</td>
<td>ii. Continually evolve the list to eventually include all significant property types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Air force bases, command centers</td>
<td>iii. Develop contexts for interpreting Cold War history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Missile stations and systems</td>
<td>h. Determining significance should take into account public issues and concerns, particularly those on the regional and community level; solicit public and professional comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Launch complexes</td>
<td>i. Property types—define in terms of functional, physical, and architectural integrity. Functional integrity applies, in part, to the continuation of “mission.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Combat weapons systems and combat support systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Missiles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Aircraft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Ground vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. (All these subject to cross-responsibilities with Air Force Museum: editorial addition)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Training facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. War fighting, combat support, and intelligence schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Launch complexes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Combat training ranges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Impact areas (targets, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Prisoner-of-War training camps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Materiel development facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Research laboratories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Manufacturing sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Test sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Proving grounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Intelligence facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Radar sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Listening posts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Additional categories that could come to light through additional research (such as the recent AFMC study on Research, Development, Training, and Evaluation property types (Thompson 2007))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create breakout box—example of hangars—often not NRHP-eligible, but they cross-cut categories of significance, combining architecture and technology; some were built for specific aircraft only. Box to discuss exceptions/lessons for dealing with “historic” hangars.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. [NEW] Properties that are not NRHP eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Normally, real property assets related to personnel support, base administration, infrastructure, and everyday maintenance are not likely to be found significant and eligible for listing in the NRHP. These kinds of properties include: base exchanges, recreational facilities, garages, motor pools, maintenance shops, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Base civil improvements (sidewalks, transportation systems, sewers and other utilities, etc.) are also not likely to be NRHP eligible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create breakout box—example such as Arnold AFB wind tunnel and test complexes that have mundane support facilities directly connected to a historic property and are an integral part of the property. Definition of the historic wind tunnel test facility needs to encompass the ENTIRE facility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[NOTE] New guidance will not list specific examples of listed or eligible properties, or National Historic Landmarks. Reader will be directed to database listing of Cold War properties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Not exceptionally significant Cold War properties (or anticipated to be excluded)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Family housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Bachelor Officer’s Quarters (BOQ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Base exchanges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Administrative buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Garages and motor pools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Maintenance shops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Utilities, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Most hangars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Delete this section on “Not exceptionally significant Cold War properties (or anticipated to be excluded),” and combine with VII above as New Section “g”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| IX. Recommended actions for installations regarding compliance with Sections 106 and 110  
  a. Bases develop “straw man” list of possible Cold War properties with exceptional significance  
  b. Forward list to MAJCOMs et al.  
  c. With approval, forward list to SHPO for review  
  d. Identify additional requirements for inventory, etc. for funding  
  e. Be ready to assist in a Comprehensive Air Force Cold War review and study (Air Force is beginning this in 2006) | IX. Recommended actions for installations regarding compliance with Sections 106 and 110  
  b. [INSERT] discussion on use of PAs and other Section 106 program alternatives to streamline Section 106 and 110 compliance. Examples include PAs that stipulate process for evaluating and treating categories of Cold War properties, definition of exempted categories of undertakings, standard treatments of categories of Cold War properties, etc.  
  c. [ADD] information on data sharing opportunities through use of proposed clearing house and other databases, and how these information sources can be used to streamline Section 106 and 110 compliance.  
  d. [INSERT] discussion on professional qualifications of individuals carrying out Section 106 and 110 responsibilities. Stress 36 CFR 61, Appendix A, and the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines and the importance of experience in Cold War era. |
Implementation Strategy

The Air Force will complete the Interim Guidance update in-house, considering the recommendations provided above.

Executive-Level Briefing

As noted above, the executive-level briefing topic was put on hold and will be accomplished in-house by senior Air Force cultural resources managers. The Federal Preservation Officer and other high-ranking DoD officials will participate in this briefing, which will outline a framework for future Air Force–level Cold War policy and for implementing the recommendations of this workshop. Executive-level support is critical in order to establish a Cold War–era property management program that is consistent across all services.
Recommendations

The 2006 Cold War–era properties workshop focused on four topics: (1) what Cold War resources exist (data collection/synthesis), (2) how and where to store and share data on these resources (data repository/clearinghouse), (3) how to consistently manage these resources (Interim Guidance update), and (4) how to get executive-level support to apply the workshop recommendations across DoD (executive-level briefing).

Workshop participants proposed a number of recommendations for addressing each of these topics. The following is a summary of these recommendations.

1. Data collection/synthesis. Initiate a data call to select installations. This data call would serve as the beginning of a DoD Cold War reference document. The collected data would include the number and types of recorded Cold War–era properties, the extent of the inventories completed at the installations, and the amount and types of documentation associated with these properties and inventories. Once the data call is completed, the collected data would be evaluated to identify and categorize significant property types, prepare a Cold War bibliography, and define themes and commonalities that can be used across DoD. This test data call would then be used to issue guidance for completing an Air Force–wide or DoD-wide level data call. Establishing guidelines for a larger DoD-wide data call fits within the scope of the Legacy program.

2. Data repository/clearinghouse. Identify where and how to store the collected data so it is accessible to DoD cultural resources managers and researchers. Guidelines must be established on how to implement, operate, and maintain electronic and hard copy repositories. Implementing this recommendation will begin with executive-level briefings in order obtain project support. Funding for the clearinghouse will be sought after the completion of the test data call described above. The recommended data repository/clearinghouse also falls within the scope of the Legacy program.

3. Interim Guidance update. Revise the Interim Guidance so it is up to date and ensures consistent inventory, evaluation, and management of historic Cold War properties within the Air Force. It is anticipated that the revised guidance can be used by other services. Dr. Paul Green (HQ ACC) wrote the Interim Guidance, and it is therefore appropriate for the Air Force to take the lead in revising the document following the recommendations presented in this report.

4. Executive-level briefing. This task will be conducted in-house by the Air Force. This briefing will outline a framework for future Air Force–level Cold War policy and for implementing recommendations of this workshop. This briefing will be presented to Air Staff managers and the DoD Federal Preservation Officer to garner executive-level support. Executive-level support is critical in order to establish a Cold War–era property management program that is consistent across all services.
Next Steps

As a first step in addressing the workshop recommendations, proposals based on the two topics that will not be handled in-house by the Air Force—data collection/synthesis and data repository/clearinghouse—have been submitted to the Legacy program for consideration and funding.

SRI, with HQ ACC support, submitted a preproposal entitled Managing Cold War Resources: Identifying and Compiling the Data (Tagg 2006). The project will establish guidelines for collecting Cold War-era property data and test the data collection process at four DoD installations and/or MAJCOMs. The project will also create a Cold War annotated bibliography of all materials and documents listed under the data collection/synthesis topic in Chapter 4. These documents and materials will be collected from the test bases, in addition to readily available reference materials at other installations and MAJCOMs from all services. A full proposal was submitted in November 2006. If the proposal is accepted for funding, the project will begin in mid-2007.

HQ ACC submitted a preproposal entitled Feasibility Study for the Permanent Maintenance and Sharing of DoD Cold War–Era Cultural Resources Documents and Information (Green 2006b). The project investigates “the feasibility of establishing a long term repository and electronic library or clearinghouse to maintain the record of the Cold War-era experience and to facilitate the efficient accumulation of new knowledge and understanding.” The project will identify the specific long-term requirements for a hard copy and electronic repository and will recommend suitable candidates to serve as a Cold War-era repository, based on information gathered during the project. After reviewing the initial preproposal, the Legacy management team determined that this second proposal should not be funded at this time, but it will be reconsidered after the completion of the test data-collection project discussed above.

Summary and Conclusions

In 1993, the Air Force issued Interim Guidance: Treatment of Cold War Historic Properties for U.S. Air Force Installations to ensure that historically significant properties of the Cold War would be identified, recorded, and if feasible, retained for study and public education. The Interim Guidance is still in effect and continues to assist installations in their compliance with Section 106 of the NHPA, specifically in terms of dealing with issues of NRHP eligibility. Although the Interim Guidance provides valuable recommendations on dealing with Cold War-era properties, it was not designed to streamline compliance with historic preservation laws and regulations. Installations must still consult with their SHPOs on a case-by-case basis on issues of NRHP eligibility and evaluations of effects. Further, this case-by-case Section 106 compliance process will become a costly and time-consuming burden to the Air Force as thousands of Cold War-era properties become 50 years old within the next 5–10 years.

The results of the 2006 Tucson workshop provide an action plan for Air Force and DoD cultural resources managers to begin to address this pending challenge. As noted above, two of the workshop recommendations have already been submitted for Legacy funding. The implementation of these two recommended projects, in addition to the Air Force’s future in-house efforts to update and expand the Interim Guidance, will result in a streamlined and programmatic approach to DoD-wide management of Cold War-era historic properties. In addition, the proposed executive-level briefing will serve as the foundation for the Air Force’s future efforts as the leader in the DoD Cold War Initiative.
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# LIST OF ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Air Combat Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AETC</td>
<td>Air Education and Training Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFB</td>
<td>Air Force Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFCEE</td>
<td>Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFMC</td>
<td>Air Force Materiel Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMC</td>
<td>Air Mobility Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOQ</td>
<td>Bachelor Officer’s Quarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAC</td>
<td>Base Realignment and Closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFR</td>
<td>Code of Federal Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWHIC</td>
<td>Cold War–era Historic Information Clearinghouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENIX</td>
<td>Defense Environmental Network and Information Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoD</td>
<td>Department of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DODI</td>
<td>Department of Defense Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTIC</td>
<td>Defense Technical Information Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTRIAC</td>
<td>Defense Threat Reduction Information Analysis Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Fiscal Year (October to September in DoD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HABS</td>
<td>Historic American Buildings Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAER</td>
<td>Historic American Engineering Record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALS</td>
<td>Historic American Landscape Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRMP</td>
<td>Integrated Cultural Resource Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Library of Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJCOM</td>
<td>Major Command (Air Force)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOA</td>
<td>Memorandum of Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NADB</td>
<td>National Archeological Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARA</td>
<td>National Archives and Records Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPA</td>
<td>National Historic Preservation Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRHP</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPR</td>
<td>Office of Primary Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSD</td>
<td>Office of the Secretary of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Programmatic Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>Portable Document Format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC</td>
<td>Point of Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Standard Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHPO</td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOW</td>
<td>Scope of Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRI</td>
<td>Statistical Research, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRIF</td>
<td>SRI Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THPO</td>
<td>Tribal Historic Preservation Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACERL</td>
<td>United States Army Construction Engineering Research Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAF</td>
<td>United States Air Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USC</td>
<td>United States Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW</td>
<td>World War</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A

INTERIM GUIDANCE: TREATMENT OF COLD WAR HISTORIC PROPERTIES FOR U.S. AIR FORCE INSTALLATIONS (JUNE 1993)
(includes original distribution letter; 1992 Vest memorandum is also attached)
FROM:      HQ USAF/CE
           1260 Air Force Pentagon
           Washington DC  20330-1260

SUBJ:      Interim Guidance for Cold War Resources

TO:        HQ AFDW/CE
           HQ ACC/CE
           HQ AU/CE
           HQ AMC/CE
           HQ PACAF/CE
           HQ AFSPACECOM/CE
           HQ ATC/CE
           HQ AFMC/CE
           HQ AFRES/CE
           HQ AFCEE/CC

1. Numerous buildings, sites, objects, structures, and items
   associated with the Cold War may be eligible for inclusion in the
   National Register of Historic Places (National Register).
   Consultation with the respective State Historic Preservation
   Officer (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
   (ACHP) is required before any undertakings are implemented that
   may have an adverse effect on National Register eligible resources.

2. The interim guidance (attached) is for use in evaluating such
   resources and for achieving compliance with Section 106 of the
   National Historic Preservation Act. Efforts have begun as part
   of the DoD Legacy Resource Management Program to develop a DoD-wide
   historical context for the Cold War Era. This will offer final
   guidelines and recommendations for further identification and
   proper stewardship of these resources. The final report, as a
   cooperative project between the National Conference of State
   Historic Preservation Officers, the National Park Service, and the
   Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, is expected to be
   finalized in the spring of 1994. Until then, we request that you
   follow the enclosed guidelines and consult with the appropriate
   SHPO and the ACHP prior to undertaking any actions that may affect
   potentially eligible Cold War resources.

3. Acknowledgement is made to Dr. Paul Green, HQ ACC/CEVAN, who
   authored and coordinated the Guidelines after several review
   meetings with interested parties. Points of contact for this
   issue are Mr. Paul K. Williams and Maj Tom Lillie. They can be
   reached at DSN 225-6118 or (703) 695-6118; Fax DSN 225-8943.

   JAMES E. MCCARTHY
   Brigadier General, USAF
   The Civil Engineer

1 Atch
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INTERIM GUIDANCE
TREATMENT OF COLD WAR HISTORIC PROPERTIES

FOR
U.S. AIR FORCE INSTALLATIONS

June 1993
Introduction
In 1989 the Berlin Wall fell and "Checkpoint Charlie" became history. Suddenly the historic preservation community became aware of a Cold War heritage that would be lost without timely action. Both the DoD Legacy Resource Management Program and the Air Force Federal Preservation Officer acted to ensure that historically significant properties of the Cold War are identified, recorded, and, if feasible, retained for study and public education.

This guidance is intended as an interim measure for use at Air Force installations, mainly to assist them in complying with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. It is not aimed at meeting the broad mandate for Cold War study set down in the DoD Legacy Program. A more comprehensive treatment of Cold War history and historic preservation is expected from the Legacy Program in the next year or two.

In the simple question and answer format used here, we have relied heavily and purposefully on existing regulations and guidance of the Department of Interior, again for compliance purposes. If criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or other such guidance is changed, we will use it. Comments and criticisms on this interim guidance are welcomed from all parties.

1.0 WHY SHOULD I BE CONCERNED ABOUT HISTORIC PROPERTIES FROM THE COLD WAR? ISN'T THAT TOO RECENT?

1.1 Although 50 years is the normal age for the Interior Department (the lead agency in such matters) to begin considering properties potentially significant, its regulations and guidelines do allow for younger properties to be nominated if they are of exceptional importance, or are integral parts of National Register districts. Even though the Cold War ended only recently, it was unquestionably of exceptional importance in our Nation's history. Experience shows that waiting 50 years before engaging in historic preservation activities would result in the loss of many historic resources. The Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Environment, Safety & Occupational Health, Mr. Gary Vest, recognized this in a 9 Oct 92 action memo to the Air Force Civil Engineer (Atch 1). He stated that bases must consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) on actions that may affect significant Cold War or highly technical or scientific facilities. In a 1 Jul 91 memorandum, the Air Force forwarded policy guidance on the latter area (Atch 2).

2.0 WHAT DOD/AF PROGRAMS DEAL WITH COLD WAR HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES?

2.1 In November 1990 Congress tasked DoD in its Legacy Resource Management Program (P.L. 101-511, Sec 8120) to undertake studies of the Cold War and to
identify significant properties worthy of preservation. The Legacy Program, directed by the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Environmental Security, DUSD(ES), funded several projects in the Cold War area; these are summarized below.

3.0 WHAT IS HAPPENING WITH COLD WAR STUDIES IN DOD?

3.1 A draft report titled "Coming in from the Cold: A Preliminary Report on the Legacy Cold War Study" was completed in December 1991. Although still officially a draft, its recommendations will be folded into the 1993 report to Congress on the Cold War required by the Legacy statute.

3.2 To meet the Congressional mandate, a draft Report to Congress, outlining Cold War-related historic resources, existing laws that pertain to them, problems associated with their management and preservation, and recommendations for future activities of the Cold War Task Area, is expected in the fall of 1993.

3.3 Dr. Rebecca Cameron of the Air Force History Office is the Legacy Resource Management Program task area manager for the DoD Cold War history project (HQ USAF/CEVP, 1260 Air Force Pentagon, Washington, DC 20330-1260, (703) 697-8937). Among its forthcoming activities, the Cold War Task Area will sponsor a series of case studies that relate Cold War themes to military activities and to the sites, structures, buildings, objects, artifacts, and documents that illustrate them; will develop criteria and processes for identifying, evaluating, and protecting Cold War historic resources; will pursue projects concerned with declassification of records and with curation of Cold War-related artifacts; will coordinate the Legacy demonstration projects with Cold War themes; and, drawing upon a uniform methodology, will coordinate an effort to survey DoD Cold War holdings.

3.4 Some examples of the Legacy Resource Management Program demonstration projects with Cold War themes include: (1) the Department of History at the University of South Carolina is a partner with DoD Legacy in assessing Cold War properties at all Defense installations in that state; (2) the Army Corps of Engineers is developing some documentary information on the Nike missile defense system as part of its installation restoration program; and (3) late in FY92 a Legacy proposal by the National Park Service regarding Minuteman II/NIKE Missile Launch Facilities was funded. The project will inventory, evaluate, and document to Historic American Engineering Record standards MMII and NIKE facilities in the midwestern United States and develop a historic context based on both the administrative and technological components.
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3.5 In summary, for the Cold War we have the outlines of a sociopolitical timeline developed and some initial efforts at context development. For preservation purposes, we now need the help of military historians and informants in identifying significant tangible DoD assets from the Cold War.

3.6 Treatment of Cold War properties in terms of inventory and evaluation for compliance purposes may eventually be worked out programmatically by DoD with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers. Until that time, however, installations must consult case-by-case with their SHPOs on any action that could affect a historically significant Cold War property.

4.0 WHAT ARE OUR EXISTING SOURCES FOR TECHNICAL GUIDANCE ON THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OF COLD WAR PROPERTIES?

4.1 National Register Bulletin 15: "How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation," National Park Service

4.2 National Register Bulletin 22: "Guidelines for Evaluating and Nominating Properties that have Achieved Significance within the Last Fifty Years," National Park Service

4.3 National Register Bulletin 29, "Guidelines for Restricting Information about Historic and Prehistoric Resources," National Park Service


5.0 HOW DO WE DEFINE COLD WAR HISTORIC PROPERTIES?

5.1 In November 1992 Legacy Program representatives suggested the following temporal boundaries for the Cold War: from the March 1946 "Iron Curtain" speech of Winston Churchill to the fall of the Berlin Wall in November 1989. Since these were easily recognizable to the layperson, we have adopted them for this interim Section 106 guidance. "Cold War historic properties" are buildings, structures, sites, objects, and districts built, used, or associated with critical events or persons during this period and that possess exceptional historic importance to the Nation or that are outstanding examples of technological or scientific achievement. In addition to real property assets, two other categories can be found to have historic significance: artifacts and documents. The latter may or may not be associated with surviving real property. Legacy Program definitions for these categories follow.
Cold War Historic Preservation Policy

**Historic personal property** is any artifact, relic of battle experience or other military activity, piece of military equipment, weapon, article of clothing, flag, work of art, movable object, or other item of personal property to which historical or cultural significance may be ascribed through professional evaluation of historic associations to persons, events, places, eras, or military organizations.

**Historic records** are any historical, oral-historical, ethnographic, architectural, or other document that may provide a record of the past, whether associated with real property or not, as determined through professional evaluation of the information content and significance of the information. Special care should be taken to ensure that potentially important historic personal property and records are not lost during base realignments, closures, and disposals. Identify these items to records managers at the base and the gaining agency, who should ensure that curation measures are taken that meet the standards of the National Archives.

Most Air Force Cold War historic properties in the real property sense will be buildings and structures. Most of this guidance is directed to their compliance treatment. The following terminology is adapted directly from National Park Service guidelines for the National Register of Historic Places. While they may be at odds with some current military service conventions, their usage is preferred, especially since the Keeper of the Register has the final say in any determination of eligibility.

5.2 "Buildings" are created principally to shelter any form of human activity. Parts of buildings are not eligible for consideration independent of the rest of the existing building. The whole building must be considered and its significant features identified. Examples include: administration buildings, chapels, dormitories, family housing, garages, hangars, launch control centers, libraries, and radar stations.

5.3 "Structures" usually are made for purposes other than creating human shelter and all of the extant structural elements must be considered for eligibility. Examples include: aircraft, bridges, fences, missiles and their silos, launch pads and weaponry, railroads, roads, runways, water towers, and wind tunnels. Aircraft would not routinely be eligible as significant Cold War properties; however, if associated with an exceptionally important event, person, theme, scientific or technological development, they may warrant individual recognition and treatment. That association would have to be clearly documented through professional investigations by aviation historians.

5.4 An "object" refers to works that are primarily artistic in nature or that 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 (NPS Bulletin 15, p.5).
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Examples include: fountain, monument, statuary (note: movable sculptures and furniture are not eligible). See the Legacy terminology for historic personal property cited earlier.

5.5 A "site" is the location of a significant event, activity, etc. Actual physical remains may or may not be present at the location. Although this usually refers to archaeological sites and would not typically be of concern for Cold War properties, such sites are possible. Air Force examples include locations where critical missions were stationed or events transpired, e.g., sites of early rocket testing or test tracks (now dismantled), nuclear testing ranges, treaty signing locations, and aircraft wrecks.

5.6 Finally, a "district" possesses a significant concentration of buildings, structures, etc. united historically or aesthetically by plan or physical development. An Air Force example could include a block of buildings, lacking any significant architectural or engineering merit, that hosted a crucial code breaking or intelligence gathering activity during the Cold War, a group of buildings built for nuclear weapon testing (laboratories), or an entire installation constructed for a specific Cold War mission. Because the majority of the Air Force-built inventory dates from the Cold War period, the last category (entire installations) will be applied only after extensive justification (cf. paras 11.1 and 12.4).

5.7 Historic properties can also be identified as sharing a common theme or context. In this case they need not be co-located. Some possible examples: "Minuteman II Launch Control Centers and Launch Facilities of South Dakota", "Nuclear Test Sites in the Desert Southwest", etc.

6.0 HOW DO WE DETERMINE THE HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE OF COLD WAR PROPERTIES?

6.1 As stated in the Introduction, we rely in this interim guidance on Section 106 compliance on the Department of Interior’s National Register Criteria for Evaluation. These encourage nomination of recently significant properties if they are of exceptional importance to a community, State, region, or the Nation. According to NPS, "The criteria do not describe exceptional, nor should they. 'Exceptional', by its own definition, cannot be fully catalogued or anticipated."

6.2 Our approach will be thematic, i.e., "Cold War Historic Properties of the Department of Defense, 1946-1989." All DoD Cold War properties determined significant and eligible for the National Register are so designated at the national level. Regional or local significance remains to be determined through overviews, background studies, and inventories to be conducted as these properties approach the 50 year horizon.
6.3 Cold War historic properties may be of two classes:

6.3.1 Those that are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

6.3.2 Those that warrant designation as National Historic Landmarks; these must have achieved extraordinary national importance or significance.

7.0 WHAT ARE THE SPECIFIC CRITERIA OF HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE FOR COLD WAR PROPERTIES?

7.1 Buildings, structures, objects, sites, or districts that possess exceptional value or quality in illustrating the Cold War heritage of the United States, that possess a high degree of integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association, and:

7.1.1 That are directly associated with events that have made a significant contribution to, and are directly identified with, or that outstandingly represent, the broad national pattern of United States Cold War history and from which an understanding and appreciation of those patterns may be gained; or

7.1.2 That are associated directly and importantly with the lives of persons nationally significant in the Cold War history of the United States; or

7.1.3 That represent some great idea or ideal of the American people (e.g., "Peace through Strength"); or

7.1.4 That embody the distinguishing characteristics of an architectural, engineering, technological, or scientific type specimen exceptionally valuable for a study of a period, style, method, or technique of construction, or that represent a significant, distinctive and exceptional entity whose components may lack individual distinction.

7.2 Some of the military factors which influenced the shape of plans and operations during the Cold War era include:

- Forward power projection
- Capability to engage at all scales: limited/theater/global
- Rapid deployment
- Rapid resupply
- Large standing force
- 24 hour vigilance
- Worldwide intelligence gathering
- Short warning/response time
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High level of security
Emphasis on high technology (quality over quantity)

8.0 HOW DO WE ESTABLISH THE CASE FOR EXCEPTIONAL SIGNIFICANCE?

8.1 According to the National Park Service, "...nominations for such properties must demonstrate that sufficient historical perspective and scholarly, comparative analysis exist to justify the claim of exceptional importance." Furthermore, the rationale or justification must be an explicit part of the statement of significance and is not treated as self-explanatory.

8.2 Unfortunately, we are several years away from having this kind of reasoned basis from which to operate. In the meantime, irreplaceable pieces of our Cold War legacy have been and will continue to be lost. In this document the Air Force proposes an initial set of property types and Air Force examples as meeting the criteria of exceptional significance and eligibility for National Register listing. Although the list will be an evolving one and we shall seek the consensus of scholars and professional military alike, the litmus test will be recognition by the public at large. This will ensure that we focus our time and funds appropriately.

9.0 WHAT ARE AIR FORCE COLD WAR HISTORIC PROPERTY TYPES?

9.1 Air Force Cold War assets are grouped in the following categories, subject to revision:

Operational and Support Installations
  Air Force bases, including Command Centers
  Missile Stations
  Launch Complexes

Combat Weapons Systems & Combat Support Systems
  Missiles
  Aircraft (Fixed Wing & Rotary)
  Ground Vehicles & Equipment

Training Facilities
  Warfighting, Combat Support, & Intelligence Schools
  Launch Complexes
  Combat Training Ranges
  Impact Areas; Targets
  POW (Prisoner of War) Training Camps
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Materiel Development Facilities
   Research Laboratories
   Manufacturing Sites
   Test Sites
   Proving Grounds

Intelligence Facilities
   Radar Sites
   Spy Satellites
   Listening Posts

10.0 WHAT ARE AIR FORCE EXAMPLES OF THESE TYPES?

10.1 Air Force examples include:

10.1.1 Missile systems deployed in the CW era, including IRBM and ICBM systems,
   e.g., Snark, Thor, Jupiter, Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman. Specific examples include
   Space Launch Facility 576 A-3, Thor Launch Complex SLC-10, and Titan Launch
   Facility 395-C, all at Vandenberg AFB, CA; MMII LF A-9 and LCC A-1 at
   Malmstrom AFB; MMII LCC Delta I and Delta IX LF, Ellsworth AFB.

10.1.2 Antiaircraft missile/Surface to Air (SAM) systems; Bomarc installations at
   McGuire, Otis, and Niagara. Nike and HAWK systems operated by the Army in
   defense of Air Force installations may be worthy of consideration.

10.1.3 Major airframe types deployed in the CW era, e.g., F-86, F-4, F-15, SR-71.
   The Air Force Museum maintains representative examples of all types. Dispersed
   throughout most Air Force installations, they number 1600+, including WWII
   specimens. For airframes associated with exceptional people, events, or themes, and
   not currently in the museum inventory, the proponent should develop documentation
   to evaluate and support its significance.

10.1.5 SAC "moleholes" or alert facilities; examples at Carswell, Castle, Mather,
   and Wurtsmith AFBs.

10.1.6 Training Facilities; Missile launch complexes at Vandenberg AFB such as the
   Peacekeeper in Rail Garrison; simulated Russian POW training camp at the Air Force
   Academy in Colorado Springs.

10.1.7 Test and experimentation facilities; Johnston Island, US Territory, Pacific
   Ocean (formerly USAF, now Navy/Defense Nuclear Agency); site of high altitude
   nuclear testing and anti-satellite (ASAT) system.
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10.1.8 Air Force weapons production facilities

10.1.9 Key bases and command centers; Alternate National Military Command Center (ANMCC), or Site R, Raven Rock, PA.

10.1.10 Special operations; Building P-1900, Air Force Special Projects Facility, Westover AFB, MA.

11.0 WHAT AIR FORCE ASSETS FROM THE COLD WAR HAVE ALREADY BEEN IDENTIFIED AS HISTORIC PROPERTIES?

11.1 Properties listed in the National Register of Historic Places include:


11.1.3 Launch Pads 5, 6, 13, 14, 19, 26, 34, and Mission Control Center, Cape Canaveral Air Force Station, Patrick AFB, FL. Listed in 1984.


11.2 The following properties are considered exceptionally significant Cold War resources and have been determined eligible for the National Register by the Air Force:

11.2.1 "Minuteman II ICBM System"; significance confirmed in Environmental Impact Statements and Records of Decision for MMH drawdown at Ellsworth AFB, SD and Whiteman AFB, MO, dated 18 Nov 91 and 19 Oct 92, respectively.

11.2.3 Bomarc Missile Site, McGuire AFB, NJ.

11.3 Other assets which appear potentially eligible include SAC headquarters, SAC alert facilities, the "Looking Glass" operation (24 hour airborne command post), the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs, and numerous testing, training, and operational missile facilities at Vandenberg AFB (e.g., Oak Mountain telemetry, Tranquillian Peak Radar, Titan processing facility, SLC-3/Atlas and Thor).
12.0 WHAT ASSETS ARE NOT CONSIDERED EXCEPTIONALLY SIGNIFICANT HISTORIC PROPERTIES OF THE COLD WAR AND THEREFORE NOT ELIGIBLE FOR LISTING ON THE NATIONAL REGISTER?

12.1 Our reading of "exceptional significance" excludes many real property assets which are typically the subject of Section 106 consultations on older, pre-WWII bases, e.g., family housing (Capehart, Wherry, etc), BOQs, base exchanges, administrative buildings, garages & motor pools, maintenance shops, sewage treatment plants, etc. The Air Force will instead focus specifically on operational missions and equipment of unmistakable national importance and a direct, not merely temporal, Cold War relationship. The vast support complex that lay behind the "frontline" combat or intelligence units will, in due time, be inventoried for historic significance. Limited funds and the need to act quickly argues for this system of priorities.

12.2 We anticipate that most hangars may not meet the criteria of exceptional significance. However, only a good, hard look by knowledgeable people can verify this. Once a base has conducted an in-house assessment per para 12.4, provides this documentation to higher headquarters and the SHPO for review and comment, and addresses any changes, unexceptional properties can be excluded from further consideration under Section 106.

13.0 WHO DESIGNATES THE PROPERTIES IN PARA 10 AND 11 AND HOW SHOULD BASES TREAT THEM REGARDING COMPLIANCE WITH SECTIONS 106 AND 110 OF THE NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT?

13.1 As stated earlier, a preliminary list of properties will be developed and provided to the following parties for comment: the public at large, combat & combat support personnel, military historians, civil engineers, scientists, engineers, and technicians (individuals, companies and corporations, professional societies), preservation specialists, historians, and historical architects. The refined list will constitute the initial Air Force Cold War inventory.

13.2 From an agency perspective, determinations of significance are and will be made in two contexts. For routine compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and 36 CFR 800.4(b) & (c), the base makes the determination of significance in consultation with the MAJCOM. Mr. Gary Vest, SAF/MIQ, is the Air Force Federal Preservation Officer and makes final agency determinations of significance for listing on the National Register per 36 CFR 60.9(d).
13.3 Once a property has been identified as meeting the criteria of historic significance established here, any undertaking potentially affecting that property will be coordinated with the SHPO and Advisory Council for review and comment. All the provisions of 36 CFR 800 apply, per SAF/MIQ policy memo of 9 Oct 92. Potential actions include those that change the function of the facility or that change essential features, qualities, characteristics, and other elements which contribute to the property's exceptional significance and that are critical to conveying the significance of the resource or in defining its association with important historical themes and developments. These include any activities requiring Air Force funding, licensing, approval, or granting of assistance on any property.

13.4 We anticipate that an Air Force wide inventory will be developed to confirm the identification of these historic CW properties. In the meantime, bases should take the following steps.

13.4.1 The Base Historic Preservation Officer should organize a meeting of knowledgeable installation personnel (civil engineering staff, historian, museum, operations, logistics, etc.) within 60 days of publication of this guidance. Within 30 days of such a meeting, develop a "strawman" list of potential Cold War era properties of exceptional significance for the base. Failure to perform such an assessment could result in large portions of the base, or the entire base, being inappropriately designated "significant."

13.4.2 Forward the results of this initial screening to the MAJCOM Cultural Resources Manager. After review (maximum 10 days), the MAJCOM will forward this report to HQ USAF/CEVP, the DoD Cold War Task Area Manager, and the AF Cold War Working Group. Within 30 days, these offices will validate the report, recommend additional work to be accomplished, or recommend changes. Air Staff then returns the report through the MAJCOM for transmission to the base.

13.4.3 Depending on command action, the base provides the survey report to the SHPO for comment/concurrence. This will be the first regulatory step in establishing a list of significant Cold War properties.

13.4.4 The base should identify any requirement for additional inventory, study, curation, or protective treatment to higher command in the Environmental Compliance Program A-106 System.
14.0 CONCLUDING REMARKS

14.1 The Air Force was a major player in winning the Cold War. There are likely to be dozens of properties on (or off) CONUS bases warranting designation as "exceptionally significant." Some exceptional Cold War properties were located overseas and are no longer extant or in the DoD inventory. Perhaps only a few physical assets remain from an entire weapon system; these remains may be in a stateside or OCONUS museum, tucked away on a corner of a large test facility, or languishing in a semiactive facility. Only a comprehensive inventory can identify these properties. This guidance is intended as an interim measure for use while the service gears up for such an effort in the near future.
MEMORANDUM FOR THE AIR FORCE CIVIL ENGINEER

SUBJECT: Historical Significance of Cold War Materials - ACTION MEMORANDUM

Personnel involved in a project to upgrade two operational Minuteman Launch Control Centers (starting October 13, 1992) and six Minuteman Missile Procedure Trainers (starting January 1993) at Vandenberg AFB, CA, are uncertain of their requirements under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). The issue concerns historical significance of Cold War materials and Scientific and Technical equipment.

There is no DoD or USAF-wide agreement concerning the eligibility of Cold War or Scientific and Technical assets for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. This is clearly an opportunity for the USAF to take the lead. Request you coordinate with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers to develop a policy or programmatic agreement regarding Cold War materials and Scientific and Technical equipment. Until such an agreement or policy is fully executed, it will be necessary for USAF bases to consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) in accordance with Section 106 of the NHPA. Also, please advise Vandenberg AFB to prepare the necessary documentation for submission to the California SHPO for determining eligibility of the properties for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

GARY D. VEST
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force
(Enviroinment, Safety and Occupational Health)
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