1. NAME AND LOCATION OF PROPERTY

Historic Name: Fort William H. Seward

Other Name/Site Number: Chilkoot Barracks (1922-1946); AHRS No. SKG-000001

Street and Number (if applicable)**:**

City/Town: Haines **County:** Haines Borough **State:** Alaska

2. SIGNIFICANCE DATA

NHL Criteria: 1

NHL Criteria Exceptions:

NHL Theme(s): IV. Shaping the Political Landscape
3. Military institutions and activities
VIII. Changing Role of the United States in the World Community
1. International Relations
3. Expansion and Imperialism

DRAFT

Period(s) of Significance: 1902–1945

Significant Person(s) (only Criterion 2)**:**

Cultural Affiliation (only Criterion 6)**:**

Designer/Creator/Architect/Builder: U.S. Army Quartermaster Corps

Historic Contexts: VII. Political and Military Affairs, 1865–1939
D. America Becomes a World Power, 1865–1914
X. Westward Expansion of the British Colonies and the United States, 1763–1898
E. The Mining Frontier
7. Alaska Gold Rushes

Paperwork Reduction Act Statement. We are collecting this information under the authority of the Historic Sites Act of 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461-467) and 36 CFR part 65. Your response is required to obtain or retain a benefit. We will use the information you provide to evaluate properties nominated as National Historic Landmarks. We may not conduct or sponsor and you are not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. OMB has approved this collection of information and assigned Control No. 1024-0276.

Estimated Burden Statement. Public reporting burden is 2 hours for an initial inquiry letter and 344 hours for NPS Form 10-934 (per response), including the time it takes to read, gather and maintain data, review instructions and complete the letter/form. Direct comments regarding this burden estimate, or any aspects of this form, to the Information Collection Clearance Officer, National Park Service, 12201 Sunrise Valley Drive, Mail Stop 242, Reston, VA 20192. Please do not send your form to this address.

3. WITHHOLDING SENSITIVE INFORMATION

Does this nomination contain sensitive information that should be withheld under Section 304 of the National Historic Preservation Act?

___ Yes

_X_ No

4. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

1. **Acreage of Property:** 33

2. **Use either Latitude/Longitude Coordinates or the UTM system:**

Latitude/Longitude Coordinates (enter coordinates to 6 decimal places)**:**

Datum if other than WGS84:

DRAFT

	Latitude:	**Longitude:**
A.	59.2273092 ºN	135.4472323 ºW
B.	59.2286815 ºN	135.4445031 ºW
C.	59.2291954 ºN	135.4424392 ºW
D.	59.2283767 ºN	135.4407958 ºW
E.	59.2288008 ºN	135.4400387 ºW
F.	59.2279048 ºN	135.4381323 ºW
G.	59.2276345 ºN	135.4386909 ºW
H.	59.2269554 ºN	135.4373877 ºW
I.	59.2267429 ºN	135.4377752 ºW
J.	59.2270343 ºN	135.4383146 ºW
K.	59.2264417 ºN	135.4394175 ºW
L.	59.2267829 ºN	135.4401770 ºW
M.	59.2261875 ºN	135.4407677 ºW
N.	59.2251276 ºN	135.4429170 ºW

3. **Verbal Boundary Description**:

The boundary is illustrated on the accompanying map titled “Fort William H. Seward NHL: Boundary Overview Map.” Situated approximately 0.5 miles south/southeast from the center of downtown Haines, the boundary is described as follows: beginning at the intersection of FAA Road and Mud Bay Road at point A; thence heading northeast along Mud Bay Road to point B near the intersection of Mud Bay Road and S. 2nd Avenue; thence continuing northeast along Mud Bay Road to point C approximately 90 feet northeast of the

Post Exchange building; thence heading southeast to intersect with Blacksmith Street at point D; thence heading northeast along Blacksmith Street and crossing Beach Road to point E; thence heading southeast along Beach Road approximately 490 feet to point F; thence heading southwest along Tower Road for approximately 145 feet to point G; thence heading southeast following lot lines for approximately 350 feet to point H; thence southwest following lot lines approximately 106 feet to point I; thence northwest along lot lines approximately 147 feet to point J; thence southwest along a road approximately 300 feet and crossing Theater Drive to point K; thence following Theater Drive northwest to its intersection with Tower Road approximately 190 feet at point L; thence following Tower Road south approximately 245 feet to its intersection with Battle Road at point M; thence heading southwest along Tower Road to its intersection with FAA Road approximately 563 feet to point N; and finally returning to the start by following FAA Road northwest to point A.

4. Boundary Justification:

The boundary has been informed by the original survey plan of the fort, while also taking into consideration modern infrastructure and new construction that has occurred over the years. Local zoning and parcel information was also relied upon and used to define the boundaries whenever possible.

In the original nomination the boundary begins at the corner of Mud Bay Road and Tower Road; goes north to where Mud Bay Road meets 3rd Avenue; turns northwest on Mud Bay Road, crossing the Haines Highway Cutoff and extending approximately 200 feet into Portage Cove; the boundary then turns southeast to include the Haines Dock; then southwest behind the non-commissioned officers' quarters on Soap Suds Alley, connecting with Tower Road and extending back to where it began at the corner of Mud Bay Road. The revised boundary, as presented in this nomination, moves the southwest boundary northeast to FAA Road, more tightly encompasses contributing buildings, and moves the northeast boundary southwest to exclude the Haines Dock, which is a modern dock. Although not stated in the original nomination, it appears, from photographic evidence, that the boundary along Mud Bay Road was intended to include a water tower located in the south-southwest corner of the district that is no longer extant.

DRAFT

5. SIGNIFICANCE STATEMENT AND DISCUSSION

INTRODUCTION: SUMMARY STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Fort William H. Seward National Historic Landmark (NHL) is significant under NHL Criterion 1 for its association with the themes "Shaping the Political Landscape" and the "Changing Role of the United States in the World Community." The fort stands as the best remaining example of a military outpost constructed in response to the Alaska gold rush of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries that is intact and retains most of its historic buildings. Its location in southeast Alaska next to Haines, on the Chilkat Peninsula along the Lynn Canal (a natural waterway/fjord), placed it in view of the Chilkoot and White Pass Trails that were in heavy use during the Klondike Gold Rush as tens of thousands of people arrived in the area seeking fortune. Alaska was the last major gold rush frontier during the United States' westward expansion.

Fort William H. Seward is also nationally significant for its connection to the Alaska boundary dispute at the turn of the twentieth century. The boundary conflict between the United States and Canada was precipitated by the gold rush and resulted in an international boundary tribunal affecting the jurisdictional fate of the Upper Lynn Canal area of Alaska's panhandle. The U.S. constructed the fort during the border dispute near the end of the Klondike Gold Rush and asserted its sovereignty over the head of the Lynn Canal, which included the gold rush towns of Skagway and Dyea as well as the Haines area. The construction of the fort using standardized U.S. Army Quartermaster plans for permanent military installations underscored President Theodore Roosevelt's confidence that the United States would secure the disputed area and communicated his willingness to use the military to defend U.S. claims. In the late 1800s, as gold rushes led to westward political and industrial expansion by the United States and Canada, an imprecise boundary that was suddenly strategically valuable came into question. When the international tribunal ultimately voted in favor of the United States' preferred boundary, many Canadians were outraged. The result—and President Theodore Roosevelt's commitment to asserting U.S. claims—occurred in the context of the United States' growing imperial power following victory in the Spanish-American War.

From 1925 until 1940, Fort Seward was the lone active army installation in Alaska. During World War II, the fort served as a recruitment station, rest stop, and training ground for troops involved in the Aleutian Campaign and the war effort throughout the territory. The period of significance for Fort William H. Seward is unchanged from the original NHL designation in 1978. It begins when clearing and construction began in 1902 and ends in 1945 with the conclusion of World War II and decommissioning of the fort.

Designation History

Fort William H. Seward was listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NR) on April 11, 1972. The nomination was written by Carl Heinmiller, a veteran who helped establish the Port Chilkoot Company within the decommissioned fort grounds following World War II. Heinmiller wrote in the NR nomination that in April 1966, the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments noted Fort Seward as being "an interesting example of an early twentieth century military installation."

In early 1976, the owners at Fort Seward were notified that the National Historic Landmarks Program of the National Park Service was evaluating potential NHLs in Alaska, and that Fort Seward potentially qualified for NHL status. The NHL office had a contract with the new Alaska Office of History & Archaeology (OHA) to prepare several NHL nominations in Alaska. Fort William H. Seward was presented to the NPS Advisory Board at its meeting April 17–19, 1978, was awarded National Historic Landmark designation on June 2, 1978, along

DRAFT

with fifteen other Alaska properties.

This nomination update expands the historic context to provide a more comprehensive account of the events that make Fort Seward nationally significant, especially with regards to its gold rush-era origins and the fort's role in the Alaska-Canada boundary dispute. In addition, the update evaluates and inventories the contributing and noncontributing resources of the historic district and provides more specific boundary descriptions than the original NR and NHL nominations.

Fort William H. Seward was one of the first Alaska properties listed in the National Register but was mistakenly classified as a "site" in 1972. A formal correction to the National Register record in 1984 changed the fort's designation to a "historic district," and this update follows suit and classifies Fort Seward NHL as a historic district. Today, Fort William H. Seward National Historic Landmark stands as the best surviving example of a gold rush-era Alaskan army fort and the only NHL associated with the Alaska-Canada boundary dispute at the turn of the twentieth century.

PROVIDE RELEVANT PROPERTY-SPECIFIC HISTORY, HISTORICAL CONTEXT, AND THEMES. JUSTIFY CRITERIA, EXCEPTIONS, AND PERIODS OF SIGNIFICANCE LISTED IN SECTION 2.

DRAFT

Tlingit Homeland, Russian America, and American Missionaries

The area of the Chilkat Peninsula that became home to Haines and Fort William H. Seward is the ancestral homeland of the Tlingit, who trace their heritage back thousands of years.[1] The peninsula is situated near the north side of the 90-mile Lynn Canal, which is the largest fjord in the United States (and one of the deepest and longest in the world). Rugged mountains and glaciers dominate the region and create dramatic scenery throughout the Alaska panhandle. From the low-lying isthmus where Fort William H. Seward and the town of Haines are situated, many of the historic trade routes and trails can be observed, and both the Chilkoot Inlet and Chilkat Inlet branches of the Lynn Canal, which lead to Skagway and Klukwan, respectively, can be easily observed and accessed.

The Chilkat and Chilkoot Tlingit have thrived in the resource-rich marine environment of the upper Lynn Canal while fostering strong cultural identity and communities during several eras of political, economic, and social upheaval that happened beginning with the arrival of Russians in the eighteenth century.[2] At the time of regular contact with Europeans in the late eighteenth century, Tlingit clans lived throughout areas that are now known as southeast Alaska from the Portland Canal, which currently marks Alaska's southeastern border with Canada, north to Yakutat Bay. Two northern Tlingit Kwáan, or communities, the Chilkat Kwáan and Chilkoot Kwáan, were most affected by the presence of prospectors arriving in the Lynn Canal area to access the Klondike gold fields in Canada via the boomtowns of Dyea and Skagway, located at the head of the Lynn Canal. During the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the Tlingit used and controlled access to the routes that became the main thoroughfares into the Yukon. Five different clans controlled five different routes through the mountains to trade with Yukon First Nations and Athabascans. Two of the routes were the Chilkoot Trail and White Pass

[1] "Tlingit" spelling is used throughout the document although the "Lingít" spelling is also in common use in publications today. The Tlingit name for the Haines area is Deishú which translates to "end of the trail" or "beginning of the trail."
[2] David Neufeld and Frank Norris, *Chilkoot Trail: Heritage Route to the Klondike* (Madeira Park, BC: Harbour Publishing, 1996), 22–38.

Trail that were overtaken by tens of thousands of prospectors during the Klondike Gold Rush.[3]

The Russians first encountered the Tlingit in 1741 and faced resistance for the next 125 years. In 1808 the Russians set up their Alaskan capital, Sitka, on Baranof Island in Tlingit territory 150 miles south of the Chilkat Peninsula. No Euro-American settlements were established on the Chilkat Peninsula until the late nineteenth century as the northern Tlingit resisted colonial power. Following the Treaty of Cession in 1867—when the United States bought the Alaska territory from Russia without consent from Alaska Natives—an "Americanization" of Alaska occurred as military and missionary expeditions spread throughout the territory. Facing "gunboat diplomacy" in the late nineteenth century, the Tlingit adapted to U.S. economic and political power despite facing discrimination and disenfranchisement.[4]

Presbyterian missionaries led by Sheldon Jackson, made their way into southeast Alaska in the 1870s. In 1879, Presbyterian missionary Samuel Hall Young ventured into the Chilkat Peninsula area with conservationist John Muir with the objective of assimilating the northern Chilkoot and Chilkat Tlingit. Local Tlingit leaders were also interested in working with the missionaries to establish a school after being aware of the missions established in Wrangell and Sitka. The Deishú area of the peninsula, which became the Haines Mission, was selected as the best place to serve five Tlingit villages. In the memoir *Alaska Days with John Muir*, Young described his interactions with the Chilkoots and Chilkats and a meeting with Chief Shathitch. He briefly mentions the establishment of the Haines Mission on land he selected between the Lynn Canal and Pyramid Harbor, a section of land next to where Fort Seward now exists. The Chilkoot village on the Eastern Arm of the Lynn Canal and the town of Klukwan, which is 25 miles up the Chilkat River (where Chief Shathitch lived), are both described in the memoir.[5] Although Muir was studying glaciers during the voyage, he accompanied Young to meet with Tlingit leaders and spent days speaking with them.[6]

DRAFT

The Klondike Gold Rush brought an onslaught of people into traditional Tlingit territory, including into the Haines Mission. Chilkoot and Chilkat Tlingits historically controlled the trails that eventually were overwhelmed by the stampede, but they adapted to the new conditions including working as packers along the routes into the Klondike. The Tlingit leaders continued to fight for autonomy within the new American political and economic systems brought on by the gold rush.[7]

---

[3] Andrei Val'terovch Grinev, *The Tlingit Indians in Russian America 1741–1867* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005), 15; Alaska Native Knowledge Network, "Tlingit Tribes, Clans and Clan Houses," ANKN, University of Alaska Fairbanks, accessed April 16, 2024. http://www.ankn.uaf.edu/ancr/southeast/tlingitmap/; Neufeld and Norris, *Chilkoot Trail*, 25–33.

[4] Wallace M. Olson, *The Tlingit: An Introduction to Their Culture and History* (Auke Bay, AK: Heritage Research, 2001), 67–79.

[5] Samuel Hall Young, *Alaska Days with John Muir* (Portland, OR: WestWinds Press, 2013), 69–89.

[6] When Muir returned to the contiguous United States, he was later quoted saying, "The last hostile heathens are now mollified, the hills are now open for gold prospectors." Haines was named for Francina E. Haines who was the secretary of the Presbyterian Church's Women's Executive Society of Home Missions. The group helped raise money to establish the Haines Mission. "General History of Haines, Alaska," Haines Sheldon Museum, accessed May 23, 2024, https://www.sheldonmuseum.org/vignette/general-history-of-haines-alaska/; Emily Files, "New Haines museum exhibit explores how a Tlingit stronghold gave way to non-Native settlement," KHNS, Oct. 19, 2017, accessed April 17, 2024, https://khns.org/new-haines-museum-exhibit-explores-how-a-tlingit-stronghold-gave-way-to-non-native-settlement; David Lee Henry, *Across the Shaman's River: John Muir, the Tlingit Stronghold, and the Opening of the North* (Fairbanks: University of Alaska Press, 2017), 184–185, 226–227.

[7] When the Klondike Gold Rush precipitated the boundary dispute between the United States and Canada, a delegation of Chilkats from the Klukwan village petitioned commissioners to guarantee their rights to fish, hunt, and trade across the boundary that was being placed in their traditional homeland. Lewis Green, *The Boundary Hunters: Surveying the 141st Meridian and the Alaska Panhandle* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1982), 76; Edwin J. Foscue, "The Development and Decline of Skagway, Alaska," *Economic Geography* 10, no. 4 (Oct. 1934): 421–422.

The Klondike Gold Rush and the Boundary

The arrival of tens of thousands of gold seekers to the region as part of the Klondike Gold Rush in the late 1890s set the stage for the establishment of a series of U.S. forts in Alaska, including Fort William H. Seward. With news of gold discoveries in the Klondike region of the Yukon Territory in Canada in late 1897, as many as 100,000 people set out for the gold fields. Traveling to Nome on Alaska's west coast and then up the Yukon River by boat was the easiest route to the Klondike, but it was also the longest and most expensive. Most traveled up Alaska's Inside Passage and then through Skagway or Dyea—two settlements at the head of Lynn Canal in southeast Alaska that formed because of the stampede. This huge influx of people to southeast Alaska drew renewed attention to a longstanding need to clearly define the Alaska-Canada boundary in this area.[8]

The Anglo-Russian Treaty of St. Petersburg of 1825 defined the Alaska-Canada boundary from the Arctic Ocean south to Mount St. Elias to follow along the 141st degree of west longitude. South of Mount St. Elias, the boundary between the British possessions (Canada) and the coastal area that was to belong to Russia (and later the United States) was to follow the summit of the mountains that run parallel to the coast. The treaty stated that if this boundary line was greater than ten nautical miles (34.5 miles or 55.6 kilometers) from the ocean, the boundary shall be formed by a line parallel to the "sinuosities" or windings of the coast, never exceeding the distance of ten nautical miles from the coast. Although imprecise, it was always intended using the word "sinuosities" that the boundary would be no more than ten nautical miles from the inside of any bays, inlets, or arms of the ocean, and when Russia published a map to accompany the Treaty in 1826, it went unchallenged by Britain.[9]

DRAFT

Even though the boundary between southeast Alaska and Canada had not been surveyed when the 1826 map was drawn, the boundary drawn on that map became the accepted boundary. It was published widely in numerous geography publications worldwide between 1832 and 1898, including throughout Canada. Thus, when the United States purchased Alaska from Russia in 1867, the 1826 map had already been the generally accepted boundary map for more than forty years and became the accepted map in the Treaty of Cession. As the United States and Russia were concluding the Treaty of Cession in 1867, the British government passed the British North American Act, which combined the provinces of Canada, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia into the Dominion of Canada, a British colony. British Columbia and Prince Edward Island joined the Dominion in 1871 and 1873, respectively, motivated by the threat of potential annexation by the United States. Thus, the ill-defined boundary became an issue between the United States, Britain, and the Dominion of Canada.[10]

Gold discoveries in northern British Columbia just east of the boundary during the late 1860s and early 1870s drew approximately 20,000 prospectors to the disputed area. Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) were sent to the area to keep law and order. It was during this time that encroachment by the RCMP on territory claimed by the United States first highlighted the need to define the limits of U.S. and British sovereignty more clearly in the area. In 1872, Britain raised the idea of a joint boundary commission with a receptive President Ulysses Grant. Although it was welcomed by the president, Congress did not appropriate funds for a boundary survey. Discussions between G. M. Dawson, director of the Geological Survey of Canada, and W. H. Dall of the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey in 1888 revealed widely different interpretations of the boundary terms of the treaty of 1825. The Canadian interpretation, although unofficial at that time, was that the boundary was

[8] National Park Service, "What Was the Klondike Gold Rush?" Klondike Gold Rush National Historical Park, accessed May 14, 2024, https://www.nps.gov/klgo/learn/goldrush.htm.
[9] Green, *Boundary Hunters*, 1–3; Thomas Hodgins, "The Alaskan Boundary: Its Practicability and Cost," *The North American Review* 179, no. 572 (July 1904): 65–71.
[10] D. M. L. Farr and Niko Block, "The Alaska Boundary Dispute," The Canadian Encyclopedia, Historica Canada, updated August 9, 2016, https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/alaska-boundary-dispute.

drawn along the summits of the mountains arising immediately from the sea, without regard for the "sinuosities" of the coast as spelled out in the treaty. This view would later become the crux of the Alaska-Canada Boundary dispute.[11]

Although later proved to be untrue, reports that Canada had established posts and RCMP patrols on territory claimed by the United States spurred Congress to appropriate funds for a boundary survey in 1896. That same year, a new government headed by a new prime minister came to office in Canada. While Britain and the United States generally agreed on the boundary, Prime Minister Wilfrid Laurier's government demanded a boundary that was significantly different from that defined by the Anglo–Russian Treaty of St. Petersburg of 1825. The boundary proposed by Laurier placed all of Pyramid Harbor, Lynn Canal, Skagway, and Dyea within Canada. Furthermore, the province of British Columbia proposed a boundary separate from the Canadian government's demand that would have also included Juneau and Ketchikan. Neither of these were acceptable to the United States.[12]

As the United States, Britain, and Canada boundary discussions were getting underway, the Klondike Gold Rush began, with as many as 100,000 people rushing north in 1897. From the 1880s through the early 1900s, numerous gold strikes at Juneau in southeast Alaska, Resurrection Creek and Six Mile Creek in south-central Alaska, at Nome in western Alaska, near Iditarod in southwest Alaska, and numerous locations in the Interior drew thousands of gold seekers to Alaska. With the large influx of people came crime. Most of it consisted of property crimes such as theft, embezzlement, con games, or "sin crimes" such as gambling, prostitution, and illegal manufacture and sale of alcohol. Between 1897 and 1904, twelve army posts were established around the Alaska territory to keep law and order.[13] Mirroring the army's typical approach to frontier posts in the West in the contiguous United States prior to 1890, the gold rush posts in Alaska were typically small, widely dispersed, and located in areas where the army's presence was most needed. As at frontier forts in the West, the buildings at gold rush forts were often hastily constructed by troops using locally available materials.[14]

DRAFT

When the Klondike Gold Rush began in 1897, most of the approximately 100,000 gold seekers took the southern route to the diggings, which consisted of two main trails that began at the head of the Lynn Canal in Alaska's southeast panhandle. The Chilkoot Trail was a 33-mile trail that began in Dyea and ended at Lake Bennett in Canada, while the White Pass Trail was a 45-mile trail that began in Skagway and terminated at Lake Bennett. An easier all-water northern route began at Seattle and went around Alaska's west coast to St. Michael near the mouth of the Yukon River in Norton Sound. At St. Michael, miners transferred from ocean going ships to riverboats for the trip up the Yukon to Dawson. While much faster and easier than the southern route, it was also much more expensive. Initially, a miner could expect to pay as much as $1,000 ($37,000 in 2024 dollars) for transportation to the Klondike via the northern route. This later dropped to around $125 ($4,700 in 2024 dollars) but remained an incredibly expensive route for most.[15] St. Michael Island in Norton Sound, 80 miles

[11] David Eric Jessup, "Between Two Empires: Canada and the Alaska Boundary Dispute," in *The Big Wild Soul of Terrence Cole: An Eclectic Collection to Honor Alaska's Public Historian*, ed. Frank Soos and Mary Ehrlander, 203–224 (Fairbanks: University of Alaska Press, 2019), 213; Norman Penlington, *The Alaska Boundary Dispute: A Critical Reappraisal* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Limited, 1972), 20–21.
[12] Penlington, *Alaska Boundary Dispute*, 20–29. Pyramid Harbor is on the west side of the Chilkat Inlet, opposite Haines and the Chilkat Peninsula.
[13] Some details on the other eleven Alaska gold rush forts are in the comparative analysis section of this nomination. The forts were Camp Circle City, Camp Dyea, Camp Rampart, Camp Skagway, Fort Davis, Fort Egbert, Fort Gibbon, Fort Liscum, Fort St. Michael, Fort Wrangell, Fort Yukon.
[14] R. Christopher Goodwin (R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates), *National Historic Context for Department of Defense Installations, 1790-1940*, vol. 1 (Baltimore, MD: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1995), 24–25.
[15] Pierre Berton, *Klondike: The Last Great Gold Rush 1896–1899* (Toronto, Canada: Anchor Canada, 2001), Chapter 4, 6; Joan

from the mouth of the Yukon was the closest deepwater port to the Yukon River and became the transfer point for freight and passengers heading up the river. To maintain law and order at the busy port, the army established Fort St. Michael there in 1897. Fort St. Michael was the first of the twelve army posts established during the gold rush. To uphold law and order in the Dyea and Skagway area at the beginning of the southern route, the first in a series of U.S. Marshals were assigned to Dyea and Skagway in 1897. Because of poor pay, the marshals at Skagway and Dyea did not stay long, with nine marshals cycling through in the first year.[16]

Dyea and Skagway became vital access points at the head of the Lynn Canal for prospectors headed to the Klondike gold fields in the Yukon. Dyea was a short-lived boomtown that grew due to its connection with the Chilkoot Trail, which was a steep 35-mile trail at the mouth of the Taiya River that led prospectors into the Klondike. Dyea was about three miles northwest of Skagway and began as a trading post but turned into a major port by the height of the Klondike Gold Rush in the late 1890s. Prior to the arrival of prospectors, Tlingits used the land that became Dyea as a fishing and hunting camp area. In the spring of 1898, Dyea had between 4,000 and 10,000 residents lining two miles above the high tide line, and 200 businesses were recorded. After June 1898, the town began its decline and was almost completely abandoned by 1900.[17] Skagway was not as significant as the Dyea area to the Tlingit before European American prospectors arrived. What started in 1887 as a homestead for steamboat captain William Moore had boomed into a town of 10,000 residents by the late 1890s as prospectors used it as a gateway to the White Pass Trail enroute to Canada. The gold rush subsided in the early 1900s, and by 1910, the population of Skagway fell to 872. Many of the gold rush-era buildings and resources have been preserved, and Skagway is now a part of Klondike National Historical Park, which was designated in 1976.[18]

DRAFT

In February 1898, the U.S. government responded by sending two companies of soldiers to a Skagway base camp, followed by two more companies at Dyea later that month. They were sent with a dual mission to keep the peace and show the flag.[19] The lawlessness and disorganization of thousands of gold seekers flooding the area on their way to Canada's Yukon Territory brought increased attention to the simmering boundary dispute between Canada and the United States. Tensions between the United States and Canada stemmed partly from a perception that Americans were treated unfairly by Canada, but in Skagway there was also concern among business owners that Canada might try to impose its rule on them. Limited claim size, a ten percent tax on gold, and an average of 25% taxes on goods and supplies brought into Canada angered prospectors who considered this excessive. The town of Eagle City, just eight miles from the Canadian border, along the Yukon River in Interior Alaska, was established in 1898 by miners trying to create an all-American community and escape Canadian rule. The following year the U.S. Army established Fort Egbert adjacent to the new town.[20]

Antonson, "St. Michael, Fort Site (AHRS Site No. SMI-015)," St. Michael, Alaska, National Register of Historic Places Registration Form (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1977), 5.

[16] Camp Dyea was destroyed by fire in 1899. Robert B. Roberts, *Encyclopedia of Historic Forts: The Military, Pioneer, and Trading Posts of the United States* (New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1988), 21.

[17] Frank B. Norris*, Legacy of the Gold Rush: An Administrative History of Klondike Gold Rush National Historical Park* (Anchorage: National Park Service, 1996), 3; Frank Norris, "Chilkoot Trail and Dyea Site," Skagway, Skagway Borough, Alaska, National Historic Landmark Nomination Form (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1987), 11. The former Dyea town site and Chilkoot Trail were designated a National Historic Landmark in 1978; Skagway Historic District and White Pass were designated as a National Historic Landmark in 1962.

[18] Norris, *Legacy of the Gold Rush*, 4, 157; Frank B. Norris, Terrence Cole, and Bonnie Houston, "Skagway and White Pass District," Skagway, Skagway Borough, Alaska, National Historic Landmark Nomination Form (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1998), 33.

[19] Neufeld and Norris, *Chilkoot Trail*, 138–139.

[20] Starting in 1900, Fort Egbert took on the additional mission of constructing and maintaining telegraph lines and later radio systems.

The army's earliest presence in the Haines area occurred in spring 1898, when it was chosen as the launch point for the Yukon Relief Expedition organized by the U.S. Army. The goal of the expedition was to send 538 reindeer to feed starving miners in Dawson City in Canada via the Dalton Trail. By the time the decimated herd of 114 reindeer reached the miners, they were no longer starving and there were doubts that they ever were.[21] Late in 1898, the War Department—trying to decide the best location to garrison troops in the Upper Lynn Canal region—set aside a reservation next to the Haines Mission about 15 miles south of Skagway. Despite local lobbying efforts to expand and improve the military camp at Skagway, where most military personnel in Alaska were deployed, ultimately it was decided to build a fort next to Haines because there was more room to build. In addition to the extra space, the Chilkoot and White Pass Trails could all be observed from Haines.[22]

On the eve of the Klondike Gold Rush there were three differing claims in the Alaska-Canada boundary dispute: one held by the United States; one held by Canada and Britain; and one held by the Canadian province of British Columbia, separate from Canada. Part of the confusion of the Anglo-Russian Treaty of 1825 is that, while it defined the general area that today is southeast Alaska, it also allowed access to the Pacific for the British via the various inlets in the territory. The Lynn Canal was one of the major access points to the Pacific from British territory. However, maps drawn up by Russia right after the treaty effectively cut Britain (Canada) off from the Pacific Ocean, and Britain never challenged these maps. Thus, the boundary line drawn up by Russia became what was disputed between the United States, Britain, and Canada.[23]

In 1898, a trilateral Joint High Commission between Great Britain, the U.S., and Canada convened in Washington to settle the boundary disputes. The commission disbanded by 1901 because parties were unable to agree on a resolution. With President William McKinley's assassination in 1901, Theodore Roosevelt became president. While President McKinley had sought compromise to settle the dispute, President Roosevelt was willing to use military force if necessary, reflecting his "speak softly and carry a big stick" approach to foreign policy.[24] Canada insisted on a boundary that essentially included the heads of all the inlets in southeast Alaska. For example, the boundary as proposed by Canada would have crossed Lynn Canal about halfway up the canal, leaving Haines, Skagway, and Dyea completely within Canada. This was unacceptable to Roosevelt, and in April 1902, he expressed a willingness to send engineers and troops to the region to draw the boundary according to the American view if necessary. In July 1902, Haines was chosen as the site for a permanent U.S. Army fort in upper Lynn Canal. The fort's location near the Haines Mission on Lynn Canal placed it inside the disputed boundary claimed by Canada, a clear challenge to their claim.[25]

DRAFT

It closed in 1911. Kathryn Winslow, *Big Pan-Out: The Klondike Story* (London, UK: Phoenix House Ltd, 1952), 79; National Park Service, "Klondike-Alaska Gold Rush," Yukon-Charley Rivers National Park and Preserve, last updated August 12, 2020, https://www.nps.gov/yuch/learn/historyculture/klondike-alaska-gold-rush.htm; U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM), "Fort Egbert," BLM Alaska Archaeology, accessed August 9, 2024, https://www.blm.gov/programs/cultural-heritage-and-paleontology/archaeology/what-we-manage/alaska/fort-egbert.

[21] Jack Stokes Ballard, *Commander and Builder of Western Forts: The Life and Times of Major General Henry C. Merriam, 1862-1901* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2014), 162.

[22] Brian G. Shellum, *Buffalo Soldiers in Alaska: Company L, Twenty-Fourth Infantry* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2021), 88; Alaska Northern Studies Program, "Design Guidelines and Standards for Fort William H. Seward" (Seattle: University of Washington Department of Urban Design and Planning, 1998), 4.

[23]Tony McCulloch, "Theodore Roosevelt and Canada: Alaska, the 'Big Stick' and the North-Atlantic Triangle, 1901–1909," in *A Companion to Theodore Roosevelt*, ed. Serge Ricard (West Sussex, United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 266–297.

[24] The Alaska boundary dispute is often overshadowed by the Panama Canal issue that occurred at the same time. Both represented Roosevelt's approach of protecting U.S. interests in the Western Hemisphere and are connected to the "Roosevelt Corollary" to the Monroe Doctrine. McCulloch, "Theodore Roosevelt and Canada," in Ricard, *Companion*, 304–307.

[25] John Herd Thompson and Stephen J. Randall, *Canada and the United States: Ambivalent Allies* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1994), 67; McCulloch, "Theodore Roosevelt and Canada," in Ricard, *Companion,* 300–301; "Army Post for Alaska: Will Be Established at Haines Mission Contiguous to Strip of Disputed Territory," *Los Angeles Times*, August 9, 1902, 3.

In the summer of 1902, *The Daily Alaskan* reported—via special dispatch from Washington, DC—the intent of constructing a fort in Haines:

> The announcement is made by the authority of the secretary of war today that the war department will establish a full military post at Haines, Alaska, to cost $200,000. Buildings have been set aside and improvements ordered. The improvements are considered significant at this city, as Haines is in the disputed territory. The statement is given out at the capital by military experts, under the sanction of Secretary Root, of the war department, that the United States government plans a complete line of defense along the Alaskan boundary, and that the present post at Skagway will be maintained.[26]

The construction of a permanent fort on Lynn Canal and President Roosevelt's readiness to use the military to enforce territorial claims reflected a broader shift in the mission of the U.S. Army at the turn of the twentieth century. After 1890, the need for a strong military presence on the frontier in the contiguous United States declined. Following decades of armed conflict with Indigenous peoples in the West, forced removal of Indigenous people to reservations, and programs aimed at cultural assimilation, the U.S. military's mission as a frontier army faded. Around the same time, the army increasingly took on international missions to expand and defend the United States' territories and colonies. Between 1898 and 1914, troops were stationed in Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Philippines, and Hawaii, as well as along the Panama Canal, to defend U.S. colonial interests. Alaska had been a U.S. territory since 1867—much longer than Puerto Rico, the Philippines, Hawaii, or the Panama Canal Zone—but the decision to establish a fort at Haines to assert U.S. territorial claims took place in the context of the army's growing involvement in international affairs and colonialism.[27]

DRAFT

Captain Charles Pelot Summerall, who was in command at Skagway in 1902 and ordered to Haines to build the fort in the disputed territory, later recollected the contentious milieu—including a standoff between the U.S. Army and the Canadian police— in his memoir:

> The Army ordered me to Haines Mission on Lynn Canal, about fifteen miles south of Skagway, [to] locate a military reservation, and begin construction of a post for a battalion of four companies of infantry. I procured a small launch, employed a surveyor, and took about twenty armed men to Haines Mission. This was the heart of the disputed territory and the beginning of the trails to the Yukon and Porcupine River. On landing, I found a number of men of the [Canadian] Northwest Mounted Police. The message to me had been sent in the clear over Canadian telegraph lines as there was no American telegraph or cable line to Alaska. The northwest police forbade me to begin any construction and said that this was disputed territory. I replied that this was American territory and that, if they interfered, I would use force.[28]

Summerall's account demonstrated the tensions during the boundary dispute and the United States' willingness to use force if the Canadians interfered. The Canadians backed down and construction on Fort William H. Seward commenced. On June 26, 1902, the steamer *Farallon* unloaded the first lumber and casks of nails for the fort at the newly constructed dock near Haines.[29] By September, a 40-man civilian crew began clearing the grounds using mules and oxen, and foundations for buildings were cut from local granite by an Italian stone

[26] "Skagway Not to Lose Army Post: Establishment of Haines Post Part of General Plan of Boundary Defense," *The Daily Alaskan*, July 24, 1902, 1. *The Daily Alaskan* was the official newspaper of Skagway, Alaska. Original newspaper report did not capitalize War Department.
[27] Goodwin, *National Historic Context*, 45–46.
[28] Charles Pelot Summerall and Timothy K. Nenninger, *The Way of Duty, Honor, Country: The Memoir of General Charles Pelot Summerall* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2010), 66.
[29] Haines Chamber of Commerce, "Walking Tour of Historic Fort William H. Seward," n.d.

mason and crew.[30] A surveyor that passed through the Haines Mission area in June 1903, on his way to the Porcupine gold district, described the area in his U.S. Geological Survey report:

> Besides the native village of about 80 huts, there are several trading stores, a drug store, a comfortable hotel—the 'Northern'—and large mission buildings. The War Department is establishing an army post 1 mile south of the town. A square mile or more of ground had already been cleared and barracks were being built at the time of the writer's visit.[31]

In 1903, as construction progressed on the fort, the Alaska Boundary Tribunal, a panel of six representative jurists (three Americans, two Canadians, and one British) met in London to resolve the boundary dispute. On the American side, President Roosevelt appointed Secretary of War Elihu Root, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge (Massachusetts), and Senator George Turner (Washington). The British selected Sir Louis Jetté (Quebec's lieutenant-governor), Allen Aylesworth (Ontario attorney), and Lord Alverstone (lord chief justice of England). Roosevelt was unwilling to concede to any elements of Canada's interpretation of the boundary as drawn up in the Anglo-Russian Treaty and directed the American representatives not to yield on any significant aspect of the U.S. position. Roosevelt used Associate Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr. to communicate warnings to the British that he was willing to engage in military action if the U.S. boundary positions were not upheld.[32]

In a letter to the tribunal panel in March 1903, Roosevelt wrote, "You will, of course, impartially judge the questions that come before you for decision," but the Canadian claim to any ports on Lynn Canal could not "be properly considered open for discussion."[33] In July 1903, in a letter to Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, one of the three American representatives, President Roosevelt stressed that the tribunal was the "last chance" to settle the boundary dispute amicably.[34] Lodge shared the letter with British Prime Minister Arthur Balfour, as well as Joseph Chamberlain, the colonial secretary, Lord Landsdowne, the British foreign secretary, and Lord Alverstone, lord chief justice of England and the British representative on the tribunal.

DRAFT

Understanding that they would have been unable to prevent the U.S. from taking unilateral action if the tribunal failed, the British government pressured their representative to come to a decision that was favorable to the United States. The result was the Alaska-Canada boundary as it was delineated after the 1825 Anglo-Russian Treaty. The Canadians were outraged by the outcome, and when the award was officially signed on October 20, 1903, there was no public ceremony nor any Canadian signatories. Although the Canadians did not get control of the Lynn Canal, they did receive two islands (Wales and Pearse) at the mouth of the Portland Canal between the U.S. and Canada.[35]

Fort William H. Seward, 1903-1921

Construction on Fort William H. Seward continued throughout negotiations over the boundary until approximately 40 buildings, including elegant officers' quarters with Colonial Revival architectural elements,

[30] Lael Morgan, "Fort William Henry Seward," *Alaska Sportsman* (April 1967), 13.
[31] Charles W. Wright, "The Porcupine Placer District, Alaska," USGS Bulletin No. 236 (Washington, DC: GPO, 1904), 10.
[32] Thompson and Randall, *Canada and the United States*, 68.
[33] McCulloch, "Theodore Roosevelt and Canada," in Ricard, *Companion*, 302.
[34] Ibid., 303.
[35] Ibid., 303–304. The outcome of the tribunal led to Canadian nationalism, resentment of British authority, and eventually resulted in Canada gaining power from Great Britain to control its own foreign policy. From Britain's perspective, it was not worth risking good relations with the United States while they were enmeshed in the Boer War. David G. Haglund, "The TR Problem in Canada-US Relations," *London Journal of Canadian Studies* 23 (2007/2008): 38.

two large U-shaped barracks, a hospital, and fire hall surrounded a rectangular parade ground.

In July 1903, the military cableship *Burnside* arrived at Fort Seward to lay a telegraph connection to Skagway. Fort Seward was the final military installation in Alaska connected to the Washington-Alaska Military Cable and Telegraph System (WAMCATS). WAMCATS was a monumental infrastructure project that connected 2,128 miles of submarine cable and 1,497 miles of landlines to improve communications between Alaska military posts and the contiguous United States while circumventing Canada.[36]

On March 3, 1904, the fort was officially named after William H. Seward, the secretary of state who negotiated the purchase of Alaska from Russia. Over the next ten years, the fort's original tract was enlarged several times to include land for clay and water reserves; by 1909 the fort property included 4,410 acres.[37] *The San Juan Islander* reported on April 9, 1904, that "In accordance with its policy of making Fort William H. Seward … one of the largest military posts on the Pacific Coast, the war department has ordered three companies of infantry to be sent there during the coming season." Fourteen officers and 241 soldiers were transferred from Camp Skagway to be permanently garrisoned at the new fort. Detachments of headquarters and quartermaster personnel joined the roster, and at least two corpsmen were on duty to handle telegraph messages for army and civilian residents alike. Fort Seward was designated the regimental headquarters for the U.S. Army in Alaska, meaning that it was where recruits assembled and trained, where soldiers and officers awaiting discharge or postings were based, and where injured soldiers recovered before returning to duty. It was common for soldiers assigned to Fort Seward to be sent to other Alaska forts for extended duty.[38] The closure of the frontier-style camps such as the one at Skagway and establishment of Fort Seward as the regimental headquarters in Alaska brought the territory's military installations in line with the organization of army posts in the contiguous United States, which had closed frontier posts and consolidated regimental posts in the 1890s.[39]

DRAFT

The fort functioned as a typical infantry post of the period, maintaining constant military readiness. In May 1907, when disgruntled miners struck for better food at Juneau's Treadwell gold mine, troops from Fort Seward were called upon "to protect life and property and to assist the U.S. Marshall in executing U.S. laws in connection with labor strikes and threats of violence."[40] Conflicts between miner and boss would flare up again in 1908, and once again troops from the fort were requested to keep the peace. Other duties included fighting fires. In 1907, one soldier was killed when soldiers from Fort Seward responded to a fire in Haines. In 1911, when a forest fire broke out near Haines, destroying a sawmill, soldiers from Fort Seward were called on to help fight the fire. With the completion of Alaska Engineering Commission buildings in Anchorage in 1916, forty soldiers were sent from Fort Seward to guard the new properties.[41]

Reflecting its status as the regimental headquarters for the U.S. Army in Alaska, the facilities at Fort Seward were more inviting than what the average Alaska post had to offer. Fort William H. Seward was originally laid out and constructed using standardized plans that were developed and disseminated by the U.S. Quartermaster General in the 1890s. These standardized plans were connected to a broader reorganization of the army that also

[36] The WAMCATS was connected from Alaska to Seattle in August 1904. David Eric Jessup, "The Washington-Alaska Military Cable and Telegraph System, *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 6, no. 4 (Oct. 2007): 402–403.
[37] Lyman Woodman, *Duty Station Northwest: The U.S. Army in Alaska and Western Canada, 1867-1987*, vol. 1 (Anchorage: Alaska Historical Society, 1997), 226.
[38] "Troops for Alaska," *San Juan Islander*, April 9, 1904.
[39] Goodwin, *National Historic Context*, 46–47.
[40] Woodman, *Duty Station Northwest*, 324–326.
[41] "Brave Soldier Loses Life," *The Evening Statesman*, January 21, 1907; "Fire Wipes Out 20 Acre Forest," *The San Francisco Call*, July 23, 1911; Preston Jones, *The Fires of Patriotism: Alaskans in the Days of the First World War, 1910–1920* (Fairbanks, AK: University of Alaska Press, 2013), 63.

included the consolidation of posts. The standardized plans not only helped control costs and establish uniformity across military installations, they also offered some consistency in living conditions across the service, as well as an improvement over quarters at small frontier forts and at the early gold rush forts in Alaska.[42]

Because of the use of standardized army building plans, army personnel and their families found at Fort William H. Seward many of the same amenities they enjoyed at posts in the contiguous United States. The officers' quarters were complete with indoor flush toilets, six-foot-long claw-foot bathtubs, and marble-topped washstands. Each house was equipped with a kitchen and butler's pantry. Although the buildings did not have central heating, most rooms had their own fireplaces. The living and dining rooms each had a coal-burning stove set in a tile fireplace with an oak mantelpiece. The commanding officer, the post surgeon, and their families lived in single-family homes, with other married officers in duplex housing and unmarried officers in the dormitory-style bachelor officers' quarters. Non-commissioned officers and their families lived in duplexes along a street known as Soap Suds Alley, named for rivers of froth created by the wives of "non-coms" who took in the officers' laundry.[43]

While the soldiers trained regularly and were ready for action, life at Fort Seward was less demanding than for army troops elsewhere in the Alaska territory who struggled to maintain roads and telegraph systems. Garrison duties at Fort Seward often included beautifying the grounds and improving the fort's target range. The troops drilled regularly on the nine-acre parade ground, practicing marksmanship, and engaging in field maneuvers. Each morning the men heard bugle calls for reveille, and each evening they gathered for the retreat parade and cannon blast. School for non-commissioned officers was held for one hour, three days per week. In summer, large gardens provided vegetables for the kitchen, and men, both on-duty and off-duty, spent long hours hunting and fishing. In winter, the men performed drills on snowshoes and skis, and off-duty troops blazed trails into the woods and built cabins where they could get away from the base on three-day passes.[44]

DRAFT

In the fort's early years, dances were held in one of the barracks buildings, but this arrangement eventually proved inadequate. To provide a larger dance hall, the army purchased a cannery building located at nearby Pyramid Harbor, cut it into sections, and rafted it around the Chilkat Peninsula to be reassembled at the fort in 1919. The new Education and Recreation (E&R) Building hosted summer dances whenever ships came into port carrying not only freight and supplies, but badly needed dance partners. During winter, the garrison orchestra put on monthly dances at which women from Haines could dance into the night with army men. The officer in charge of the E&R also arranged monthly schedules of basketball and baseball tournaments, movies, and plays. The social functions were hosted by the wives of officers. These events and details about daily life at the fort can be found in the post newspaper, which changed with the times from the *Fort Seward News* (pre-1922) to the *Chilkat Post* (1922) and *Chilkoot Post* (1923–1926). While the fort's troops were seldom called to action, and life at the fort was rather peaceful, world events did interrupt the peace.

With U.S. entry into World War I in April 1917 and passage of the Selective Service Act in May 1917, all men ages 18 to 30 were required to enroll in the armed services. In Alaska, almost 16,000 men responded to the call to join, making the territory a leader in the number enrollees per capita. Many of the territory's enrollees

[42] Goodwin, *National Historic Context*, 47, 154, 175, 176; Alison K. Hoagland, "The Architecture of Efficiency: the U.S. Army and the Colonial Revival Style in the West," in *Re-creating the American Past: Essays on the Colonial Revival*, ed. Richard Guy Wilson, Shaun Eyring, and Kenny Marotta (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2006), 83, 84–86. The layout of army installations was not standardized at the time that Fort William H. Seward was constructed, but its general layout follows typical patterns that had emerged by the 1860s.
[43] Woodman, *Duty Station Northwest*, 48.
[44] Ibid., 23.

received basic training at Fort Seward before being sent to posts in the United States for specialized training.[45]

Chilkoot Barracks, 1922-1945

After World War I, optimistically dubbed the war to end all wars, the U.S. public and politicians sought to reduce the size of the military. In the early 1920s, Congress steadily reduced both funding for the army and the authorized number of officers and enlisted men. Beginning in 1922, likely in response to the need to cut both personnel and costs, the army removed garrisons from other posts in Alaska. Military leaders saw Alaska as having little strategic importance in the post-World War I era, and many posts in the territory had completed their original missions, such as maintaining order during the gold rush or building roads or telegraph lines.[46] On December 13, 1922, General Order 54 changed the name of Fort William H. Seward to Chilkoot Barracks, commemorating the local Tlingit and the mountain pass over which Alaska's prospectors struggled to reach the gold fields of the Klondike. Throughout the 1920s, Chilkoot Barracks was home to two full companies plus detachments of headquarters and quartermaster personnel, which totaled 255 troops. Except for a small detachment for the Alaska Railroad, Chilkoot Barracks was the only active army base in Alaska between 1925 and the build-up before World War II.[47] Following the abandonment of Forts Egbert, Gibbon, Liscum, and St. Michael in 1925, the primary focus of the army in Alaska was maintaining the Alaska Communication System, road and trail infrastructure, and the Alaska Railroad.[48]

In the 1930s, as world events increasingly suggested the United States might be entering the war in Europe and Asia, military planners recognized the need for better Arctic weather clothing for troops. In 1935, a board of officers met at Chilkoot Barracks and recommended the purchases of clothing items and equipment to be tested in the territory to determine its suitability for all seasons. After testing in 1938–39 the board met again at Chilkoot Barracks to review results of the tests and make recommendations regarding clothing, equipment, and transportation items for military activities in cold weather.[49] This marked the beginning of many years of cold weather testing of military equipment in Alaska. The army activated the Cold Weather Test Detachment at Ladd Field in 1940, and testing of clothing and equipment there continued into the Cold War.[50]

In 1939, on the eve of World War II, the garrison at Chilkoot Barracks was only slightly larger than previously, and the remote outpost was lacking weaponry suited to modern warfare. The fort did not possess a single antiaircraft gun; the soldiers were armed with aging Springfield rifles; and the fort's only sea transport was the 52-year-old tug *Fornance*.[51] With the boundary dispute with Canada resolved and gold fever cooled, Chilkoot Barracks's strategic importance had passed. Despite General Billy Mitchell's warning in 1935 that Japan represented the primary threat to the United States in the Pacific and that Japanese forces would attack Alaska

DRAFT

[45] "The Sourdough Rebellion," *The Sun*, April 26, 1918; "Alaska to Furnish 300 Registrants," *Rogue River Courier*, July 5, 1918.
[46] William J. Woolley, "Disappointment and Disillusionment: The Army and the Nation, 1920–1925," in *Creating the Modern Army: Citizen-Soldiers and the American Way of War, 1919–1939*, Studies in Civil-Military Relations Series (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2022), 30-32; Richard W. Stewart, ed. *American Military History, Volume II: The United States Army in a Global Era, 1917-2008*, Second Edition, Army Historical Series (Washington, DC: Center of Military History, United States Army, 2010), 60-61; Darrell Lewis, with Erik Johnson and John Wachtel, "Sitka Naval Operating Base and U.S. Army Coastal Defenses," Sitka, Alaska, National Historic Landmark Nomination (draft) (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, January 2024), 8.
[47] Woodman, *Duty Station Northwest*, 24, 48.
[48] Jonathan M. Nielson, *Armed Forces on a Northern Frontier: The Military in Alaska's History, 1867-1987* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press), 85.
[49] Thomas M. Pitkin, *Quartermaster Equipment for Special Forces*, Q.M.C. Historical Studies 5 (Historical Section, General Administrative Services Division, Office of the Quartermaster General, 1944), 7–9.
[50] Kathy Price, *The World War II Heritage of Ladd Field, Fairbanks, Alaska* (Fort Collins: Center for Environmental Management of Military Lands, Colorado State University, 2002), 21–28.
[51] U.S. Army, *The U.S. Army in Alaska*, Pamphlet 360-5 (1972), 74.

rather than other potential targets of the United States, Alaska's defenses were largely neglected. This was evident at Chilkoot Barracks, where 400 men were garrisoned in 1939. Although the garrison was larger than it had been in the 1920s, Chilkoot Barracks was clearly not prepared to repel an enemy attack from a modern military, but the threat of the Japanese in the North Pacific would soon provide the fort with a new role.[52]

As in World War I, Chilkoot Barracks again became a training camp for World War II enlistees. It also became a staging area for troops headed to the Aleutians and a rest camp for military personnel who were serving in the North Pacific theater. In 1942, sixteen officers and 438 enlisted men were stationed at the fort; the military population would peak in 1943 with 65 officers and 1,228 soldiers, though many of these troops were just passing through. For example, the 93rd Engineer General Service Regiment, made up of Black soldiers, spent a month at the fort in early 1943 before beginning a construction assignment on the Alaska Military Highway.[53] During the war, work had begun on a number of new warehouses, ordnance storage facilities, and road improvements, but progress was slowed by shipping delays and the severe winter of 1942–43.[54] The newly constructed Haines Cut-Off road served as an important transportation link between southeast Alaska and the Alaska Highway, but Chilkoot Barracks had already taken a back seat to other bases for fighting the Japanese in the Aleutian Campaign and supplying war materiel to the Soviet Union through the Lend-Lease Program.[55] At war's end the army deactivated Chilkoot Barracks, and the fort was declared surplus property by the War Assets Office.

Post-Military History: Port Chilkoot Company, 1947–present

DRAFT

In 1947, the entire fort was auctioned for $105,000, sight unseen, to a group of five veterans from the East Coast calling themselves the Port Chilkoot Company. The new owners had plans to begin a self-supporting community of artisans called Port Chilkoot. They moved their families to the decommissioned fort in the hope that as many as 200 families would follow, creating business cooperatives based on the use of the region's natural resources. Carl Heinmiller established a school devoted to reviving interest in Native art, while another veteran, Steve Homer, began a ferry service linking Haines with Skagway and Juneau. As the years passed, only a few were able to adapt to local economic conditions, and the founders' vision of a thriving community went largely unfulfilled.[56]

The development of the Alaska Marine Highway, the opening of Haines Cut-Off for year-round travel, and the rise of tourism all contributed to the post-war economic success of Haines and Port Chilkoot, and in 1970, by popular vote, the former army fort became part of the City of Haines. On April 11, 1972, "Fort William H. Seward" was listed in the National Register of Historic Places. On June 2, 1978, the property was designated a National Historic Landmark. Local families and entrepreneurs have purchased many of the former army buildings, converting them to their individual purposes. Today several fort buildings are in use as businesses. The commanding officer's quarters and bachelor officers' quarters, for example, have been converted into a sixty-room hotel; the chief surgeon's quarters is a bed-and-breakfast; the bakery is a distillery; and the hospital now provides workshops for Northwest Coast carvers. Several local families and relatives of the original Port

[52] Stetson Conn, Rose C. Engelman and Byron Fairchild, *Guarding the United States and Its Outposts* (Washington, DC: Center of Military History, United States Army, 2000), 223.
[53] Woodman, *Duty Station Northwest*, 237.
[54] James D. Bush, *Narrative Report of Alaska Construction, 1941–1944* (Alaska Defense Command, U.S. Army, 1943), 149.
[55] Ray Bonnell, "The Haines Cut-off: From Native Trail to Modern Highway," in *Interior Sketches III: More Ramblings around Interior Alaska Historic Sites* (Fairbanks: Pingo Press, 2023); for more on Alaska's role in the Lend Lease program see Casey Woster, "Ladd Field," Fort Wainwright, Fairbanks North Star Borough, Alaska, National Historic Landmark Nomination (draft) (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, January 2024).
[56] Richard L. Neuberger, "The Battle of Chilkoot Pass," The *Reporter*, November 1949, 24–26.

Chilkoot founders still reside at the fort, and tourists are encouraged to take self-guided walking tours of the grounds.

Passengers on a cruise ship docked at the Haines dock today are met with a similar view as passengers on cruise ships during the historic period. The imposing officers' houses overlooking the parade ground, barracks, warehouses, and enlisted men's houses, in the backdrop of the 6,233-foot Mt. Davidson on Chilkat Inlet to the southwest look much like they did when the fort was completed in 1904. Its roots in the turn-of-the-twentieth-century army's standardized plans for forts remain evident in its Colonial Revival architecture and in its layout. It is the only fort in Alaska to be active during the gold rush, the Alaska-Canada boundary dispute, World War I, and World War II.

Comparative Analysis

Fort William H. Seward is exceptional in comparison to similar places for its role in establishing the United States' presence and authority over land in southeast Alaska that was being contested by Canadians during the Klondike Gold Rush. It is also the best remaining example of a military fort built in Alaska during the Alaska gold rush period that took place between the late 1890s and the early 1900s.

The forts listed below were identified as being properties that convey historic significance or functions similar to Fort William H. Seward. The comparable properties include forts constructed in Alaska during the Alaska gold rush of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Of these, Fort William H. Seward retains the highest degree of integrity to convey significance under NHL Criterion 1. The comparative analysis also includes other U.S. Army installations associated with maintaining and defending U.S. borders and sovereignty, particularly in the age of U.S. overseas imperialism and with regard to Canada. Fort William H. Seward is exceptional because it is connected to important events in the expansion of United States territory and retains buildings that are associated with the U.S. Army's presence in Alaska during the historic gold rush and the two World War periods.

DRAFT

Alaska Gold Rush Forts

Fort William H. Seward was the final of twelve Alaskan forts established to maintain order during the Alaska gold rush of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, which was the last significant gold rush in North America. Fort Seward is unique among these forts for its strong historical association with the tumultuous border controversy between the United States and Canada at the turn of the twentieth century. Because it was intended to express U.S. power over the disputed territory near the head of the Lynn Canal, it was the only gold rush-era Alaska fort that was constructed as a permanent military installation. Once the Klondike and Nome gold rush subsided, most of the twelve Alaskan forts were abandoned or decommissioned; many were abandoned only one or two years after being established. By 1925, Fort William H. Seward (known by then as Chilkoot Barracks) was the only army installation in Alaska.

Gold Rush Forts near the U.S.-Canada Border

Two Alaska gold rush-era forts, besides Fort Seward, were placed in southeast Alaska near the Canadian boundary. The original Camp Dyea military post was established within the town of Dyea at the mouth of the Taiya River, three miles north of Skagway, on March 8, 1898. The site was garrisoned by Companies B and H of the 14th Infantry to maintain law and order at the Chilkoot Trail leading to the Klondike gold fields. The Camp Dyea post was moved to the Dyea-Klondike Transportation Company wharf site about three miles south of town not long after the first soldiers arrived. This post was destroyed by fire on July 28, 1899, and the troops were evacuated to Skagway. Camp Dyea was associated with the gold rush in the Lynn Canal area and lay in

the disputed territory that the Canadians sought to annex; however, nothing of the gold rush-era military post remains besides potential archeological resources. The first Camp Dyea site was washed away by the Taiya River, and the second camp site is within the Chilkoot Pass and Dyea Site National Historic Landmark, designated in 1978, which is significant for its connection to the Klondike Gold Rush.

The other southeast Alaska gold rush fort near the Canadian border was Camp Skagway, established on February 27, 1898, at the mouth of the Skagway River and head of the Taiya Inlet. Companies A and G of the 14th Infantry were stationed there to keep order in the boomtown of Skagway that connected prospectors to the White Pass Trail leading to the Klondike. Company L of the 24th Infantry arrived in May 1899. The camp was abandoned on October 5, 1904, and the remaining troops transferred to Fort William H. Seward. Although the Skagway Historic District and White Pass NHL contains a few historic remnants of the military presence in a Klondike border community, most of the district preserves residential, commercial, and civic buildings connected to the Klondike Gold Rush. Buildings that were originally used as army barracks were repurposed and became contributing resources to the historic district. Some of these include the Trail Inn, the Nome Saloon, the Pullen complex, and the Lynch and Kennedy Dry Goods and Haberdashery. Many noncontributing resources in the district were also former army barracks that were altered and no longer retain integrity related to Camp Skagway's gold rush era. Skagway is associated with the gold rush in the Lynn Canal area and lay in the disputed territory, but Fort William H. Seward has a stronger association with the Alaska-Canada boundary dispute and is a more well-preserved military landscape.

DRAFT

Some other Alaska gold rush-era forts were close to the Canadian border section of the Yukon River in the Interior. Fort Egbert was established adjacent to the town of Eagle in 1899 and was situated along the Yukon River approximately six miles from the Canadian border. Like Fort Seward, Fort Egbert was constructed at the turn of the twentieth century to keep order but was also important for its connection to the Washington-Alaska Military Cable and Telegraph System (WAMCATS). By 1911, the fort was abandoned except for a small Signal Corps detachment which did not stay past 1925. Only five of the original 45 buildings remain and are managed by the Bureau of Land Management. Fort Egbert, along with part of the old town of Eagle, was designated a National Historic Landmark in 1978 at the same time as Fort William H. Seward. It is significant as a military, judicial, transportation, and communications hub for Interior Alaska. Fort Egbert was not a part of the Alaska boundary dispute despite its proximity to the Canadian border. Downstream from Fort Egbert nearly 158 miles was Camp Circle City. A detachment of the 8th Infantry was sent to Circle on September 30, 1898, to set up a military post that functioned as a sub-post of Fort Egbert in Eagle. Camp Circle City was one of the military posts set up on the recommendation of Major Nelson A. Miles to the secretary of war, Russel A. Alger. Camp Circle City was abandoned on August 31, 1900. Nothing of the gold rush-era military fort remains in Circle.

Gold Rush Forts of Western and Interior Alaska

The Fort St. Michael military post was established on September 17, 1897, to protect life and property during the late nineteenth-century gold rush affecting the Alaska territory. The fort was located on the Norton Sound above the mouth of the Yukon River. Early prospectors heading to the Klondike traveled around the west side of Alaska to access the Yukon River and used that waterway to access the gold fields in the Canadian Yukon territory. A detachment of the 3rd Infantry was deployed to the fort, followed by Companies A, C, E, and F of the 8th Infantry in October 1897. Fort St. Michael was designated a military reservation on October 20, 1897, and became the headquarters of the U.S. Army in Alaska for 20 years. At the height of its operation, the post consisted of 56 buildings. The fort was vacated on May 23, 1923, following Special Orders No. 120. Before the gold rush to Alaska, Fort St. Michael was the site of the Signal Corps telegraph station from 1874 to 1886. Prior to that, the area was used by Russians. Fort St. Michael was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1976, but very few remnants of the fort remain, and integrity is greatly diminished.

East of Fort St. Michael, Fort Davis was established on the southwest side of the Seward Peninsula in 1900. The fort was constructed at the mouth of the Nome River (four miles southeast of Nome), and initially garrisoned by Companies A and K of the 7th Infantry. Fort Davis became important after miners sparked another gold rush on the beaches of Nome in September 1898. The post was abandoned in 1921, and the buildings were removed or repurposed in Nome. One of the buildings became the offices for the *Nome Nugget* newspaper.[57]

Inland on the Yukon River, five forts (including the previously discussed Fort Egbert and Camp Circle City) were constructed in Interior Alaska as a part of the reaction to the gold rush activity. Fort Gibbon was created by General Orders No. 104 on June 7, 1899, near Tanana at the confluence of the Yukon and Tanana Rivers. It was garrisoned on July 25, 1899, by Companies E and F of the 7th Infantry. The site of the fort was originally surveyed and reported in 1869 as a potential military site by Captain Charles W. Raymond of the U.S. Engineers, and it was once a trading post called Fort Adams. Fort Gibbon was the military headquarters for all Interior Alaska until it was vacated in 1923. All buildings associated with the onetime fort were destroyed during the Civil Aeronautics Administration airfield construction in 1941. Sixty miles northeast of Tanana, Camp Rampart was established on July 27, 1899, on the south bank of the Yukon River. A detachment of Company E of the 7th Infantry occupied Camp Rampart to protect property in the town of Rampart, which was a supply center for gold miners. The post was abandoned on August 1, 1901. Nothing of the military post remains. Just over 150 miles northeast of Camp Rampart was Fort Yukon, which was established in 1897 on the Yukon River at its junction with the Porcupine River. Fort Yukon was garrisoned by a detachment of the 8th Infantry under Patrick Henry Ray. The fort was abandoned by 1898.[58]

DRAFT

Other Alaska Gold Rush Forts in the Southeastern Region

General Orders No. 14 established Fort Liscum on the south shore of Port Valdez, four miles southwest of the town of Valdez, on February 12, 1900. It was originally garrisoned by Company F of the 59th Infantry. The fort contained an officers' quarters, civilian quarters, a hospital, a few store houses, an adjutant's office, a bakery, and a stable. The buildings were all wood and the quarters were two stories. Fort Liscum was closed on July 23, 1922, and the military reservation cancelled in 1925, at which time fort structures were moved or salvaged. In 1929, the fort site was purchased, and a cannery and sawmill operated there. In 1977, the terminal to the Trans Alaska Pipeline was built on the former site of Fort Liscum.

Fort Wrangell**,** on the north side of Wrangell Island in southeast Alaska, was the farthest southeast of the gold rush forts. The site itself was originally used as a fort by the U.S. Army in 1868, shortly after the Alaska Purchase, and abandoned in 1870. It was reestablished for a short time from 1874 to 1877 by a small detachment of the 4th U.S. Artillery for purposes of controlling liquor trade with the local Tlingits. Fort Wrangell was reoccupied by the U.S. Army for a final time in May 1898 to maintain order in the region during the Alaska gold rush. It was garrisoned by Company H, 14th U.S. Infantry, which included five officers and 60 enlisted personnel. The fort was abandoned for the final time by May 12, 1900 (General Orders No. 9). Nothing of the fort remains but the site is now where the post office is located within the Wrangell Core Historic District, which was determined eligible for the National Register.

Comparable Frontier Mining Forts in the U.S.

Sutter's Fort

[57] Robert S. Roberts, *Encyclopedia of Historic Forts: The Military, Pioneer, and Trading Posts of the United States* (New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1988), 20–31.
[58] There is another "Fort Yukon" that was built by Alexander Hunt Murray several miles from the confluence of the Porcupine River in 1847.

Sutter's Fort in Sacramento, California, was developed beginning in 1839 by John A. Sutter. The fort became an important outpost for immigration into California and was tied to the California Gold Rush. An employee of the fort, James Marshall, found gold at Coloma in 1848 which helped spark the gold rush. The fort was designated a National Historic Landmark in 1963 after being identified in the "Overland Migrations West of the Mississippi" Theme Study.

Fort Wilkins

Located on the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, Fort Wilkins was established to create order during the nineteenth-century copper boom. The U.S. Army constructed the fort in 1844 and permanently abandoned the site in 1870. There are 19 surviving buildings, including 12 original structures from the 1840s, which are part of a Michigan state park and a cooperating site of the Keweenaw National Historical Park. The fort is not related to any Canadian boundary tension. Fort Wilkins was listed in the National Register in 1970.

Canadian Border-Region Forts

Some of the Canadian border forts started as British or French possessions for trading. Their locations at strategic places along waterways later lent themselves to military defense when the United States took possession. Some are like Fort William H. Seward in that they represent an expression of sovereignty and military defense near a border, yet most represent earlier periods of American history, especially the Revolutionary War era, the War of 1812, and the Civil War. The defenses of Puget Sound (Forts Worden, Casey, and Flagler) are also located in sight of the Canadian border and played a nationally significant role in U.S.-Canada relations during World War II. Fort William H. Seward stands out among this group as being the only fort associated with defense of the U.S.-Canada border at the turn of the twentieth century.

DRAFT

Fort Drummond, in Michigan, previously known as Fort Colyer, was established by the British on Drummond Island after they vacated Fort Mackinac. It was eventually determined that Drummond Island belonged to the United States per the Treaty of Ghent. American forces took control of the fort in 1828. It was listed in the National Register in 1969 for its political and military significance, and its period of significance is 1815–1828. Fort Mackinac, also in Michigan, was originally built by the British during the Revolutionary War, but the fort was relinquished to the United States in 1796. The fort played an important role in the War of 1812 as the British and U.S. fought for control of Lake Huron. Fort Mackinac was listed in the National Register in 1970. Fort Wayne is another Michigan fort located on the Detroit River near the border with Ontario. Fort Wayne was the third fort to be built in Detroit (following Fort Pontchartrain du Detroit and Fort Selby). Construction began in 1842 as part of an effort to increase defense of the border in the aftermath of the Patriot War (1837–1838) in Canada, and the fort was completed in 1851. It was listed in the National Register in 1971; the National Register nomination was updated in 2019.[59]

Fort Snelling in Minnesota is another early nineteenth-century border fort that was developed after the War of 1812 "to assert US sovereignty over the area," which included parts of the Louisiana Purchase of 1803, and to secure the lucrative fur trade from British traders based in Canada. It was designated a National Historic Landmark in the 1960s for its military significance.[60] Fort Montgomery, located along the border of New York and Canada at Lake Champlain, was constructed between 1844 and 1871 at the same site as a previous 1816 fort. The site is connected to the War of 1812 and the Civil War. Fort Montgomery was listed in the National

[59] The 2019 update to the National Register nomination established the period of significance as 1845–1965. The update defined Fort Wayne as nationally significant in the mid-nineteenth century and locally significant in the later period.
[60] Fort Snelling was designated an NHL in 1960, at which time nomination forms were not required. Documentation of Fort Snelling's national significance was completed in 1978. Marilynn Larew, "Fort Snelling," Minneapolis, Hennepin County, Minnesota, National Historic Landmark Nomination (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1978), Section 8, 1.

Register in 1977.

Fort Worden in Port Townsend, Washington, has national significance in the history of U.S.-Canada relations during World War II. Constructed between 1898 and 1920, Fort Worden is the largest of three Endicott-era coastal defenses making up a "triangle of fire" that guarded Puget Sound, the shipyard at Bremerton, and the Seattle-Tacoma area. Among U.S. coastal defenses, the Puget Sound defenses are unique in that when they were built, they were in sight of the border with another country. However, their construction was associated with a broader campaign to fortify U.S. coastal areas, not with a border dispute with Canada. Fort Worden is significant in the history of U.S.-Canada relations as the U.S. headquarters for a joint U.S.-Canada defense strategy to protect Puget Sound from possible attack from Japan in the years leading up to and during World War II. Fort Worden was originally designated a National Historic Landmark in 1976, and updated NHL documentation recognizing its World War II significance in joint U.S.-Canada coastal defense is pending approval. Most of the NHL is part of Fort Worden Historical State Park.[61]

Mexican Border Forts

Two National Historic Landmarks are associated with U.S. defense along its border with Mexico. Like Fort William H. Seward, Fort Brown National Historic Landmark in Texas represents American expansionism as well as an expression of sovereignty over a disputed international boundary. The National Historic Landmark nomination for the Yuma Crossing National Historic Landmark, which includes Fort Yuma as well as four other sites, focuses on these sites as transportation and communication centers at a key border crossing. Both forts are significant under NHL Criterion 1 related to the themes of "Shaping the Political Landscape" and "Changing Role of the United States in the World Community."

DRAFT

Fort Brown demonstrates national significance as being the oldest in the chain of border forts bult to maintain security along the U.S.-Mexico border from 1848 through 1917. When construction on the fort began in 1846, it was a declaration that the United States claimed a disputed territory between the Rio Grande and Rio Nueces. Fort Brown represented not only a U.S. stronghold but a symbolic assertion of intimidation in a strategic border location across from the Mexican port of Matamoros.

Fort Yuma is a part of the Yuma Crossing National Historic Landmark, which is a group of five sites near the Colorado River in California and Arizona. The fort was constructed in the early 1850s on a bluff on the California side of the river. The fort was next to the prominent border crossing area on the Colorado River between Mexico and the U.S. The NHL was designated in 1978.

[61] Fort Casey and Fort Flagler were also part of the joint defenses with Canada but as supporting installations to Fort Worden. Fort Casey is now a part of the Fort Casey State Park and a historic district within U.S. Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve. Fort Flagler was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1976 and is part of Fort Flagler State Park. David M. Hansen, Alex McMurry, and Christopher E. Johnson, "Fort Worden," Port Townsend, Jefferson County, Washington, National Historic Landmark Nomination (Draft) (U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, April 2024). https://irma.nps.gov/DataStore/Reference/Profile/2303084

6. PROPERTY DESCRIPTION AND STATEMENT OF INTEGRITY

Ownership of Property	Category of Property
Private: X	Building(s):
Public-Local:	District: X
Public-State:	Site:
Public-Federal:	Structure:
	Object:

Number of Resources within Boundary of Property:

Contributing		Noncontributing	
Buildings:	27	Buildings:	26
Sites:	2	Sites:	
Structures:		Structures:	
Objects:		Objects:	
Total:	29	Total:	26

DRAFT

PROVIDE PRESENT AND PAST PHYSICAL DESCRIPTIONS OF PROPERTY

(Please see specific guidance for type of resource[s] being nominated.)

Summary Description

Fort William H. Seward National Historic Landmark is located in the City and Borough of Haines in southeast Alaska. The historic army fort is situated on the southeast side of Haines on an isthmus of the Chilkat Peninsula. The fort sits along the Chilkoot Inlet arm of the Lynn Canal, and the square-shaped historic district is oriented northeast to southwest. The surrounding Lynn Canal fjord provides a mountainous backdrop, and the maritime climate is rainy containing mild summers and cool, snowy winters. The region surrounding Fort Seward is a temperate rain forest with Sitka spruce, western hemlock, black cottonwood, and willow trees mixed with dense second-story plants like alder, salmonberry, ferns, and devil's club. The fort landscape is centered around a parade ground. Most of the contributing buildings are wood frame and between one and two-and-a-half stories tall. The noncontributing buildings are generally small or compatible in design and scale with the character of the historic fort landscape.

Fort William H. Seward was designated a National Historic Landmark (NHL) in 1978 for its significance as the last of a series of gold rush military posts established in Alaska between 1897 and 1904, for providing a military presence in Alaska during the Alaska-Canada boundary dispute, and as the only active army post in Alaska between 1925 and 1940. This nomination form updates the original Fort William H. Seward National Historic Landmark nomination form completed in 1978.

In the original nomination, the boundary is defined by a hand drawn outline on a U.S. Geological Survey map, and claims the district is 200 acres, which is incorrect. Four photos are included in the nomination, including an aerial photo that generally shows the area that is defined by the hand drawn boundary. Fort William H. Seward

was designated as a "site" before it was recognized that a "district" designation was more appropriate. The property was formally re-classified as a district in the National Register in 1984, but documentation was never updated showing contributing and noncontributing resources within the district. This improved documentation specifically identifies contributing and noncontributing properties.

Fort Architecture and Landscape Design

The architecture and landscape design of Fort William H. Seward and other military landscapes were shaped by the military mission, the local environment and transportation networks, and military values such as uniformity, hierarchy, efficiency, and utility.[62] With a mission of establishing order in the gold rush era and asserting U.S. territorial claims, Fort Seward is sited and laid out to be a highly visible expression of the U.S. military presence. The fort's orientation towards Lynn Canal reflects the strategic importance of the waterway and its role as a major transportation route, since roads in turn-of-the-twentieth-century Alaska were frequently impassable.

The military's cultural tradition of uniformity at Fort William H. Seward is expressed in the use of standardized building plans that created uniformity among the buildings of the fort and across military installations. In the 1890s, the Quartermaster Corps expanded its program of building standardization, developing standard building plans for coast artillery, cavalry, field artillery, and infantry forts. Because of this program, buildings often looked nearly identical from one fort to the next. The Colonial Revival influences seen at Fort William H. Seward were the architectural mode most commonly used in Quartermaster Corps building designs, but at other forts, the buildings reflected regional architectural heritage.[63]

DRAFT

While standardized architectural plans made fort construction easier and expressed military uniformity, the plans also signaled grades of rank, conveying and reinforcing the military hierarchy. Military hierarchy was evident in residential quarters ranging from barracks to commanding officers' quarters and in an array of service, administration, support, and logistic buildings. To express the cultural value that the military placed on hierarchy, the army adopted architectural standards within which rank was reflected in the size of the building and in its architectural detailing. Military landscapes were not as fully standardized as the buildings, but general patterns of building placement within forts also served to reinforce the military hierarchy.[64] For example, at Fort Seward, officers' housing was placed around the parade ground at the highest point of the fort, which gave officers a commanding view of the fort and surrounding area. The barracks were located at the bottom of the parade ground, followed by the warehouses, stables, and support buildings, and the non-commissioned officers' (NCO) housing was located at the bottom of the hill. This separation of ranks continues at military bases across the nation and around the world today.

---

[62] Suzanne Keith Loechl, with Susan I. Enscore, Megan Weaver Tooker, and Samuel L. Batzli, *Guidelines for Identifying and Evaluating Historic Military Landscapes*, ERDC/CERL TR-09-6 (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Engineer Research and Development Center, February 2009), 29, 35, 67, 73–77; Hoagland, "Architecture of Efficiency," in Wilson, et al., *Re-creating the American Past*, 83.

[63] Loechl, et al., *Guidelines*, 29, 48, 73–75; Hoagland, "Architecture of Efficiency," in Wilson, et al., *Re-creating the American Past*, 85–86. Fort Seward strongly resembles coastal defense installations of the Endicott era since the timing of construction and geographic location next to a waterway were similar, even though the missions were different. Mark Berhow, Joel Eastman and Bolling Smith, "Barracks, Bakeries, and Bowling Alleys: Non-Tactical Structures at American Coast Artillery Forts," in *American Coastal Defenses: A Reference Guide*, ed. Mark A. Berhow (Acconeek, MD: CDSG Press, 2015), 507, accessed March 5, 2024. www.cdsg.org/reprint%20PDFs/CAGarrison.pdf

[64] Loechl, et al., *Guidelines*, 23–25, 29, 48, 73; Hoagland, "Architecture of Efficiency," in Wilson, et al., *Re-creating the American Past*, 86–87.

Setting

Fort William H. Seward National Historic Landmark is located one-quarter mile south of downtown Haines, Alaska, on the northeast shore of Chilkat Peninsula, which lies between Chilkoot Inlet and Chilkat Inlet at the head of Lynn Canal, a natural waterway that connects to the Pacific Ocean. The fort's Colonial Revival buildings organized around a parade ground on a hillside descending to the waters of Chilkoot Inlet reflect standardized turn-of-the-twentieth-century fort design and architecture. Fort William H. Seward is flanked by the majestic 6,233-foot Mt. Davidson on Chilkat Inlet to the southwest, the 3,675-foot Mount Ripinski to the northwest, and the 4,446-foot Mount Villard to the northeast on Chilkoot Inlet. The mountainous relief of this area is most evident when standing on the dock looking southwest. The view is of the fort, framed by Mt. Davidson in the background. Constructed around a rectangular parade ground measuring 500 feet by 750 feet with a four percent slope, the Fort William H. Seward historic district is framed on three sides by a thick growth of Sitka spruce, hemlock, alder, and berry bushes, and at its lower edge by Portage Cove on Chilkoot Inlet. Set before a backdrop of lush forest and stunning alpine peaks, the ordered assemblage of white army buildings can be seen from the water, presenting a dramatic vision of the military's gold rush-era presence in Alaska. Historic photos of the fort, taken from the dock, show a similar view in the historic period, the largest difference being that the grounds of the fort were treeless at the time.

Originally established to control unruly mobs of gold seekers enroute to the Klondike and to provide a challenge to Canadian claims in southeastern Alaska during the Alaska-Canada boundary dispute, Fort William H. Seward also had minor roles in World War I and World War II. Fort William H. Seward was the last of twelve army outposts established in Alaska between 1897 and 1904. It originally consisted of 44 buildings and structures constructed between 1902 and 1907. During World War II, nine additional buildings were constructed at the fort. Today twenty-nine Klondike Gold Rush-era and two World War II-era buildings and structures remain. After World War II, Fort William H. Seward was deactivated and sold as surplus to the Port Chilkoot Company. At some point after the sale, three small buildings were constructed on the lower half of the parade ground. Their small size and location at the lower edge of the parade ground minimizes their impact to the landmark. Since the 1970s, thirteen new buildings have been constructed in and around the original fort property. These buildings are complementary with respect to their size and do not detract from the appearance of the district as an army fort or compromise the district's overall historic integrity. Some have been constructed using materials salvaged from other fort buildings and include design elements that are sympathetic to the fort's historic buildings.

DRAFT

Following the army's standardized plans, the buildings of Fort William H. Seward were arranged in descending order of rank and function across a broad slope leading to the water, with officers and their families living above the parade ground, and enlisted men, workshops, and stables below the parade ground, closer to the water. Roadways and footpaths also lent order to the property by encircling major buildings and leading inevitably toward the fort's primary transportation link, the sea. Organized by nature and military protocol, the fort continues to convey its original scale and streetscape and a sense that it has functioned as a cohesive, self-contained district with defined boundaries. Historically the fort included a pipeline, water tower and reservoir, a clay reserve, and bayonet and firing ranges, but these elements are excluded from the historic district because they lie beyond the core of the fort and there has been intervening construction, or, like the water tower, are no longer extant.

Design Elements

Although Fort William H. Seward is not nationally significant for its architecture, it is important to understand the common design elements of Fort William H. Seward. The design elements of the buildings that make up the

fort reflect the influence of the Colonial Revival, which was widely popular in the late nineteenth century. Colonial Revival design elements suggested the colonial era but did not imitate it exactly. Architects used design elements from early American architecture, such as pedimented or gabled windows, pronounced front porch and entrances, pilasters and columns, front doors with fan lights or side lights, and Palladian and ocular windows, and adapted them for residences, banks, libraries, churches, and schools. Because the late nineteenth-century architects could take advantage of advancements in building construction technology and better mill work, Colonial Revival buildings were larger and more robust looking than their earlier counterparts.[65] The rise in popularity of the Colonial Revival coincided with the period when the army was developing standardized plans for permanent military installations, which was a major reason for the Colonial Revival's influence on the design of forts of this period. Drawing inspiration from colonial Georgian construction, the buildings of Fort William H. Seward convey a strict sense of order with symmetrical façades, oversized entry porches with columns and balustrades, gabled dormers, Palladian windows, double-hung fenestration, and clapboard siding.[66] These elements cultivate an aura of martial authority, as if the buildings surrounding the parade ground are standing at attention.

With few exceptions, the buildings of the historic district are of wood frame construction, sided with wood clapboard, and have foundations of local granite ashlar. The majority were painted white with light green detailing, though utility buildings and new warehouses were painted dark green during World War II. Of all the buildings originally painted white, the majority remain so today, however the color of trim on these buildings varies. Roofs throughout the historic district are typically gabled with a 9:12 pitch, and many are covered in original asbestos-composite shingles made to resemble slate, a common feature of fort buildings in this period. These shingles were installed during the original construction of the fort. With the exception of unheated warehouses and sheds, fort buildings feature red brick chimneys usually oriented along roof ridges. In the decades since the end of World War II, sixteen buildings have been constructed within the fort's boundaries. Three have been constructed using in-kind materials or materials salvaged from demolished fort buildings and incorporate sympathetic design elements, which has helped to preserve the historic feel of the district. All have been constructed in a scale and massing that is complementary to the fort buildings.

DRAFT

The residences along Officers' Row set the standard for design throughout the historic district. Their covered porches, balustrades, and window configurations are imitated to a lesser degree among housing for lower-ranking personnel. The officers' quarters feature wood trim with dentil ornamentation in gable eaves. The trim is arranged with both partially and fully returned soffits. Gables at the front elevations of several officers' quarters feature Palladian windows. Ocular windows with radial muntins also distinguish officers' quarters from enlisted housing.

The original windows are still found in several buildings throughout the fort. They are typically divided light and double-hung, with four-over-four configurations being the most common. Many have been replaced and some are sympathetic to the original windows, while others are not. Doors vary widely after having been repeatedly replaced over the years, with some being originals salvaged from other buildings. Formal entryways on officers' homes have double doors with raised panels, transoms, and glass inlays. Entryways in lower-ranking buildings are single doors with raised panels but lacking the transoms and glass common in officers' homes. Freestanding porch columns throughout the fort are either round or square with minimal cornices. Porch

[65] Richard Guy Wilson, "Introduction: What is the Colonial Revival?," in Wilson, et al., *Re-creating the American Past*, 2–5; "Guide of Architectural Styles at Golden Gate: Colonial Revival Style," Golden Gate National Recreation Area, 2015, https://www.nps.gov/goga/learn/historyculture/colonial-revival.htm.
[66] Marcus Whiffen, *American Architecture Since 1780* (Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press, 1969), 159–165; Hoagland, "Architecture of Efficiency," in Wilson, et al., *Re-creating the American Past*, 86, 90–91. See also Lester Walker, *American Shelter* (Woodstock: Overlook Press, 1981), 172-173.

balustrades consist of shaped wood railings and square wood balusters. Molded cast-iron balustrades are used at side entrances or on some lower-ranking buildings (e.g., barracks). Among the fort's original residential buildings, materials and design elements are nearly universal.

Integrity of the Historic District

The Fort William H. Seward NHL maintains a high degree of location, design, setting, workmanship, feeling, association, and to a lesser degree, materials.

All 29 of the Fort William H. Seward NHL's contributing resources are in their original locations and settings. Despite construction of a few buildings adjacent to the fort since the historic period, the surrounding area continues to be a thick growth of Sitka spruce, hemlock, alder, and berry bushes, and at its lower edge, Portage Cove, a setting much like that of the historic period. Historically, the dock was a critical entry point to the fort during the period of significance. The sympathetic design of the current, non-historic dock is important to the overall setting. While the steel-pile dock is longer and wider than the original dock, it is in the same location, and its wood plank decking is sympathetic to the original dock and the district as a whole. The history of the dock is unknown, but the existing dock replaced an older dock in 2014.

The Fort William H. Seward NHL retains a high degree of design and, because of unsympathetic window and door replacement, a lesser degree of integrity of materials. Many original doors and windows remain, but replacement doors and windows are typically modern vinyl windows and metal doors, designed for efficiency and durability, but that are not in-kind replacements of the historic window and door configurations or materials. Many buildings have retained the original asbestos-composite shingles, and wood siding has been well taken care of or replaced in-kind. Decorative features such as corbelled chimneys, porch columns, pediments, and Palladian, ocular, and transom windows remain and clearly demonstrate the high degree of workmanship that went into the buildings. Most of the fort's contributing buildings and structures have been well maintained by their owners. The open space of the parade ground and siting of the officers' housing around it remain as they did during the period of significance.

DRAFT

The landscape of the historic district retains a high degree of integrity of design and setting. Except for the construction of three small buildings along the lower edge, the parade ground remains open. As in the historic period, the view from the commanding officer's quarters, looking southeast across the parade ground, is of the hospital and administration buildings at the opposite end of the parade ground, Officers' Row on east-southeast side, and the barracks on the west-northwest side. This layout of housing around the parade ground by rank was a common design feature of army forts of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Contributing buildings located away from the parade ground, although less ornate, continue to convey their association with standardized army plans. Important Colonial Revival design features of the fort's contributing buildings have been well maintained.

Through its high degree of integrity of design, workmanship, setting, and to a lesser degree, materials, Fort William H. Seward conveys a strong feeling of and association with a fort from the turn of the twentieth century. Standing in the center of the parade ground and looking around at Officers' Row, the hospital and administration building, the commanding officer's quarters, and barracks, one can easily get a sense of a military fort. The surrounding mountains and spruce forest help convey the sense of a frontier fort.

Circulation Patterns and Spatial Organization (keyed to site map)

Fort William H. Seward's circulation system consists of roads and sidewalks. The heart of the fort is the

rectangular parade ground, which runs southeast to northwest lengthwise and is bordered by Fort Seward Drive on all four sides. A concrete sidewalk, officers' housing, the barracks, and the hospital border Fort Seward Drive on the outside. Four roads border the fort: FAA Road runs southeast to northwest, behind officers' housing at the upper edge of the fort, intersecting with Mud Bay Road; Mud Bay Road runs southwest to northeast behind the commanding officer's quarters, intersecting with Beach Road; Beach Road runs northwest to southeast parallel to the beach; Tower Road runs northwest to southeast from Beach Road through non-commissioned officers' housing and behind the administration building and hospital, and to intersect with FAA Road. Beginning near the north corner of Fort Seward Drive, Totem Street runs southwest to northeast intersecting with Beach Road. Beginning near the east corner of Fort Seward Drive, Portage Drive runs southwest to northeast intersecting with Beach Road.

Fort William H. Seward is situated on a gently sloping hill with the upper edge bounded by officers' housing and its lower edge bounded by the beach along Portage Cove. Many of the buildings of Fort William H. Seward are arranged around the nine-acre parade ground (29). Along the upper edge of the parade ground is Officers' Row, a series of buildings including the chief surgeon's quarters (1), five duplex officers' quarters (2–6) and the duplex bachelor officers' quarters (7). Rounding the western corner of the parade ground are situated the captains' quarters (8) and the commanding officer's quarters (9), today joined by a one-story addition to create the Hotel Halsingland. Behind the commanding officer's quarters is the commanding officer's garage (10). Also on the northwest side of the parade ground are the fire hall (11) and guardhouse (12). On the southeast side of the parade ground are situated the administration building (13) and hospital (14). Below or north of the parade ground are the barracks (15) and the barracks foundation (28). The hospital sergeant's quarters (16) and non-commissioned officers' quarters (17–20) descend toward the water in the eastern corner of the district. The Post Support area included storage and utility buildings that occupied the lowest section of the district and include the quartermaster warehouse (23), bakery (24), post exchange (25), subsistence warehouse (26), and Signal Corps office (27).

DRAFT

CONTRIBUTING BUILDINGS

Officers' Row

Officers' Row is a series of nine buildings facing the parade ground and situated along the southwest boundary of the NHL. Of the nine buildings, six are duplexes, two are single-family quarters, and one is an apartment building. Located at the highest point of the fort, Officers' Row has a commanding view of the fort, overlooking the parade ground, barracks, quartermaster warehouse, dock, and Portage Cove. Constructed for officers and their families, the houses on Officers' Row were the most elaborately designed of the buildings that made up Fort William H. Seward. The row of houses along the southwest boundary sits on a bench approximately five feet in elevation above Fort Seward Drive. A small set of concrete steps rises from the sidewalk along Fort Seward Drive, leading to a walkway which runs approximately 20 feet across a front lawn to the porch of each house.

1. Chief Surgeon's Quarters (Historic no. 1; AHRS Site no. SKG-00149): The chief surgeon's quarters is the first of the nine officers' quarters buildings that make up Officers' Row. A single-family home constructed in 1904, the chief surgeon's quarters is a two-and-a-half-story, wood frame, L-plan building with a full basement and ashlar foundation carved from local granite. The building is clad in horizontal clapboard siding painted white with green trim, and the cross-gable roof is covered with gray asphalt shingles. Measuring approximately 55 feet by 40 feet in plan, the building faces northeast toward the parade ground. The 1905 site plan identifies this building as "F.O. 1" with a Quartermaster General's Office (QMGO) plan number of 145 A.

The chief surgeon's quarters is a contributing resource in the district and retains many of the character-defining features of standardized Colonial Revival buildings on army installations during this period. Notable features include an open wrap-around porch, denticulated cornice and pediment, a Palladian window on the gable of the primary façade, and brick chimneys. The roof above the porch is now covered with green corrugated metal, but the change does not visually detract due to the low slope. Limited window and door replacement has occurred, but the overall fenestration has been retained.

2. Officers' Quarters 2 and 3 (Historic no. 2 and 3; AHRS Site no. SKG-00150): Officers' Quarters 2 and 3 is the second in a series of nine officers' quarters buildings that make up Officers' Row. A duplex constructed in 1904, Officers' Quarters 2 and 3 is a two-and-a-half-story, wood frame, U-plan building with a full basement and ashlar foundation carved from local granite. The building is clad in horizontal clapboard siding painted white with sky blue trim, and the cross-gable roof is covered with gray asphalt shingles. Measuring approximately 55 feet by 38 feet in plan, the building faces northeast toward the parade ground. The 1905 site plan identifies this building as "LIEUT. 2, 3" with a QMGO plan number of 120 A.

   Officers' Quarters 2 and 3 is a contributing resource in the district and retains many of the character-defining features of standardized Colonial Revival buildings on army installations during this period. Notable features include a shared front porch with pedimented gables marking the two main entrances, a simplified cornice with modest returns, a Palladian window on the gable of the primary façade, elliptical windows on the northwest and southeast gables, and three brick chimneys. The roof above the porch is now covered with gray standing seam metal panels, but the change does not visually detract due to the low slope. Limited window and door replacement has occurred, but the overall fenestration has been retained.

DRAFT

3. Officers' Quarters 4 and 5 (Historic no. 4 and 5; AHRS Site no. SKG-00151): Officers' Quarters 4 and 5 is the third in a series of nine officers' quarters buildings that make up Officers' Row. A duplex constructed in 1904, Officers' Quarters 4 and 5 is a two-and-a-half-story, wood frame, U-plan building with a full basement and ashlar foundation carved from local granite. The building is clad in horizontal clapboard siding painted white with red trim, and the cross-gable roof is covered with gray asphalt shingles. Measuring approximately 66 feet by 55 feet in plan, the building faces northeast toward the parade ground. The 1905 site plan identifies this building as "CAPT. 4, 5" with a QMGO plan number of 142 REV.

   Officers' Quarters 4 and 5 is a contributing resource in the district and retains many of the character-defining features of standardized Colonial Revival buildings on army installations during this period. Notable features include separate wrap-around porches, a Palladian window on the gable of the primary façade, elliptical windows on the northwest and southeast gables, and two brick chimneys. The roof above the porches is covered with gray standing seam metal panels, but they do not visually detract due to the low roof slope. Limited window and door replacement has occurred, but the overall fenestration has been retained.

4. Officers' Quarters 6 and 7 (Historic no. 6 and 7; AHRS Site no. SKG-00152): Officers' Quarters 6 and 7 is the fourth in a series of nine officers' quarters buildings that make up Officers' Row. A duplex constructed in 1904, Officers' Quarters 6 and 7 is a two-and-a-half-story, wood frame, U-plan building with a full basement and ashlar foundation carved from local granite. The building is clad in horizontal clapboard siding painted white with gray-blue trim, and the cross-gable roof is covered with a dark gray asbestos shingle in a diamond pattern. Measuring approximately 66 feet by 55 feet in plan, the building faces northeast toward the parade ground. The 1905 site plan identifies this building as "CAPT. 6, 7" with a QMGO plan number of 142 REV.

Officers' Quarters 6 and 7 is a contributing resource in the district and retains many of the character-defining features of standardized Colonial Revival buildings on army installations during this period. Notable features include separate wrap-around porches, a Palladian window on the gable of the primary façade, elliptical windows on the northwest and southeast gables, and two brick chimneys. The roof above the porches is covered with gray standing seam metal panels, but the panels do not visually detract due to the low roof slope. Window and door replacement has occurred, but the overall fenestration has been retained.

5. Officers' Quarters 8 and 9 (Historic no. 8 and 9; AHRS Site no. SKG-00153): Officers' Quarters 8 and 9 is the fifth in a series of nine officers' quarters buildings that make up Officers' Row. A duplex constructed in 1904, Officers' Quarters 8 and 9 is a two-and-a-half-story, wood frame, U-plan building with a full basement and ashlar foundation carved from local granite. The building is clad in horizontal clapboard siding painted white with dark red trim, and the cross-gable roof is covered with gray asphalt shingles. Measuring approximately 55 feet by 38 feet in plan, the building faces northeast toward the parade ground. The 1905 site plan identifies this building as "LIEUT. 8, 9" with a QMGO plan number of 120 A.

   Officers' Quarters 8 and 9 is a contributing resource in the district and retains many of the character-defining features of standardized Colonial Revival buildings on army installations during this period. Notable features include a shared front porch with pedimented gables marking the two main entrances, a simplified cornice with modest returns, a Palladian window on the gable of the primary façade, elliptical windows on the northwest and southeast gables, and one brick chimney. The roof above the porch is now covered with gray standing seam metal panels, but the change does not visually detract due to the low slope. Window and door replacement has occurred, but the overall fenestration has been retained.

DRAFT

6. Officers' Quarters 10 and 11 (Historic no. 10 and 11; AHRS site no. SKG-00154): Officers' Quarters 10 and 11 is the sixth in a series of nine officers' quarters buildings that make up Officers' Row. A duplex constructed in 1904, Officers' Quarters 10 and 11 is a two-and-a-half-story, wood frame, U-plan building with a full basement and ashlar foundation carved from local granite. The building is clad in horizontal clapboard siding painted white with dark green trim, and the cross-gable roof is covered with gray asphalt shingles. Measuring approximately 55 feet by 38 feet in plan, the building faces northeast toward the parade ground. The 1905 site plan identifies this building as "LIEUT. 10, 11" with a QMGO plan number of 120 A.

   Officers' Quarters 10 and 11 is a contributing resource in the district and retains many of the character-defining features of standardized Colonial Revival buildings on army installations during this period. Notable features include a shared front porch with pedimented gables marking the two main entrances, a simplified cornice with modest returns, a Palladian window on the gable of the primary façade, elliptical windows on the northwest and southeast gables, and one brick chimney. The roof above the porch is now covered with gray standing seam metal panels, but the change does not visually detract due to the low slope. Window and door replacement has occurred, but the overall fenestration has been retained.

7. Bachelor Officers' Quarters (Historic no. 49 and 50; AHRS site no. SKG-00155): The bachelor officers' quarters is the seventh in a series of nine officers' quarters buildings that make up Officers' Row. An apartment building constructed in 1907, the bachelor officers' quarters is a two-and-a-half-story, wood frame, rectangular building with a full basement and ashlar foundation carved from local granite. The building is clad in horizontal clapboard siding painted white with dark green trim, and the cross-gable roof is covered with a dark gray asbestos shingle in a diamond pattern. Measuring approximately 50 feet by 64 feet in plan, the building is situated on the west corner of the parade ground. The primary façade faces northeast toward the neighboring captains' quarters. The 1905 site plan faintly depicts the proposed location

for the building, which is identified as "LIEUT." with no accompanying QMGO plan number.

The bachelor officers' quarters is a contributing resource in the district and retains many of the character-defining features of standardized Colonial Revival buildings on army installations during this period. Notably, this building combines design elements found on the other officers' quarters buildings, such as open side porches, denticulated cornice and pediment on the primary façade, and four brick chimneys. The porch roofs are covered with red standing seam metal panels, but the panels do not visually detract due to the low roof slope.

8. Captains' Quarters 51 and 52 (Historic no. 51 and 52; AHRS Site no. SKG-00156): Captains' Quarters 51 and 52 is the eighth in a series of nine officers' quarters buildings that make up Officers' Row. A duplex constructed in 1907, Captains' Quarters 51 and 52 is a two-and-a-half-story, wood frame, roughly T-plan building with a full basement and ashlar foundation carved from local granite. The building is clad in horizontal clapboard siding painted white with dark green trim, and the cross-gable roof is covered with gray asphalt shingles. The building's core measures approximately 60 feet by 60 feet in plan and sits near the west corner of the parade ground, which it faces. The 1905 site plan faintly depicts the proposed location for the building, which is identified as "CAPT." with no accompanying QMGO plan number.

   Captains' Quarters 51 and 52 is connected to the neighboring Commanding Officer's Quarters 53 via the noncontributing Halsingland Hotel addition, resulting in a connected complex of three buildings to form the Halsingland Hotel. The wrap-around front porch has been enclosed and incorporates some design language from the original building. The porch connects at the northeast end to the noncontributing addition, which adopts this design language as well. Although this design language is somewhat sympathetic to the original, the addition itself introduces a loss of uniformity and order when compared to the other buildings on Officers' Row.

   Captains' Quarters 51 and 52 is a contributing resource in the district, but the contemporary additions and changes detract somewhat from its original design and spatial relationship to its immediate surroundings.

9. Commanding Officer's Quarters 53 (Historic no. 53; AHRS Site no. SKG-00157): The commanding officer's quarters is the ninth in a series of nine officers' quarters buildings that make up Officers' Row. Constructed in 1907, the commanding officer's quarters is a two-and-a-half-story, wood frame, roughly L-plan building with a full basement and ashlar foundation carved from local granite. The building is clad in horizontal clapboard siding painted white with dark green trim, and the cross-gable roof is covered with gray asphalt shingles. The building's core measures approximately 55 feet by 40 feet in plan, and the primary façade faces southeast toward the parade ground. The 1905 site plan faintly depicts the proposed location for the building, which is identified as "F.O." with no accompanying QMGO plan number. While the building's plan suggests it would align with the QMGO plan number 145 A, its outward design is noticeably different from the chief surgeon's quarters based on that plan.

   The commanding officer's quarters is connected to the neighboring Captains' Quarters 51 and 52 via the noncontributing Halsingland Hotel addition, resulting in a connected complex of three buildings to form the Halsingland Hotel. The wrap-around front porch of the commanding officer's quarters has been enclosed and incorporates some design language from the original building. The porch connects at the southwest end to the noncontributing addition, which adopts this design language as well. Although this design language is somewhat sympathetic to the original, the addition itself introduces a loss of uniformity and order when compared to the other buildings on Officers' Row.

DRAFT

The commanding officer's quarters is a contributing resource in the district, but the contemporary additions and changes detract somewhat from its original design and spatial relationship to its immediate surroundings.

10. Commanding Officer's Garage (AHRS Site no. SKG-00158): Constructed during the period of significance, the commanding officer's garage is a one-story, wood frame, square plan building located approximately 50 feet northwest of the commanding officer's quarters. The building is clad in horizontal lap siding painted white with white trim, and the gable roof is covered with a dark gray asbestos shingle in a diamond pattern. The rectangular building measures approximately 23 feet by 23 feet. There are no windows or chimneys on the building. The original garage door opening on the southeast wall has been covered with siding, and a single-entry door has been added in its place. The northeast wall bears a sign advertising the adjacent hotel. The building is currently used as a utility/storage shed.

    The commanding officer's garage retains sufficient integrity to contribute to the district despite the changes in materials and design.

11. Fire Hall (Historic no. 19; AHRS Site no. SKG-00159): Constructed in 1904, the fire hall is a one-story, wood frame, rectangular building. To the rear of the one-story portion of the building is a fire tower which was reconstructed in 2014 and stands approximately 50 feet tall. The building is clad in horizontal lap siding painted white with white trim on the one-story portion and red trim on the tower. The gable roof is covered with a light gray corrugated metal. The building measures approximately 20 feet by 55 feet in plan and faces the parade ground to the southeast. The 1905 site plan identifies this building as "HOSE HOUSE 19" with "NO PLAN NO." noted in place of the QMGO plan number.

    The fire hall is a contributing resource in the district despite the loss of the original tower.

12. Guardhouse (Historic No. 18; AHRS Site no. SKG-178): Constructed in 1904, the guardhouse is a one-and-a-half story, wood frame, rectangular building with a full basement and ashlar foundation carved from local granite. The building is clad in vertical lap siding painted gray with white trim. The core of the building is covered with a pyramidal roof and covered in dark gray metal shingles. The building measures approximately 60 feet by 70 feet in plan and faces the parade ground to the southeast. The 1905 site plan identifies this building as "GUARD HOUSE 18" with a QMGO plan number of 30 E. The original front porch has been enclosed, and a one-story garage addition has been added to the southwest façade of the original building.

    The guardhouse is a contributing resource in the district despite the changes in design and materials.

13. Administration Building (Historic no. 12; AHRS Site no. SKG-00160): Constructed in 1904, the administration building is a two-and-a-half-story, wood frame, rectangular plan building with a full basement and ashlar foundation carved from local granite. The building is clad in horizontal clapboard siding painted white with green trim. The gable roof is covered in gray asphalt shingles. The building measures approximately 38 feet by 40 feet in plan and faces the parade ground to the northwest. The 1905 site plan identifies this building as "ADMINISTRATION BUILDING 12" with a QMGO plan number of 122 A.

    The original front porch has been enclosed, and an open two-bay carport addition extends from the southwest façade of the original building.

DRAFT

The administration building is a contributing resource in the district and retains many of the character-defining features of standardized Colonial Revival buildings on army installations during this period. Notable features include Palladian windows centered within the gables of the northeast and southwest façades, a simplified cornice with modest returns, and two brick chimneys on opposite ends of the roof ridge. The roof above the porch is now covered with gray corrugated metal, but the change does not visually detract due to the low slope. Limited window and door replacement has occurred, but the overall fenestration has been retained.

14. Hospital (Historic no. 13; AHRS Site no. SKG-00161): Constructed in 1904, the hospital is a two-and-a-half-story, wood frame, rectangular plan building atop an ashlar foundation carved from local granite. The building is clad in horizontal clapboard siding painted white with pale green trim. The gable and hipped roofs are covered with a dark gray asbestos shingle in a diamond pattern. The building measures approximately 108 feet by 40 feet in plan and faces the parade ground to the northwest. The 1905 site plan identifies this building as "HOSPITAL 13" with no accompanying plan number. The hospital is divided into a two-and-a-half-story main block and a one-and-a-half-story lateral wing surrounded on all three sides by an enclosed porch extending to the southwest.

    The hospital is a contributing resource in the district and retains many of the character-defining features of standardized Colonial Revival buildings on army installations during this period and of the first round of the surgeon general's standardized hospitals. Notable features include an emphasis on ventilation and lighting and the increasingly popular pavilion plan, with a central administrative block and ward wings surrounded by a porch on all sides.[67] Although the porch surrounding the ward was originally an open design, its enclosure seems to have occurred during the period of significance and maintains the open feeling by using a continuous band of six-light windows along its perimeter. The cylindrical air vents remain along the roof ridge and illustrate the emphasis placed on providing ample ventilation for the building and its occupants.

15. Double Company Barracks 16 and 17 (Historic no. 16, 17; AHRS Site no. SKG-00162): Constructed in 1905, Double Company Barracks 16 and 17 is a wood frame, U-plan building with a full basement and ashlar foundation carved from local granite. The building is clad in horizontal clapboard siding painted white with white trim. The cross-gable roof is covered with a dark gray asbestos shingle in a diamond pattern. Double Company Barracks 16 and 17 was one of two identical buildings, the second of which burned in 1981 and is now conveyed by the remaining barracks foundation (28). The building measures approximately 150 feet by 105 feet in plan and faces the parade ground to the southwest. The 1905 site plan identifies this building as "BARRACKS 16, 17" with a QMGO plan number of 75 H.

    Double Company Barracks 16 and 17 is a contributing resource in the district and retains many of the character-defining features of standardized Colonial Revival buildings on army installations during this period. Notable features include an open porch along the main façade, a simplified cornice with modest returns, and Palladian windows centered within the front-facing gables. Limited window and door replacement has occurred, but the fenestration has been retained.

Non-Commissioned Officers' (NCO) Quarters and Civilians' Quarters

This collection of buildings is situated northeast of the hospital building along Tower Road, colloquially known

[67] Adam D. Smith and Sunny Stone, *Military Hospitals Historic Context*, Legacy Project #06-296 (Department of Defense Legacy Resource Management Program, June 2008), 148–150. The hospital at Fort William H. Seward appears nearly identical to the second hospital constructed at Fort Bliss, Texas.

DRAFT

as Soap Suds Alley.

Of the eight buildings originally constructed along Tower Road, one was a two-story, single-family quarters, four were two-story duplexes, and three were smaller one-story quarters. The two-story single-family quarters was reserved for the hospital sergeant and his family and is situated nearest the hospital. The four two-story duplexes were used for non-commissioned officers and their families and are situated on both sides of Tower Road. The three smaller single-story quarters were constructed on the next lot downhill from the NCO duplexes, along the northwest of Tower Road. These simple buildings were reserved for civilian contractors that would have been working at the fort, and only two remain today. All NCO duplexes and the hospital sergeant's quarters are extant and in good condition.

The army's fort design philosophy of reinforcing the military hierarchy in the landscape is evident in the size and design of the NCO quarters. When compared to officers' quarters, NCO quarters were smaller and less ornate. NCO quarters were two-story buildings, smaller than the typical two-and-a-half story construction found in officers' housing. Simple wide cornices decorate the eaves of NCO quarters, differing from the more ornate cornices of officers' housing. The civilians' quarters were the least ornate and smallest of all housing on the fort.

16. Hospital Sergeant's Quarters (Historic no. 20; AHRS site no. SKG- 00163): A single-family home constructed in 1904, the hospital sergeant's quarters is a two-story, wood frame, L-plan building clad in horizontal clapboard siding painted white with green trim. A gable roof covers the original two-story core of the building, while a low sloped roof covers an addition running three-quarters of the perimeter of the ground floor. This addition is largely enclosed except for an open wrap-around porch on the west corner which also serves as the primary entrance. The building measures approximately 45 feet by 43 feet in plan, with its primary façade facing northwest toward Portage Street. Parking and rear access is located along Tower Road to the southeast. The building sits uphill approximately 25 feet southwest from Non-Commissioned Officers' Quarters 21 and 22 (17). The 1905 site plan identifies this building as "HOSP. STEWD. QRS." with a QMGO plan number of 87 E.

    The hospital sergeant's quarters is a contributing resource in the district, but the contemporary additions and changes detract somewhat from its integrity on an individual level.

17. Non-Commissioned Officers' Quarters 21 and 22 (Historic no. 21, 22; AHRS site no. SKG-00164): A duplex constructed in 1904, Non-Commissioned Officers' Quarters 21 and 22 is a two-story, wood frame, rectangular building clad in horizontal clapboard siding painted white with red trim. The cross-gable roof is covered with a gray asbestos shingle in a diamond pattern, while a dark gray metal roof covers the enclosed porches on the northwest and southeast. The building measures approximately 50 feet by 40 feet in plan, with its primary façade facing northwest toward Portage Street. Parking and rear access is located along Tower Road to the southeast. The building is flanked by the hospital sergeant's quarters (16) to the southwest, and Non-Commissioned Officers' Quarters 23 and 24 (18) to the northeast. The 1905 site plan identifies this building as "N.C.O. QRS. 21, 22" with a QMGO plan number of 82 E.

    Non-Commissioned Officers' Quarters 21 and 22 is a contributing resource in the district. The building maintains the core form and design of an NCO duplex based on the 82 E plan. The front and rear porches have been enclosed, but the fenestration and materials are compatible and do not significantly detract from its integrity.

18. Non-Commissioned Officers' Quarters 23 and 24 (Historic no. 23, 24; AHRS site no. SKG-00165): A

DRAFT

duplex constructed in 1904, Non-Commissioned Officers' Quarters 23 and 24 is a two-story, wood frame, rectangular building clad in horizontal clapboard siding painted white with a pale blue trim. The cross-gable roof is covered with dark gray asphalt shingles, while a dark gray metal roof covers the enclosed porches on the northwest and southeast. The building measures approximately 50 feet by 40 feet in plan, with its primary façade facing northwest toward Portage Street. Parking and rear access is located along Tower Road to the southeast. The building sits downhill approximately 30 feet northeast from Non-Commissioned Officers' Quarters 21 and 22 (17). The 1905 site plan identifies this building as "N.C.O. QRS. 23, 24" with a QMGO plan number of 82 E.

Non-Commissioned Officers' Quarters 23 and 24 is a contributing resource in the district. The quarters maintains the core form and design of an NCO duplex based on the 82 E plan. The front and rear porches have been enclosed, but the fenestration and materials are compatible and do not significantly detract from its integrity.

19. Non-Commissioned Officers' Quarters 54 and 55 (Historic no. 54, 55; AHRS site no. SKG-00166): A duplex constructed sometime between 1904 and 1910, Non-Commissioned Officers' Quarters 54 and 55 is a two-story, wood frame, rectangular building clad in horizontal clapboard siding painted white with a turquoise and pale blue trim. The cross-gable roof is covered with a gray asbestos shingle in a diamond pattern, while a dark gray metal roof covers the enclosed porch on the northwest and the open porch on the southeast.

DRAFT

The building measures approximately 50 feet by 40 feet in plan, and primary access is from Tower Road along the northwest façade of the building. The building sits uphill approximately 35 feet southwest from Non-Commissioned Officers' Quarters 56 and 57 (20). The 1905 site plan appears to outline the future location of this building, and although it is not labeled with a QMGO plan number, the building is essentially identical to the other NCO duplexes based on the 82 E plan design.

Non-Commissioned Officers' Quarters 54 and 55 is a contributing resource in the district, and the building maintains the core form and design of an NCO duplex based on the 82 E plan. The front porch has been enclosed, but the fenestration and materials are compatible with the rest of the building and the other NCO duplexes nearby.

20. Non-Commissioned Officers' Quarters 56 and 57 (Historic no. 56, 57; AHRS site no. SKG-00167): A duplex constructed sometime between 1904 and 1910, Non-Commissioned Officers' Quarters 56 and 57 is a two-story, wood frame, rectangular building clad in horizontal clapboard siding painted white with a light powder blue trim. The cross-gable roof is covered with a gray asbestos shingle in a diamond pattern, while a gray metal roof covers the enclosed porch on the northwest and porch on the southeast. The building measures approximately 50 feet by 40 feet in plan, and primary access is from Tower Road along the northwest façade of the building. The building is flanked by Non-Commissioned Officers' Quarters 54 and 55 (19) to the southwest, and a noncontributing bed-and-breakfast (35) to the northeast. The 1905 site plan appears to outline the future location of this building, and although it is not labeled with a QMGO plan number, the building is essentially identical to the other NCO duplexes based on the 82 E plan design.

Non-Commissioned Officers' Quarters 56 and 57 is a contributing resource in the district and has the core form and design of an NCO duplex based on the 82 E plan. The front porch has been enclosed with walls and does not incorporate any windows like the other NCO duplexes nearby. This does diminish somewhat its ability to convey a similar design, but the materials used are compatible with the rest of the building.

21. Civilians' Quarters 25 (Historic no. 25; AHRS no. SKG-00182): Constructed in 1904, Civilians' Quarters 25 is a one-story, wood frame, rectangular building clad in a light gray horizontal vinyl siding with white trim. The gable roof is covered with a dark gray standing seam metal panel. The building measures approximately 25 feet by 60 feet in plan, and primary access is from an alley running along the southwest. The building sits uphill approximately 20 feet southwest from Civilians' Quarters 26 (22). The 1905 site plan identifies this building as "CIVILIANS QRS. 25" with "NO PLAN" noted in place of the QMGO plan number.

    Civilians' Quarters 25 is a contributing resource in the district, despite changes in materials and design.

22. Civilians' Quarters 26 (Historic no. 26; AHRS site no. SKG-00173): Constructed in 1904, Civilians' Quarters 26 is a one-story, wood frame, rectangular building clad in gray corrugated metal panels oriented vertically. The main gable roof and small shed roof covering the enclosed arctic entry on the southeast façade is covered with a dark brown corrugated metal panel. The building measures approximately 20 feet by 50 feet in plan, and primary access is from a driveway running along the northeast. The building sits downhill approximately 20 feet northeast from Civilians' Quarters 25 (21). The 1905 site plan identifies this building as "CIVILIANS QRS. 26" with "NO PLAN" noted in place of the QMGO plan number.

    Civilians' Quarters 26 is a contributing resource in the district, despite significant changes in materials and design.

DRAFT

Post Support Area

The Post Support Area included facilities necessary to support the fort's operations. This area historically included the quartermaster warehouse, mule barn/stable, wagon shed, garage, powerhouse, and Signal Corps building, among others, as well as the dock, which is outside the NHL boundary. Buildings tended to be simpler in design than other fort buildings, reflecting their utilitarian nature. This area of the district has experienced the greatest amount of change, likely due to the challenges associated with adapting or rehabilitating the more purpose-built and utilitarian buildings.

23. Quartermaster Warehouse (Historic no. 37; AHRS site no. SKG-00168): Constructed in 1904, the quartermaster warehouse is a one-and-a-half-story, wood frame, L-plan building atop an ashlar foundation carved from local granite. The building is clad in horizontal clapboard siding painted white with green trim. The gable roof is covered with a dark gray asbestos shingle in a diamond pattern. Located between Portage Street and Blacksmith Street, the building measures approximately 200 feet by 55 feet in plan and is primarily accessed along an unnamed gravel road to the southwest. The 1905 site plan identifies this building as "Q.M. &. COMSY. [Commissary] ST. HO. 37" with a QMGO plan number of 91 F measuring approximately 30 feet by 120 feet with a faint outline suggesting possible expansion to the northwest. The 1910 reservation plan confirms that it had indeed been expanded by that point to the about 200 feet seen today. A small shed addition was added in 1940 along the east corner of the northeast façade. Two wall dormers are evenly spaced along both the southwest and northeast roof slopes.

    The quartermaster warehouse is a contributing resource in the district and maintains the materials and core design of the expanded 91 F plan.

24. Bakery (Historic no. 38: AHRS site no. SKG-00169): Constructed in 1904, the bakery is a one-and-a-half-story, wood frame, rectangular building atop a concrete and ashlar foundation carved from local granite. The building is clad in unpainted horizontal clapboard siding. The gable roof is covered with a modern composite shingle in a diamond pattern chosen to mimic the appearance of the asbestos shingles used

extensively within the district during the period of significance. Located on the west side of Blacksmith Street, the building measures approximately 50 feet by 30 feet in plan and is primarily accessed along an unnamed gravel road to the southwest. The 1905 site plan identifies this building as "BAKE HOUSE 38" with a QMGO plan number of 49 L. The building was successfully rehabilitated in 2017 and is used as a distillery and tasting room.

The bakery is a contributing resource in the district.

25. Post Exchange (Historic no. 39; AHRS site no. SKG-00171): Constructed in 1904, the post exchange is a one-story, wood frame, L-plan building atop an ashlar foundation carved from local granite. The building is clad in horizontal clapboard siding painted white with red trim. The cross-hipped roof is covered with gray asphalt shingles. The building is comprised of two main wings which form the L-plan footprint with an overall dimension of approximately 140 feet by 115 feet. The primary wing was built first and is identified on the 1905 site plan as "POST EXCHANGE & GYM. 39" with no accompanying plan number; it measured approximately 110 feet by 68 feet running southeast to northwest. Although no QMGO plan number is identified, the design is nearly identical to the 157 A plan number. The rear wing was added shortly after 1910 and measures approximately 110 feet by 25 feet running southwest to northeast.

    The primary façade of the post exchange faces southeast towards Totem Street and is the most formal of the support buildings. A few small arctic entries and shed-roofed additions have been made at various locations along the perimeter, including a large deck/patio which partially wraps around the rear wing of the building. Notable details on the primary façade include a dominant entry portico, with a pediment supported by columns. Centered in the pediment is an oculus detail with a keystone surround. A large fanlight with tracery sits atop the main entry doors.

    The post exchange is a contributing resource in the district despite changes to the columns on the entry portico and small additions on the rear of the building. However, the overall formality conveyed by the classically inspired façade remains.

26. Subsistence Warehouse (Historic no. T-6; AHRS site no. SKG-00172): Constructed in 1942, the subsistence warehouse is a one-story, wood frame, rectangular building atop an ashlar foundation carved from local granite. The building is clad in horizontal shiplap siding painted a gray blue. The gable roof is covered with green corrugated metal. The building measures approximately 90 feet by 35 feet in plan and is oriented northwest to southeast with primary access on the southeast façade. The subsistence warehouse is a 700-series World War II building, although it appears to have been constructed directly atop the foundation of a previous building constructed in 1904. The previous building is identified on the 1905 site plan as "RESERVOIR AND PUMP HOUSE 27" with no accompanying QMGO plan number. The current building is situated approximately 220 feet southeast of Tower Road, and 160 feet southwest of Beach Road and is largely obscured by vegetation on all sides.

    The subsistence warehouse is a contributing resource in the despite small shed-roofed additions on the southern corner and the encroachment of vegetation on the lot.

27. Signal Corps Office (Historic no. 31; AHRS site no. SKG-00175): Constructed in 1903, the Signal Corps office is a one-story, wood frame, rectangular building. The building is clad in horizontal shiplap siding painted white with black trim. The gable roof is covered with light gray asphalt shingles. A small building with a saltbox roof measuring approximately 15 feet by 15 feet was built along the northwest façade of the original building with a one-foot gap between them. This addition was built sometime during the World

DRAFT

War II build-up, but it is unclear if it was during the period of significance. The original building measured approximately 20 feet by 24 feet. The 1905 site plan identifies the building as "SIGNAL OFFICE 31" with "NO PLAN" noted in place of the QMGO plan number. The building is situated on the corner of Beach Road to the northeast and Portage Street to the southeast.

The Signal Corps office is a contributing resource in the district.

CONTRIBUTING SITES

28. Barracks Foundation (Historic no. 14, 15; AHRS site no. SKG-00176): A barracks building was constructed on this site in 1905 identical in design and materials to the double company barracks (15). The building was lost to a fire in 1981, and only the foundations, which were carved from local granite, remain. The remains of the U-plan foundation walls measure approximately 150 feet by 105 feet and are located at the corner of Fort Seward Drive and Portage Street along the parade ground (29).

    The barracks foundation is a contributing resource in the district. The foundation conveys the historic presence of the barracks and its place within the fort layout.

29. Parade Ground (AHRS site no. SKG-00177): The parade ground is an approximately nine-acre field that was used for marching formations, including reveille each morning and a nightly retreat parade. Parades, inspections, and rifle drills also took place on the grounds. The parade ground slopes gently downhill from its highest point at the base of Officers' Row to its lowest point near the double company barracks (15). It is rectangular in plan and measures approximately 800 feet by 500 feet with rounded corners and is surrounded on all four sides by Fort Seward Drive. A non-historic, unpaved road runs along the lower third of the grounds and provides vehicular and pedestrian traffic to several noncontributing resources built after the period of significance. Several clusters of trees have also been allowed to grow in the lower portion of the parade ground, which was typically kept free of any significant tree growth. Between 1957 and 1964, two small buildings—a Chilkat plank house and replica trapper's log cabin—were constructed on the lower half of the parade ground as a tourist attraction called the "Totem Village." A recently constructed log cabin has replaced the original trapper's cabin, and a small cookhouse has been constructed adjacent to the plank house.

    The parade ground is a contributing resource in the district. Although the non-historic construction and tree growth intrudes on the lower half of the large planned open space, most of the parade ground retains its open, grassy character.

NONCONTRIBUTING BUILDINGS

30. Garage (6 Portage Street): Constructed in 2018, this single-story, wood frame, gable-roofed building measuring approximately 60 feet by 35 feet is situated southwest of the Signal Corps office (27). A garage door and entrance face Portage Street to the southwest, with a primary entrance on the northeast façade flanked by a row of four windows on either side. The building is clad in horizontal shiplap siding painted white with black trim, and the roof is covered with gray asphalt shingles. Although not historic, it is complementary in design and materials to the surrounding resources within the district.

31. Garage (Historic no. 59; AHRS site no. SKG-00174): Constructed around 1969, the garage is a single-story, wood frame, gable-roofed building measuring approximately 28 feet by 185 feet and is situated roughly 80 feet southwest of the Signal Corps office (27). A garage door and entrance face Portage Street to the

DRAFT

southeast, with several additional entrances and smaller garage doors running the length of the building on the southwest façade. The building is clad in horizontal shiplap siding painted white, and the roof is covered with dark gray asbestos shingles in a diamond pattern. The building is complementary in design and materials to the surrounding resources within the district.

32. Residence (27 Fort Seward Drive): Constructed around 1965, this is a modern split-level house, located to the southeast of the chief surgeon's quarters (1) and built in the vicinity of the tennis court that was present during the historic period. A two-car garage extends to the rear. While the building's design employs none of the design elements of the historic district, its size, massing, and materials do not detract from adjacent Fort William H. Seward resources.

33. Residence (25 Fort Seward Drive): Constructed in 1986, this one-story, wood frame, gable-roofed home is located between the administration building (13) and hospital (14). It was constructed in 1984 using many Colonial Revival design elements, including a covered porch with square columns and horizontal clapboard siding; salvaged asbestos-composite shingles cover the roof. This building is complementary in scale, design, massing, and materials to other Fort William H. Seward buildings.

34. Haines Community Services Infant Learning Program (23 Fort Seward Drive): Constructed in 1990, this one-story, gable-roofed, wood frame building is located northeast of the hospital (14). It was constructed in 1989 echoing many of the Colonial Revival design elements, including a covered porch with round columns, horizontal clapboard siding, and materials such as salvaged asbestos-composite shingles on the roof. This building is complementary in scale, design, massing, and materials to other Fort William H. Seward buildings.

DRAFT

35. Bed and Breakfast (31 Tower Road): Constructed in 1990, this modern two-story, cross-gable, wood frame building incorporates some of the design elements of Fort William H. Seward buildings from the period of national significance. These include horizontal clapboard siding, a porch supported by round columns, and a cross-gable roof. It is set back from the row of NCO duplexes, and its main façade faces toward the inlet rather than the street. This building is somewhat complementary in scale, design, massing, and materials to other Fort William H. Seward buildings.

36. Power Plant (Historic no. 68; AHRS no. 00183): The power plant was built in 1931 at the corner of Tower Road and Beach Road. Today the original gable-roofed, concrete building lies engulfed in the three-story, gable-roofed, wood frame structure of a bed-and-breakfast and is used as a garage. The more prominent wood frame building employs none of the design elements, size, massing, or materials of Fort William H. Seward during the period of significance. Its impact to the NHL is minimized by its distance from other Fort William H. Seward buildings.

37. Residence (17 Portage Street): Constructed around 1987, this is a modern, two-story, saltbox-roofed, wood frame building. Except for the use of clapboard siding, the building's design employs none of the design elements of the historic district. This building is somewhat complementary in scale and massing to other Fort William H. Seward buildings.

38. Residence (22 Fort Seward Drive): Constructed around 1958, this is a modern, one-story, gable-roofed, wood frame building located to the southeast of the Port Chilkoot Bible Church (39) at the eastern corner of the parade ground (29). Although the building does not incorporate any significant design elements possessed by contributing resources within the district, its small size minimizes the visual impact to nearby Fort William H. Seward buildings.

39. Church (21 Fort Seward Drive): This one-story, cross-gable-roofed, wood frame church was likely constructed in the 1960s. The building employs none of the design elements of the historic district. The building is smaller than most of the officers' quarters buildings on the opposite side of the parade ground, which minimizes its impact to nearby Fort William H. Seward buildings.

40. Residence (63 Portage Street): Constructed in the 1960s, this is a modern two-story, wood frame building with a shallow gable roof and is located directly northeast of the Port Chilkoot Bible Church (39). The building's design employs none of the design elements of the historic district. Its scale and massing are relatively small, which minimize its impact to contributing resources within the district.

41. Gift Shop (43 Portage Street): This is a rectangular, one-story, gable-roofed, wood frame building measuring approximately 20 feet by 30 feet. Although not historic, it is similar in design, scale, massing, and materials to the Signal Corps office (27) and the civilians' quarters (21, 22) and does not detract from the contributing resources in the vicinity.

42. Coal Shed and Paint Shop (Historic no. 35; AHRS no. 00180): This is a one-story, saltbox roofed, wood frame building constructed in 1904 on the northwest side of Portage Street, adjacent to the quartermaster warehouse. Although the building occupies roughly the same footprint that it did during the period of significance, cumulative changes to roof, fenestration, materials, and scale have led to a loss of integrity.

43. Art Gallery (20 Portage Street): This is a rectangular, one-story, gable-roofed, wood frame building located between the coal shed and paint shop (42) and garage (31). It occupies the site of what was identified on the 1905 plan as "OIL HOUSE 32." The building is relatively similar in scale and massing to the other resources within the Post Support Area, minimizing its impact on the overall integrity of the district.

DRAFT

44. Halsingland Hotel Addition: This one-story, flat-roofed addition connects the captains' quarters (8) and the commanding officer's quarters (9) to create the Halsingland Hotel. The addition was designed with a low profile, and it is clearly subordinate to the two contributing quarters. While the addition does have a negative impact on the spatial relationship, the overall form and separation of the two contributing quarters is present, and it does not detract from the historic district overall.

45. Log Cabin (30 Fort Seward Drive): This small, rectangular, gable-roofed, log cabin was constructed in 1999, replacing a ca. 1957 model trapper's cabin. The cabin is located on the lower half of the parade ground (29) and is adjacent to the Chilkat Tribal House (46). The building is used as an art gallery.

46. Chilkat Tribal House (32 Fort Seward Drive): This replica of a traditional Chilkat dwelling is a small, rectangular, gable-roofed, wood frame building constructed between 1957 and 1964. It is situated in the lower half of the parade ground (29), across from the double company barracks (15) and barracks foundation (28). The building is constructed of rough-hewn local spruce. At the building's front and rear elevations are decorative panels by the carvers of Alaska Indian Arts.

47. Old Field Kitchen (34 Fort Seward Drive): This is a simple rectangular, gable-roofed, wood frame building clad with unpainted, vertically oriented, cedar siding. The building was constructed between 1957 and 1964 and stands adjacent to the Chilkat Tribal House (46) in the lower half of the parade ground (29).

48. Restrooms: This restroom building was built to accommodate the influx of visitors to the area. It is located between the double company barracks (15) and the barracks foundation (28) facing the parade ground (29). Its design adopts some of the fort's design elements, such as a covered entryway supported by square

columns, a gable roof, and clapboard siding. The building's small size and complementary design elements minimizes the impacts to the overall integrity of the NHL.

49. Distillery Warehouse: This building was constructed in 2019 and is a one-story, wood frame, gable-roofed, L-plan building on a concrete foundation. A Quonset hut previously occupied this location on the northeast side of Totem Street next to the bakery (24) and was used as the utility warehouse (Historic no. T-1; AHRS site no. SKG-00170). The current building is similar in scale and massing to the other resources within the Post Support Area, minimizing its impact.

50. Warehouse (Historic no. 36; AHRS site no. SKG-00181): This is a one-story, wood frame, gable-roofed, rectangular plan building. Located in the middle of the block between Totem Street and Blacksmith Street, the building is approximately 45 feet by 160 feet and was built sometime after the period of significance. It is unclear whether this building expanded upon a previously existing building, or if it was all new construction. This warehouse occupies the site of what was identified on the 1905 plan as the "WAGON SHED" with an accompanying QMGO plan number of 60 D and measured approximately 25 feet by 85 feet. Historic photos show that this building was nearly doubled in length sometime during the World War II build-up period, and then later doubled in width to the present-day dimensions. The proportions, materials and present use is relatively compatible with the other buildings in the Post Support Area.

51. Residence (16 Fort Seward Drive): Constructed in 1970, this is a one-story, wood frame, gable-roofed, rectangular building which measures approximately 45 feet by 30 feet. The building is clad in horizontal lap siding painted light blue, and the roof is covered in light brown asphalt shingles. The building is situated across from the northern corner of the parade ground (29).

DRAFT

52. Warehouse (40 Totem Street): Constructed in 1999, this is a two-and-a-half-story, gable-roofed, rectangular building which measures approximately 85 feet by 40 feet. The building is clad in horizontal lap siding painted white with white trim, and the roof is covered in light gray standing seam metal panel. Situated approximately 70 feet southwest of the post exchange (25) and 75 feet northwest of the double company barracks (15), the warehouse faces Totem Street to its southeast. Although modern construction, the building is highly compatible in design, and materials to the resources nearby.

53. Residence (40 Mud Bay Road; Historic no. 40; AHRS site no. NONE): This building is a one-and-a-half-story, wood frame, cross-gable and hipped roofed, rectangular building. The building measures approximately 40 feet by 55 feet. The original core of the building was a T-plan, while an addition was built sometime in the 1960s which enveloped most of the southwestern portion of the original. The original T-plan building was identified on the 1905 site plan as the "OFFICE & QRS. SUPT. OF CONST." with "NO PLAN" noted in place of the QMGO plan number. Although the original building may partially remain, the large addition makes it difficult to see clearly. The building is relatively secluded from the concentration of other contributing resources and does not negatively impact the district overall.

54. Mule Barn (Historic no. 43; AHRS site no. NONE): This is a one-and-a-half-story, wood frame, gable-roofed, rectangular building which measures approximately 65 feet by 35 feet. Located on the southeast side of Totem Street at the edge of the NHL boundary, this building appears to be the former mule barn or stables, although what remains is approximately half the size of the original. The original building measured approximately 115 feet by 30 feet and is identified on the 1905 plan as the "Q.M. STABLE" with an accompanying QMGO plan number of 45 D. Photos show that the building maintained its original size and general appearance until the late 1970s, with most of its southwestern half demolished sometime after that.

55. Residence (21 Tower Road): Constructed in 2019, this is a two-story, wood frame, gable-roofed, rectangular building which measures approximately 60 feet by 28 feet. The building is clad in white siding and covered by a tan metal roof. The building is situated approximately 30 feet northwest of the subsistence warehouse (26) and faces Tower Road to the northwest.

7. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES AND OTHER DOCUMENTATION

Adams, George R. "Fort Worden." Port Townsend, Jefferson County, Washington. National Register of Historic Places Registration Form. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1976.

Alaska Native Knowledge Network (ANKN). "Tlingit Tribes, Clans and Clan Houses." ANKN. University of Alaska Fairbanks. Accessed April 16, 2024. http://www.ankn.uaf.edu/ancr/southeast/tlingitmap/.

Alaska Northern Studies Program. *Fort William H. Seward, Haines, Alaska: Design Guidelines and Standards*. University of Washington, Department of Urban Design and Planning. Seattle: University of Washington, 1998.

"Alaska to Furnish 300 Registrants." *Rogue River Courier*. July 5, 1918.

Allan, Chris. "'Twisting the Lion's Tail': Joseph Ivey's Anti-Canadian Strategies during the Alaska Boundary Dispute.' *Alaska Journal* 39, no. 1 (Spring 2024): 1–22.

Antonson, Joan. "St. Michael, Fort Site (AHRS Site No. SMI-015)." St. Michael, Alaska. National Register of Historic Places Registration Form. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1977.

Antonson, Joan, and William S. Hanable. *Alaska's Heritage*. Alaska Historical Commission Studies in History No. 133. Anchorage: Alaska Historical Commission, 1985.

Ballard, Jack Stokes. *Commander and Builder of Western Forts: The Life and Times of Major General Henry C. Merriam, 1862-1901.* College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2014.

Beale, Howard K. *Theodore Roosevelt and the Rise of America to World Power*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1956.

Beard, Frank A. "Fort McKinley Historic District." Portland, Maine. National Register of Historic Places Registration Form. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1985.

Berhow, Mark, Joel Eastman, and Bolling Smith. "Barracks, Bakeries, and Bowling Alleys: Non-Tactical Structures at American Coast Artillery Forts." In *American Coastal Defenses: A Reference Guide*, edited by Mark A. Berhow. Acconeek, MD: CDSG Press, 2015. Accessed October 12, 2023. https://cdsg.org/wp-content/uploads/pdfs/FORTS/CACunits/CAGarrison.pdf.

Berton, Pierre. *Klondike: The Last Great Gold Rush, 1896–1899*. Toronto: Anchor Canada, 2001.

Bonnell, Ray. "The Haines Cut-off: From Native Trail to Modern Highway." In *Interior Sketches III: More*

DRAFT

Ramblings around Interior Alaska Historic Sites. Fairbanks: Pingo Press, 2023.

"Brave Soldier Loses Life." *The Evening Statesman*. January 21, 1907.

Brebner, John B. *North Atlantic Triangle: The Interplay of Canada, the United States and Great Britain*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1945.

Bush, James D. *Narrative Report of Alaska Construction, 1941-1944*. Alaska Defense Command, U.S. Army, 1943.

Chilkat Indian Village. "History." Chilkat Indian Village. Accessed April 23, 2024. https://chilkat-nsn.gov/history/.

Coast Defense Study Group (CDSG). "Research Resources from the CDSG." CDSG. Accessed April 30, 2024. https://cdsg.org/resources/.

Cohen, Stan. *The Forgotten War: A Pictorial History of World War II in Alaska and Northwestern Canada.* Altona, Manitoba: D.W. Friesen and Sons, 1981.

Conn, Stetson, Rose C. Engelman, and Byron Fairchild. *Guarding the United States and Its Outposts*. Washington, DC: Center of Military History, United States Army, 2000.

Dorrance, William H. "Evolution of Major-Caliber U.S. Coastal Defense Guns, 1888-1945." *Army History,* no. 37 (Spring 1996): 14–20.

Dauenhauer, Nora, and Richard Dauenhauer. *Haa Kusteeyi, Our Culture: Tlingit Life Stories*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1994.

Eagle Historical Society & Museums. *Eagle-Fort Egbert: A Remnant of the Past*. Fairbanks: Bureau of Land Management, 2003.

"Fire Wipes Out 20 Acre Forest." *The San Francisco Call*. July 23, 1911.

Farr, D. M. L., and Niko Block. "Alaska Boundary Dispute." The Canadian Encyclopedia. Historica Canada, 2016. https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/alaska-boundary-dispute

Foscue, Edwin J. "The Development and Decline of Skagway, Alaska." *Economic Geography* 10, no. 4 (Oct. 1934): 419–428.

Garfield, Brian. *The Thousand-Mile War: World War II in Alaska and the Aleutians*. Fairbanks: University of Alaska Press, 1995.

Gibson, F. W. "The Alaskan Boundary Dispute." *Report of the Annual Meeting of The Canadian Historical Association* (1945): 25–41.

Goodwin, R. Christopher (R. Christopher Goodwin & Associates). *National Historic Context for Department of Defense Installations, 1790-1940.* Volume 1. Baltimore, MD: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1995.

Gould, Lewis L. *The Presidency of Theodore Roosevelt*. Lawrence: The University of Kansas Press, 1991.

DRAFT

Green, Lewis. *The Boundary Hunters: Surveying the 141st Meridian and the Alaska Panhandle*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1982.

Grinev, Andrei Val'Terovich. *The Tlingit Indians in Russian America, 1741-1867*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005.

Haglund, David G. "The TR Problem in Canadian History." *London Journal of Canadian Studies* 23 (2008): 31–44.

Haines Sheldon Museum. "Tlingit History." Accessed September 28, 2023. www.sheldonmuseum.org/vignette/tlingit-history.

Hakkinen, Elisabeth, ed. *Haines: The First Century*. Haines, AK: Sheldon Museum & Cultural Center, 2009.

Hansen, David M. "Fort Flagler." Port Townsend, Jefferson County, Washington. National Register of Historic Places Registration Form. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1976.

Hansen, David M., Alex McMurry, and Christopher E. Johnson. "Fort Worden." Port Townsend, Jefferson County, Washington. National Historic Landmark Nomination (Draft). U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, April 2024. https://irma.nps.gov/DataStore/Reference/Profile/2303084.

Heinmiller, Carl. "Fort William H. Seward." Haines, Haines Borough, Alaska. National Register of Historic Places Registration Form. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1970.

Henry, Daniel Lee. *Across the Shaman's River: John Muir, the Tlingit Stronghold, and the Opening of the North*. Fairbanks: University of Alaska Press, 2017.

Hill, Thomas E., L. Brent Vaughan, and William Francis Rocheleau. *Hill's Practical Reference Library of General Knowledge.* Chicago: Dixon Hanson, 1906.

Hoagland, Alison K. *Buildings of Alaska*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Hodgins, Thomas. "The Alaskan Boundary: Its Practicability and Cost." *The North American Review* 179, no. 572 (July 1904): 65–71.

Hunt, William R. *Golden Places: The History of Alaska-Yukon Mining*. Anchorage: National Park Service, 1990.

Jessup, David Eric. "Connecting Alaska: The Washington-Alaska Military Cable and Telegraph System." *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 6, no. 4 (October 2007): 384–408.

Jessup, David Eric. "Between Two Empires: Canada and the Alaska Boundary Dispute." In *The Big Wild Soul of Terrence Cole: An Eclectic Collection to Honor Alaska's Public Historian*, edited by Frank Soos and Mary Ehrlander, 203–224. Fairbanks: University of Alaska Press, 2019.

Jones, Preston. *The Fires of Patriotism: Alaskans in the Days of the First World War, 1910–1920*. Fairbanks: University of Alaska Press, 2013.

Kavanaugh, Robert E. "Fort Lawton." Seattle, King County, Washington. National Register of Historic Places

DRAFT

Registration Form. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1978.

Koppers Inc. *Timber Piling Life Expectancy Guide*. Sydney, Australia: Koppers, Inc., 2010.

Lowery, William. "Fort Drummond." Drummond Island, Chippewa County, Michigan. National Register of Historic Places Registration Form. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1969.

Mangusso, Mary C., and Stephen Haycox, eds. *Interpreting Alaska's History: An Anthology*. Anchorage: Alaska Pacific University Press, 1989.

Mitchell, Jennifer Martin. "Fort Caswell Historic District." Caswell Beach, Brunswick County, North Carolina. National Register of Historic Places Registration Form. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 2013.

Muir, John. *Travels in Alaska*. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1915.

Munro, John A. *The Alaska Boundary Dispute*. Toronto: Copp Clark Publishing Company, 1970.

Leal, Morgan. "Fort William Henry Seward." *Alaska Sportsman,* April 1967.

Loechl, Suzanne Keith, with Susan I. Enscore, Megan Weaver Tooker, and Samuel L. Batzli. *Guidelines for Identifying and Evaluating Historic Military Landscapes*. ERDC/CERL TR-09-6, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Engineer Research and Development Center, February 2009.

Neufeld, David, and Frank Norris. *Chilkoot Trail: Heritage Route to the Klondike.* Madeira Park, British Columbia: Harbour Publishing, 1996.

Neuberger, Richard L. "The Battle of Chilkoot Pass." *The Reporter*, November 1949.

Nielson, Jonathan M. *Armed Forces on a Northern Frontier: The Military in Alaska's History, 1867–1987*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1988.

Norris, Frank B. "The Army on Lynn Canal, 1898–1904." Presented to the Annual Meeting of the Alaska Historical Society. Anchorage, November 1984.

———. "Chilkoot Trail and Dyea Site." Skagway, Skagway Borough, Alaska. National Historic Landmark Nomination. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1987.

———. *Legacy of the Gold Rush: An Administrative History of Klondike Gold Rush National Historical Park*. Anchorage: National Park Service, 1996.

Norris, Frank B., and David Neufield. *Chilkoot Trail: Heritage Route to the Klondike*. Madeira Park, British Columbia: Harbour Publishing, 1996.

Norris, Frank B., Terrence Cole, and Bonnie Houston. "Skagway and White Pass District." Skagway, Skagway Borough, Alaska. National Historic Landmark Nomination. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1998.

Northern Southeast Community Profiles [Haines]. Prepared by Environmental Services Limited under contract

DRAFT

with the Alaska Department of Community of Regional Affairs, Division of Community Planning. Juneau, 1983.

Olson, Wallace M. *The Tlingit: An Introduction to Their Culture and History*. Auke Bay, AK: Heritage Research, 1997.

Parker, Richard Wayne. "The Alaska Boundary Question." *The North American Review* 176, no. 559 (June 1903): 913-926.

Penlington, Norman. *The Alaska Boundary Dispute: A Critical Reappraisal*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Limited, 1972.

Pitkin, Thomas M. *Quartermaster Equipment for Special Forces*. Q.M.C. Historical Studies 5. Historical Section, General Administrative Services Division, Office of the Quartermaster General, 1944.

Price, Kathy. *The World War II Heritage of Ladd Field, Fairbanks, Alaska*. Fort Collins, CO: Center for Environmental Management of Military Lands, Colorado State University, 2002.

Reed, Paula S., and Edith B. Wallace. "Fort Brown." Brownsville, Cameron County, Texas. National Historic Landmark Nomination (Draft). U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 2024.

Ricard, Serge, ed. *A Companion to Theodore Roosevelt*. West Sussex, United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.

Roberts, Robert B. *Encyclopedia of Historic Forts: The Military, Pioneer, and Trading Posts of the United States*. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1988.

Shellum, Brian G. *Buffalo Soldiers in Alaska: Company L, Twenty-Fourth Infantry.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2021.

Smith, Adam D., and Sunny Stone, *Military Hospitals Historic Context*, Legacy Project #06-296. U.S. Department of Defense Legacy Resource Management Program, June 2008.

Smith, Gordon W. *Historical and Legal Study of Sovereignty in the Canadian North: Terrestrial Sovereignty, 1870-1939*. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2014.

Snell, Charles W. "National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings, Theme XXI, Alaska History: Special Report on the Anvil Creek Gold Discovery Site Near Nome, Alaska, Together with a Brief History of Gold Mining and Mining Rushes in Alaska, 1865-1910." San Francisco: National Park Service, 1965.

———. "National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings, Special Study of Fort William H. Seward (or Chilkoot Barracks) near Haines, Alaska." Washington, DC: National Park Service, 1965.

"The Sourdough Rebellion." *The Sun* (New York), April 26, 1918.

Stewart, Richard W. ed. *American Military History, Volume II: The United States Army in a Global Era, 1917-2008*. Second Edition. Army Historical Series. Washington, DC: Center of Military History, United States Army, 2010.

DRAFT

Summerall, Charles Pelot, and Timothy K. Nenninger. *The Way of Duty, Honor, Country: The Memoir of General Charles Pelot Summerall*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2010.

Thompson, Erwin N. "San Francisco Port of Embarkation, U.S. Army." San Francisco, San Francisco County. National Historic Landmark Nomination. U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 1984.

Thompson, John Herd and Stephen J. Randall. *Canada and the United States: Ambivalent Allies*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1994.

Tilchin, William N. *Theodore Roosevelt and the British Empire*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.

Upper, Diane, ed. *Building History: City of Haines – Survey of Historic Structures*. Haines, AK, 1983.

United States. Board on Fortifications or Other Defenses. "Report of the Board on Fortifications or Other Defenses Appointed by the President of the United States Under the Provisions of the Act of Congress Approved March 3, 1885 ..." Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1886. Accessed February 21, 2024. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/njp.32101059089340.

United States. National Coast Defense Board. "Report of the National Coast-Defense Board appointed by the President of the United States by Executive Order, January 31, 1905." Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1906. Accessed March 18, 2024. https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/008912239.

United States. "The Case of the United States before the Tribunal Convened at London under the Provisions of the Treaty Between the United States of American and Great Britain Concluded January 24, 1903." Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1903.

U.S. Army. Blueprints and inventories [assorted]. Record Group 270, War Assets Administration. National Archives, Kansas City Regional Office (Region VIII), Kansas City, Missouri.

U.S. Army. Blueprints [assorted]. Record Group 92. National Archives, Washington DC.

U.S. Army. *The U.S. Army in Alaska.* Pamphlet 360-5, 1972.

U.S. Department of Interior. "National Survey of Historic Sites and Buildings, Theme XXI, Political and Military Affairs, 1865-1910: Special Study, Alaska History, 1741-1910." Washington, DC: National Park Service, 1961.

U.S. War Department. "Annual Reports of the War Department for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 1899. Volume II: Armament, Transportation, and Supply." Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1899.

U.S. War Department. "Annual Reports of the War Department for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 1903. Report of Department and Division Commanders." Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1903.

U.S. War Department. "Annual Reports of the War Department for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 1903. Report of the Major-General Commanding the Army, Part 2." Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1903.

DRAFT

Walker, Lester. *American Shelter: An Illustrated Encyclopedia of the American Home*. Woodstock, NY: Overlook Press, 1981.

Whiffen, Marcus. *American Architecture Since 1780: A Guide to Styles*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press, 1969.

White, James. "Treaty of 1825—Correspondence Respecting the Boundary between Russian America (Alaska) and British North America." In *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, Series III, Volume IX. Ottaway: Royal Society of Canada, 1915.

Wilson, Richard Guy. *The Colonial Revival House*. New York: H.N. Abrams, 2004.

Wilson, Richard Guy, Shaun Eyring, and Kenny Marotta. *Re-creating the American Past: Essays on the Colonial Revival*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2006.

Winslow, Kathryn. *Big Pan-Out: The Klondike Story*. London, UK: Phoenix House Ltd, 1952.

Woodman, Lyman. *Duty Station Northwest: The U.S. Army in Alaska and Western Canada, 1867-1987*. Volume 1. Anchorage: Alaska Historical Society, 1997.

Woolley, William J. *Creating the Modern Army: Citizen-Soldiers and the American Way of War, 1919–1939*. Studies in Civil-Military Relations Series. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2022.

Wright, Charles W. "The Porcupine Placer District, Alaska." USGS Bulletin No. 236. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1904.

Young, Samuel Hall. *Alaska Days with John Muir*. Portland, OR: WestWinds Press, 2013.

DRAFT

Newspapers

Baltimore Sun
Daily Alaskan
Daily Morning Alaskan
Dalles Daily Chronicle
Douglas Island News
Everett Daily Herald (WA)
Los Angeles Times
New York Tribune
Rogue River Courier (Grants Pass, OR)
San Francisco Call
San Francisco Examiner
San Juan Islander (WA)
Seattle Post Intelligencer
Seward Gateway
Topeka State Journal
Vancouver Daily World
Victoria Daily Colonist
Waterbury Evening Democrat (CT)

Previous documentation on file (NPS):

X_ Previously listed in the National Register (fill in 1 through 6 below)

__ Not previously listed in the National Register (fill in **only** 4, 5, and 6 below)

1. NR #: 72000190
2. Date of listing: April 11, 1972
3. Level of significance: not stated
4. Applicable National Register Criteria: A_X_ B__ C__ D__
5. Criteria Considerations (Exceptions): A__ B__ C__ D__ E__ F__ G__
6. Areas of Significance: Military

__ Previously Determined Eligible for the National Register: Date of determination:
X_ Designated a National Historic Landmark: Date of designation: June 2, 1978
__ Recorded by Historic American Buildings Survey: HABS No.
__ Recorded by Historic American Engineering Record: HAER No.
__ Recorded by Historic American Landscapes Survey: HALS No.

DRAFT

Location of additional data:

State Historic Preservation Office: Alaska Office of History and Archaeology, Anchorage, AK

Other State Agency:

Federal Agency: National Park Service, Alaska Regional Office; National Archives and Records Administration

Local Government:

University:

Other (Specify Repository):

8. FORM PREPARED BY

Name/Title: Erik K. Johnson, Historian; John Wachtel, Historic Architect, Darrell Lewis, Historian

Address: National Park Service, Region 11 (Alaska)
240 W 5th Ave
Anchorage, AK 99501

Telephone: (907) 244-3470

E-mail: erik_johnson@nps.gov

Date: July 17, 2024

Edited by: Evelyn D. Causey, PhD, Historian
National Park Service
National Historic Landmarks Program
1849 C Street NW, Mail Stop 7228
Washington, DC 20240

Telephone: (202) 354-2179

DRAFT


Maps



Map 1. USGS map showing the boundary of the Fort William H. Seward NHL.

DRAFT

Fort William H. Seward NHL: Boundary Overview Map




Map 2. Boundary overview map of the Fort William H. Seward NHL and corresponding vertex coordinates.

Boundary Vertex	Latitude (dd)	Longitude (dd)
A	59.2273092°N	135.4472323°W
B	59.2286815°N	135.4445031°W
C	59.2291954°N	135.4424392°W
D	59.2283767°N	135.4407958°W
E	59.2288008°N	135.4400387°W
F	59.2279048°N	135.4381323°W
G	59.2276345°N	135.4386909°W
H	59.2269554°N	135.4373877°W
I	59.2267429°N	135.4377752°W
J	59.2270343°N	135.4383146°W
K	59.2264417°N	135.4394175°W
L	59.2267829°N	135.4401770°W
M	59.2261875°N	135.4407677°W
N	59.2251276°N	135.4429170°W

DRAFT

Fort William H. Seward NHL: Resource Map and Photo Locations



NHL Resource Map #	Contributing Building Name
1	Chief Surgeons Quarters
2	Officers' Quarters 2 and 3
3	Officers' Quarters 4 and 5
4	Officers' Quarters 6 and 7
5	Officers' Quarters 8 and 9
6	Officers' Quarters 10 and 11
7	Bachelor Officers' Quarters 49 and 50
8	Captains' Quarters 51 and 52
9	Commanding Officers Quarters 53
10	Commanding Officers Garage
11	Fire Hall
12	Guardhouse
13	Administration Building
14	Hospital
15	Double Company Barracks 16 and 17
16	Hospital Sergeants Quarters
17	NCO Quarters 21 and 22
18	NCO Quarters 23 and 24

NHL Resource Map #	Contributing Building Name
19	NCO Quarters 54 and 55
20	NCO Quarters 56 and 57
21	Civilians Quarters 25
22	Civilians Quarters 26
23	Quartermaster Warehouse
24	Bakery
25	Post Exchange
26	Subsistence Warehouse
27	Signal Corps Office

NHL Resource Map #	Contributing Site Name
28	Barracks Foundation
29	Parade Ground

NHL Resource Map #	Noncontributing Building Name
30	Garage
31	Garage
32	Residence
33	Residence
34	Haines Community Services Infant Learn Program
35	Bed and Breakfast
36	Power Plant
37	Residence
38	Residence
39	Church
40	Residence
41	Gift Shop
42	Coal Shed and Paint Shop
43	Art Gallery
44	Halsingland Hotel Addition
45	Log Cabin
46	Chilkat Tribal House
47	Old Field Kitchen
48	Restrooms

NHL Resource Map #	Noncontributing Building Name
49	Distillery Warehouse
50	Warehouse
51	Residence
52	Warehouse
53	Residence
54	Mule Barn
55	Residence

Map 3. Resource map showing contributing and noncontributing resources within the Fort William H. Seward NHL boundary.

DRAFT

Photograph Log

Name of Property: Fort William H. Seward NHL
City or Vicinity: Haines, Alaska
County: Haines Borough
Photographer: John Wachtel
Date of Photograph: August 29-31, 2022

Photograph 1: View of Officers' Row on left, parade ground (29) on right, looking west.

Photograph 2: View of the parade ground (29) with Officers' Row on right, looking southwest.

Photograph 3: View of the chief surgeon's quarters (1) looking west.

Photograph 4: View of Officers' Quarters 2 and 3 (2) looking southwest.

Photograph 5: View of Officers' Quarters 4 and 5 (3) looking south.

Photograph 6: View of Officers' Quarters 6 and 7 (4) looking west.

Photograph 7: View of Officers' Quarters 8 and 9 (5) looking west.

Photograph 8: View of Officers' Quarters 10 and 11 (6) looking west.

Photograph 9: View of bachelor officers' quarters (7) looking west.

Photograph 10: View of Captains' Quarters 51 and 52 (8) looking northwest.

Photograph 11: View of commanding officer's quarters (9) looking north.

Photograph 12: View of fire hall (11) looking north.

Photograph 13: View of the administration building (13) looking east.

Photograph 14: View of hospital (14) looking east.

Photograph 15: View of Double Company Barracks 16 and 17 (15) looking east.

Photograph 16: View of non-commissioned officers' (NCO) quarters, with NCO Quarters 23 and 24 (18) in foreground, and NCO Quarters 21 and 22 (17) visible behind, looking southwest.

Photograph 17: View of Non-Commissioned Officers' Quarters 54 and 55 (19) looking east.

Photograph 18: View of the quartermaster warehouse (23) looking north.

Photograph 19: View of the bakery (24) looking northeast.

Photograph 20: View of the post exchange (25) looking northwest.

Photograph 21: View of the Signal Corps office (27) looking west.

Photograph 22: View of the barracks foundation (28) looking east.

DRAFT

Photograph 23: View of the parade ground (29) with Chilkat Tribal House (46) on the left and the "Old Field Kitchen" (modern restaurant, 47) on the right, looking southwest.

Photograph 24: View of the "Port Chilkoot" commemoration sign at the top (west side) of the parade ground (29); Chilkat Tribal House (46), the double company barracks (15), and the hospital (#14) are in the background. Looking northeast.

Photograph 25. View of Fort William H. Seward from the Chilkoot Inlet looking southwest.

DRAFT

Photos



Photograph 1: View of Officers' Row on left, parade ground (29) on right, looking west. August 2022



Photograph 2: View of the parade ground (29) with Officers' Row on right, looking southwest. August 2022.

DRAFT



Photograph 3: View of the chief surgeon's quarters (1) looking west. August 2022.



Photograph 4: View of Officers' Quarters 2 and 3 (2) looking southwest. August 2022.

DRAFT



Photograph 5: View of Officers' Quarters 4 and 5 (3) looking south. August 2022.



Photograph 6: View of Officers' Quarters 6 and 7 (4) looking west. August 2022.

DRAFT



Photograph 7: View of Officers' Quarters 8 and 9 (5) looking west. August 2022.



Photograph 8: View of Officers' Quarters 10 and 11 (6) looking west. August 2022.

DRAFT



Photograph 9: View of bachelor officers' quarters (7) looking west. August 2022.



Photograph 10: View of Captains' Quarters 51 and 52 (8) looking northwest. August 2022.

DRAFT



Photograph 11: View of commanding officer's quarters (9) looking north. August 2022.


Photograph 12: View of fire hall (11) looking north. August 2022.

DRAFT



Photograph 13: View of the administration building (13) looking east. August 2022.



Photograph 14: View of hospital (14) looking east. August 2022.

DRAFT



Photograph 15: View of Double Company Barracks 16 and 17 (15) looking east. August 2022.



Photograph 16: View of non-commissioned officers' (NCO) quarters, with NCO Quarters 23 and 24 (18) in foreground, and NCO Quarters 21 and 22 (17) visible behind, looking southwest. August 2022.

DRAFT



Photograph 17: View of Non-Commissioned Officers' Quarters 54 and 55 (19) looking east. August 2022.

DRAFT



Photograph 18: View of the quartermaster warehouse (23) looking north. August 2022.

DRAFT



Photograph 19: View of the bakery (24) looking northeast. August 2022.



Photograph 20: View of the post exchange (25) looking northwest. August 2022.

DRAFT



Photograph 21: View of the Signal Corps office (27) looking west. August 2022.



Photograph 22: View of the barracks foundation (28) looking east. August 2022.

DRAFT



Photograph 23: View of the parade ground (29) with Chilkat Tribal House (46) on the left and the "Old Field Kitchen" (modern restaurant, 47) on the right, looking southwest. August 2022.



Photograph 24: View of the "Port Chilkoot" commemoration sign at the top (west side) of the parade ground (29); Chilkat Tribal House (46), the double company barracks (15), and the hospital (#14) are in the background. Looking northeast. August 2022.

DRAFT



Photograph 25. View of Fort William H. Seward from the Chilkoot Inlet looking southwest. August 2022.

DRAFT

Figures

Figure 1. Haines Mission, circa 1900. The area around the mission became Fort Seward. Falcon Joslin Papers, Alaska and Polar Regions Collections, University of Alaska Fairbanks, UAF-1979-41-13.

Figure 2. A group of nine people standing between the flags of the United States and Great Britain, July 5, 1899. "Under two flags," H.C. Barley Photographs, Alaska and Polar Regions Collections, University of Alaska Fairbanks, UAF-1998-28-8.

Figure 3. Canadian and U.S. officials meet at the Union Church regarding the border dispute, circa 1898. Alaska Governor Brady, Indiana Senator Fairbanks, and other officials are seated in the front row. National Park Service, Klondike Gold Rush National Historical Park, Bernice Lebeau Collection, KLGO 32335, KLGO Digital Library.

Figure 4. Cartoon featured in the Saint Paul Globe on July 16, 1899, depicting the ongoing border dispute between Canada and the U.S., represented on the right by Uncle Sam. The figure on the left with the lion represents Great Britain.

Figure 5. A cartoon featured in the *Minneapolis Journal* on October 19, 1903, that depicts the border dispute between Canada and the U.S.

Figure 6. View of Fort William H. Seward from the dock on Chilkoot Inlet, sometime between 1904 and 1921. "Fort Wm H. Seward, Alaska," Falcon Joslin Papers, Alaska and Polar Regions Collections, University of Alaska Fairbanks, UAF-1979-41-282.

Figure 7. View of Officers' Row and parade ground at Fort William H. Seward circa 1908–1909. Fort William H. Seward Photographs, Alaska State Library, ASL-P578-31.

Figure 8. Aerial photograph of Fort William H. Seward with Haines in the background, circa 1910. "Ft. Wm. H. Seward, Alaska, ca. 1910," Winter and Pond Photographs, 1893-1943, Alaska State Library, ASL-P87-1478.

Figure 9. Major General Hines inspecting troops at the *p*arade *g*round in 1928. "Inspection of troops at Chilkoot Barracks," Alaska State Library Place File, Photographs, ASL-Haines-PortChilkoot-14.

Figure 10. "View of Fort Seward, military installation near Haines" 1929. Alaska State Library Place File. Photographs. ASL-Haines-PortChilkoot-03.

Figure 11. Panorama of Fort William H. Seward taken some time between 1913 and 1939. View is northwest. Alaska State Library Place File. Photographs. ASL-Haines-PortChilkoot-01.

Figure 12. Fort William H. Seward, ca. 1910-1930. Haines Sheldon Museum.

Figure 13. Hospital at Fort William H. Seward in 1945. Alaska State Library, ASA_SR727_VS2691_Barracks

Figure 14. 1904 map of the Porcupine Placer District. The Upper Lynn Canal area is shown on the map. Charles W. Wright, "Porcupine Placer District, Alaska," USGS Bulletin No. 236, Washington, DC: GPO, 1904.

DRAFT



Figure 1. Haines Mission, circa 1900. The area around the mission became Fort Seward. (Alaska and Polar Regions Collections, University of Alaska Fairbanks)



Figure 2. A group of nine people standing between the British and American flags during the Klondike Gold Rush, July 5, 1899. (Alaska and Polar Regions Collections, University of Alaska Fairbanks)

DRAFT



Figure 3. Canadian and U.S. officials meet at the Union Church regarding the border dispute, circa 1898. Alaska Governor Brady, Indiana Senator Fairbanks, and other officials are seated in the front row. (NPS Photo)




Figure 4. Cartoon featured in the *Saint Paul Globe* on July 16, 1899, depicting the ongoing border dispute between Canada and the U.S., represented on the right by Uncle Sam. The figure on the left with the lion represents Great Britain.

DRAFT



Figure 5. A cartoon featured in the *Minneapolis Journal* on October 19, 1903, that depicts the border dispute between Canada and the U.S.

DRAFT



Figure 6. View of Fort William H. Seward from the dock on Chilkoot Inlet, sometime between 1904 and 1921. (Alaska and Polar Regions Collections, University of Alaska Fairbanks)



Figure 7. View of Officers' Row and parade ground at Fort William H. Seward circa 1908–1909. (Alaska State Library)

DRAFT



Figure 8. Aerial photograph of Fort William H. Seward with Haines in the background to the right, circa 1910. (Alaska State Library)



Figure 9. Major General Hines inspecting troops at the parade ground in 1928. (Alaska State Library)

DRAFT



Figure 10. "View of Fort Seward, military installation near Haines," 1929. (Alaska State Library).

DRAFT




Figure 11. Panorama of Fort Seward looking northeast sometime between 1913-1939. View is northwest. (Alaska State Library)



Figure 12. Fort William H. Seward, ca. 1910-1930. (Haines Sheldon Museum)

DRAFT



Figure 13. Hospital at Fort William H. Seward in 1945 (Alaska State Library)

DRAFT




Figure 14. 1904 map of the Porcupine Placer District. The Upper Lynn Canal area is shown on the map. (USGS Bulletin, 1904).

DRAFT