

**Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) and Facility Reduction Program (FRP)
Initiation of Agreement Document for 36 CFR 800
MEETING MINUTES
28 May 2009**

Picatinny Arsenal Garrison Staff and Interested Stakeholders met 28 May 09 in Tower 44's Large Conference Room from 0935 to 1315 hours. Lunch was till 1430 with Facility Tours resuming afterwards till 1700 hours.

Attendees

LTC John Stack	Picatinny Arsenal Garrison Commander
Larry Brady	ARDEC Legal Council for Environmental Affairs Division (EAD)
Tom Solecki	EAD, Chief
Chris Urbiola	Directorate of Public Works (DPW), Master Planning
Danilo Hiciano	EAD, Demolition Contracts Lead
Jon Van De Venter	EAD
Jason Huggan	Chugach Industries, Inc., Environmental Cultural Resources Coordinator
Luis Martin	Chugach Industries, Inc., Real Property
Carolyn Moran	Chugach Industries, Inc., Civil Engineering
Katherine Kerr	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP)
Jonathan Kinney	NJ State Historic Preservation Office (NJ HPO)
Vincent Maresca	NJ HPO
Elizabeth Merritt	National Trust for Historic Preservation
Anita Franchetti	National Trust for Historic Preservation
Peg Shultz	Morris County Heritage Commission
Don Erickson	Historical Society of the Rockaways
Lynda de Victoria	Historical Society of the Rockaways
Stephanie Cherry-Farmer	Preservation New Jersey
Marion Harris	Morris County Trust for Historic Preservation

Absent Members

Richard Havrisko	DPW, Director
Daniel Saunders (Jonathan Kinney/Vincent Maresca represented)	NJ HPO, Deputy SHPO
Greg Lattanzi	NJ State Museum

Carrie Fellows
(Peg Shultz represented)

Morris County Heritage Commission

Lynda MacDonald

Jefferson Township Historical Society

Bonnie Lynn Nadzeika

Morris County Historical Society

Mary Habstritt

Society for Industrial Archaeology, Roebling Chapter

Mr. Jason Huggan called the meeting to order at 0935 hours.

Summary

Mr. Jason Huggan, Picatinny's Cultural Resource Coordinator with Chugach Industries, Inc. gave a presentation regarding the Garrison's Real Property Master Plan (RPMP) and Facility Reduction Program (FRP) for the development of an agreement document streamlining the Section 106 consultation process with the State Historic Preservation Office (NJ HPO) under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966. Section 106 (36 CFR 800) requires Federal Agencies to identify, evaluate, protect, and preserve Cultural Resources and Historic Properties.

Mr. Huggan also reviewed maps in regards to project locations within the RPMP and the FRP building demolition list, along with associated MILCON (Military Construction) policies.

Other topics discussed included project siting constraints, unexploded ordnance concerns (UXO), archaeological surveys and historic building assessments, and alternative mitigations.

Additionally, a tour was given at the top of Tower 44 allowing an overview of Picatinny. Following this, the meeting regrouped to watch a video about UXO and Safety on the installation.

During lunch, Mr. Huggan gave a short brief on the organization of the DPW, EAD, and Chugach Industries, Inc. within the Garrison of Picatinny.

The meeting concluded with a Facilities Tour of the following areas from 1430-1700:

1. Rocket Test (1500) Area Historic District (windshield tour),
2. Naval Rocket Testing Area D (3600 Area) Historic District,
3. Navy Hill (windshield tour),
4. Picatinny Lake Dam,
5. Administrative and Research Historic District (windshield tour).

Picatinny Overview (Slides 2-6)

Mr. Jason Huggan opened the meeting by welcoming the Stakeholders to Picatinny for this important meeting. The remaining attendees introduced themselves.

Garrison Commander LTC Stack introduced himself and provided an overview of the various missions, tenants and Garrison activities at Picatinny Arsenal. He started with a background on the largest tenant on the installation- the Armament Research, Development and Engineering Center (ARDEC). Picatinny provides technology for over 90% of the Army's lethality with significant support to all branches of military service. Additionally, Picatinny is unique in its activities due to technological advances and subsets of various technologies created here. Overall due to the advances in technology, each building needs to meet the requirements and standards (safety, environmental, force protection, etc.) for today's Army.

LTC Stack summarized that due to the age of the majority of buildings on the Arsenal and what they were historically used for, it is a challenge to create new and updated facilities for each use, especially with technological advances moving forward. Additionally, *due to the installation receiving Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC 2005) related projects, it is estimated that approximately 650+ personnel will be added to the workforce. This increase in personnel has caused a realignment (since 2005) across the Arsenal to consolidate and reconfigure activities and usage areas for future Navy facility collaborations.* In order for Picatinny to stay ahead of the game, it has to remain a global leader in armaments technology solutions, adapt to changing defense needs, provide exceptional customer satisfaction, recruit and nurture top talent, and effectively identify, acquire and allocate resources.

Strategic Approach and Agenda (Slides 8-9)

Mr. Jason Huggan began by stating that the purpose of the meeting was to develop an agreement document with the Stakeholders present, allowing for the preservation of Historic Properties within the context of the current RPMP and the long range analysis of the FRP building demolition list. Overall, the RPMP has been a working and living document since 2004, and must be allowed to continue functioning effectively with this agreement document in place.

Mr. Huggan reviewed the meeting agenda as follows:

- Vision of Picatinny Arsenal's Future
- Operational, Environmental and Safety Constraints
- Land Use Plan
- Current State of Cultural Resources and Historic Properties
- Real Property Master Plan, Short Range Analysis
 - Maps
- Cultural Resources, Identification & Surveys
- Facility Reduction Program, Long Range Analysis
 - MILCON Policy
- Historic Building Assessments
- Alternative Mitigations
- Timelines
- Facilities Tour Itinerary
- Closing Remarks and Open Discussion

Operational Constraints, Unexploded Ordnance (UXO), and the Future Land Use Plan (Slides 11-13)

Mr. Jason Huggan opened from the Agenda and briefly reviewed the Vision of Picatinny Arsenal's future as the Nation's premier, integrated weapons and armaments specialty site for guns and ammunition, combining unmatched high technology research and development facilities within a unique and natural setting. Picatinny needs to be able to develop one-of-a-kind facilities for its mission. With that in mind, Mr. Huggan reviewed the Operational, UXO, and Environmental Land Use constraints currently inhibiting project siting and development on the installation, such as explosive safety arcs, high noise zones, restricted areas, anti-terrorism force protection (ATFP) requirements, and environmental factors including slope, wetlands, endangered species, and contaminated soils as Picatinny is a National Superfund site.

Mr. Huggan also reviewed the details of the 1926 UXO explosion that occurred at the Lake Denmark Naval Powder Depot part of the Arsenal. Garrison Commander LTC Stack used a large map to focus on the main location(s) of the 1926 explosion in relation to explosive safety arcs and surrounding land use.

Mr. Huggan then discussed the future Land Use Plan of the Arsenal in which open space is preserved for natural and operational areas, along with expansion capabilities for research and development missions, Navy Hill remaining the focus area for family housing and community support, and finally reserved space for the development of new warehouses and explosive storage magazines.

Current State of Cultural Resources (Slide 14)

Mr. Jason Huggan reviewed the current state of Cultural Resource Investigations across the Arsenal to date:

- 630 acres have been surveyed for Cultural Resources across 152 Archaeologically Sensitive Areas and ~ 2,050 Sensitive Acres. These numbers have been revised from previous Integrated Cultural Resource Management Plans (ICRMP; located on Picatinny's Cultural Resources webpage @ <https://picac2w4.pica.army.mil/ead/Cultural/>);
- 42 archaeological sites have been identified of both prehistoric and historic nature;
- Approximately 90+ potential archaeological sites that have been mapped across the Arsenal through historic research. These sites include homesteads, iron forge remains, dwellings, and isolated prehistoric resources that may or may no longer exist;
- One (1) cemetery, Walton Family and (potential) Hessian Soldiers;
- 75-80% of structures have been assessed for NRHP eligibility;
- 105 contributing buildings to five (5) large historic districts;
- Two (2) individually eligible buildings; and
- 1 individually eligible architectural resource which are the Arsenal's Cannon Gates.

Mr. Huggan also reviewed the installation's decision to implement Army Alternate Procedures (AAP) to 36 CFR 800 (Section 106 of the NHPA), effective March 26, 2008. This process will streamline procedures with SHPO programmatically, instead of on a case-by-case basis; implement better Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) within the ICRMP (finalized in December for 2009-2013); improve stewardship and management of Historic Properties through the development of a Historic Property Component Plan (HPC); and align favorably with mission requirements. Mr. Huggan estimates the AAP development process will take approximately 1 ½ - 2 Year to completion by Summer –Fall 2010.

Ms. Katherine Kerr, representing the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), gave a brief background on the AAP process and how the RPMP agreement document will align with it. The AAP process was approved by the ACHP in 2001 for use by the Army and its installations. To note, the point of contact for Picatinny's AAP effort with the ACHP is Ms. Sarah Killinger (liaison with Army Environmental Command [AEC]). Ms. Kerr stressed that the AAP will replace the traditional four (4) step NHPA Section 106 consultation process at Picatinny, while instead using the HPC plan of the ICRMP to complete work orders and projects. Mr. Huggan indicated that Picatinny will still conduct assessments and surveys of buildings and archaeologically sensitive areas as needed across the installation. Ms. Elizabeth Merritt (National Trust for Historic Preservation) stressed that her Organization was not aware Picatinny was performing both consultation efforts (besides the RPMP agreement document). ***Mr. Huggan indicated that a couple of the organizations present at today's meeting were not represented at the AAP Kickoff Meeting; he ensured to get these organizations up-to-date with the status of the AAP development process at Picatinny (Tasker).*** Ms. Merritt also asked what other types of undertakings are occurring at Picatinny and if they would be incorporated into the AAP;

Mr. Huggan reviewed that ongoing work orders and building renovations are separate from this RPMP agreement document, but would eventually fall into the AAP process once it was complete.

Ms. Kerr continued stating that two (2) other Army installations have implemented it, Ft. Benning and Ft. Sam Houston. She also mentioned that Ft. Sill, Ft. Carson, and Garrison Alaska are all working on implementing an AAP. She stated that the AAP works at Ft. Benning and that the process is open to any facility and rewarding when implemented. Ms. Merritt stated that the AAP process would integrate Section 106 within the NEPA process and would be used early for planning purposes for Cultural and Historic issues. Ms. Kerr stressed that the AAP process would be specifically tailored to Picatinny operational systems.

Ms. Marion Harris (Morris Co. Trust for Historic Preservation) asked on a separate note if Picatinny is determining any other Cultural Resources for the National Register (of Historic Places; NRHP); Mr. Huggan replied that recently reports have been submitted to the NJ HPO for the following projects: 217 acre archeological survey (2008); 215 acre archaeological survey (2007); and a 318 building assessment (2007). Prior to this, the remaining ~ 300 acres and ~ 450 buildings/structures were assessed before 2004.

Ms. Merritt asked if the installation had ever been evaluated as a whole as a Cultural Landscape; Mr. Huggan stated that the golf course was recently completed with 35 other buildings in 2008 (awaiting Internal review), but other than certain Building Areas in the mid to late 1980's (200, 400, 500, 600, and 800 Building Areas), 2004 (1000, 1300 and 1400 Building Areas) and recently again in 2007 (1500 Building Area), no other Building Areas have since been assessed in such a manner. Originally in 1982-83 buildings were grouped in historical areas and significantly evaluated through a Historic American Building Survey (HABS) and Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) documentation of the installation as a whole. Later through other assessments, these Building Areas were determined not eligible for the NRHP. Overall few buildings are left to assess (~ 150-200 building/structures). Army policy is to evaluate buildings between 45 to 50 years of age; Mr. Vincent Maresca and Mr. Jonathan Kinney (NJ HPO) concurred with this.

Garrison Commander LTC Stack asked if the Cultural Landscape Analysis was part of Ft. Benning's AAP processes; Ms. Kerr responded that it has not been thought of yet, but that Picatinny would be a fascinating landscape study. LTC Stack also asked how it would benefit the installation and the Stakeholders organizations; it was pointed out that Picatinny's location was originally chosen due to its surrounding topographic features as the Arsenal was historically designed as an ammunition depot. Ms. Harris pointed out that the cultural landscape study would be more inclusive of historic context with recognition to landscape functions with a comprehensive view of the Arsenal's history. Ms. Merritt added that the analysis could also be very useful as a planning tool in project siting. Mr. Huggan stressed that some historical landscape analyses had been conducted recently for installation Superfund investigations, along with concluding that currently the focus of projects is the RPMP and FRP demolition list, work orders and building renovations. ***Mr. Huggan concluded by stating that he would investigate the requirements of funding an Installation wide Cultural Landscape Analysis as part of this agreement document (Tasker).***

RPMP Project Priorities: Short Range Plan, MCA (Mission) and Garrison Priorities, including Maps (Slides 15-25)

Mr. Jason Huggan discussed the Garrison's Short Range Plan of projects, which includes BRAC projects as Picatinny is receiving four (4) complex facilities consisting of nine (9) new buildings. To note, BRAC projects are not part of the RPMP as they have their own separate NEPA action; however they are listed within the Short Range Plan to demonstrate an entirety of proposed activities occurring across the

installation. Ms. Elizabeth Merritt asked how this list is prioritized; Garrison Commander LTC Stack responded that these are the current projects in design for funding. Ms. Katherine Kerr asked if an agreement document was completed for BRAC projects; Mr. Huggan responded that only the Fuze Engineering Complex project, involving the demolition of Buildings 1510 and 1510B (Former Army Rocket Test Area Historic District) required a Memorandum of Agreement with the NJ HPO, the remaining projects are being completed with Section 106 compliance as No Effect (due to prior and existing disturbances or archaeological surveys depending on project location).

Mr. Huggan discussed in particular that the Emergency Services Center, Phase I (Fire Station) (No Adverse Effect), the Armament Integration Facility (AIF) (No Effect), and the Child Development-School Age Services Center (CDC) (No Effect due to completed archaeological survey) were completed with Section 106 compliance and in construction phase. Additionally, the Dam Upgrade project was inconclusive in its archaeological survey needs due to the high content of metal anomalies identified during UXO anomaly avoidance scans (Garrison Safety requirement for archaeological surveys).

Mr. Huggan discussed the current Mission MCA and Garrison priority project lists in brief detail. From the MCA list, it was discussed by LTC Stack that the Ballistic Experimentation Center (BEC), Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) Technology Facility, Soft Recovery System Facility, RF High Voltage Weapon Propagation Tunnel, and the High G Inertial Evaluation Laboratory are approved for construction within the next 5 years as the installation is receiving a boom in funding due to upcoming BRAC related development. Other projects mentioned in both lists may not be complete for 10 to 20 years; these projects in particular are part of the installation's wish-list as usually Picatinny only receives about 1 to 2 large construction projects per year. Garrison construction projects are needed due to current facilities not meeting today's technological advances. For example, a new police station is needed to meet current ATFP standards as a Security Headquarters, while a new IT facility is also needed for the Directorate of Operations and Information Management (DOIM). Additionally, roof, fence and road repair/replacement projects are usually determined on a case-by-case basis through the Garrison's Annual Work Plan (AWP) as funding allows. Overall, funding from the Dept. of Defense (DoD) is being reduced in 2010. As a result, certain projects on these wish-lists may fall from their current priorities. Mr. Huggan concluded that it would be beneficial to have the RPMP agreement document reviewed and amended every five (5) years based on funding for new priorities, projects, and FRP building demolitions.

Mr. Huggan reviewed RPMP project locations and proposed FRP demolition areas. Slide 18 demonstrated the following projects of discussion:

- Verizon Cell Tower near Tower 44 (originally proposed temporarily by Building 91);
- Access Control Point (ACP) improvements to the Main Gate and Truck Gate entrances per ATFP requirements. In particular, the Main Gate along Parker Road will be relocated to Shinkle Road;
- Solar Panel Project;
- New Warehouse Space;
- New Golf Maintenance Facility proposed at existing location of former Sewage Treatment Plant; and
- A large tract of land for Enhanced Use Lease (EUL) development.

Ms. Kerr asked if the installation had an EUL; LTC Stack responded demonstrating the location for the current EUL at Building 356 and discussed the future development of 15-20 acres near the Main Gate entrance proposed for DoD related contracts associated with the ARDEC mission. This EUL development would relocate two (2) ballfields to the Lake Denmark area adjacent to an existing ballfield (future community relations development with Rockaway Township). Mr. Huggan stressed that an archaeological survey was completed for both the 15-20 acres and the ballfield relocation during 2006 and 2007.

Ms. Kerr also commented that, *if needed, ATFP requirements and guidelines should be discussed as a separate Stipulation of the RPMP agreement document.*

Slide 19 demonstrated the following projects of discussion:

- AIF facility near Building 7;
- ACP improvements to the Berkshire Trail Gate and Mt Hope Gate entrances per ATFP requirements;
- Computer Aided Simulation Integration and Innovation Facility;
- Emergency Services Center/Fire Station; and
- Renovations to Building 119 for Army Community Services (ACS). Building 119 is a contributing property to the Administrative and Research Historic District.

Slide 20 demonstrated the following projects of discussion:

- DOIM facility;
- Picatinny Lake Dam Upgrade. In particular, Mr. Huggan discussed that the current proposal for the Dam Upgrade projects is to perform archaeological monitoring during the construction phase in conjunction with the required UXO removal inspections. Both Dam Upgrade projects are located near former iron forges.

On a separate but related note, Ms. Kerr and Ms. Marion Harris asked if the installation was finding much UXO debris across the installation for construction projects; LTC Stack indicated that most of the debris found was Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC; ie. fuses, shrapnel, etc). (The Installation Safety Office can be contacted if accurate numbers are needed.) Ms. Harris also asked the age of the UXO's; LTC Stack responded that the majority of UXO's have dated from the early to mid 1900s. He also mentioned that recently Vietnam War era UXO's were located from prior poor disposal practices and now the Army is paying for the remediation efforts.

Finally, it was discussed within this Slide that *the Dam Upgrades and Building 119 Renovation projects are slated for stimulus funding under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.* Ms. Kerr commented that Stimulus projects must be *'shovel ready' and in compliance with Section 106 by September 29, 2009.* As a result, it was discussed to remove these two (2) particular projects from this consultation effort and into *their own separate agreement document dedicated towards stimulus-related projects.* **Mr. Huggan stated that he will ask DPW for an up-to-date list of stimulus projects to evaluate the needs for a potential separate agreement document (Tasker).**

Slide 21 demonstrated the following projects of discussion:

- EOD Technology Facility; and
- Nanotechnology Facility.

Mr. Huggan stated that this area is of particular concern as many archaeological sites have been identified within the 1000 and 1350 Building Area from prior farmsteads (Walton, Doland, and Robinson homesteads).

Slide 22 demonstrated the following projects of discussion:

- BEC Facility; and
- Soft Recovery System Facility.

Mr. Huggan explained that the BEC Facility planned at the 636 Test Range is the permanent location for the proposed project; however in order for mission testing to continue, the function must be temporarily relocate to the 647 Test Range (planned with a separate BRAC project) until the construction phase is complete.

On a separate note, LTC Stack explained that UXO's can occur in the 600 Area within former and active artillery ranges. He stressed that Test Ranges fire ordnance into a Slug Butt building - container building partially filled with sand or earth into which a projectile is fired, and on rare occasions incidents can occur where the ordnance overshoots.

Slide 23 demonstrated the following projects of discussion:

- Emergency Services Center/Security Headquarters;
- CDC;
- Land Mobile Radio Tower (150'); and
- New Warehouse Space; and
- New Physical Fitness Center.

It was discussed later by Mr. Christian Urbiola (DPW Master Planner) that ARDEC has slated the 3400 Building Area as a potential site for an upgrade to the existing Armament University; not currently shown on Slide 23.

On a related note to Slide 23, LTC Stack discussed the UXO remediation efforts within the housing areas in which six (6) UXO's and much MEC debris were identified. Housing maintenance at Picatinny is managed by Balfour Beatty Communities as part of the Residential Communities Initiative (RCI). Mr. Huggan stressed that this RCI effort was completed for Section 106 through a separate Programmatic Agreement in 2004.

Slide 24 demonstrated the following project of discussion:

- EUL Ballfield Relocation located near Lake Denmark and the former Heliport area (New Jersey National Guard tenant). Mr. Huggan mentioned that near this particular project location, preliminary borings have been performed to identify the potentiality of the former Denmark Mine. Overall, he stressed that these results have found no iron vein voids in relation to the potential mine.

Mr. Huggan also mentioned the following Historic Districts within this vicinity of the Arsenal along Lake Denmark Road: Former Army Rocket Test (1500) Area, and the Naval Air Rocket Test Stand (NARTS) Test Areas D and E. These facility areas were the core focus of historic rocket development and testing for the Arsenal and the Naval Facility at Picatinny. In particular, Mr. Huggan and LTC Stack discussed that much FRP demolition is proposed within these Historic District areas as the buildings are no longer suitable for the technology and mission of today's Army.

Finally, Slide 25 demonstrated the following projects of discussion:

- Lake Denmark Dam Upgrade (similar discussion to the Picatinny Lake Dam Upgrade followed);
- Self Contained Munitions Experimental Facility, in which a cave is proposed for ordnance testing; and
- New Explosive Storage Magazines.

(To note separate from the RPMP projects, Ms. Harris asked about Picatinny's involvement with the proposed upgrade and expansion to the existing PSE&G transmission line; Mr. Huggan responded that Picatinny is participating with Louis Berger's consultation efforts for an archaeological survey to be performed this June. NJ HPO discussed the Area of Potential Effects [APE] for that project; Mr. Huggan concurred with their APE determinations).

Concluding the RPMP map slides, Mr. Huggan reviewed the current state of Cultural Resource Surveys. In particular he stated the following:

- 20 Projects have no need for a Cultural Resource Survey due to previous or existing disturbances in which SOPs will be implemented during construction for potential inadvertent discoveries;
- 7 Projects require additional Cultural Resource assessments;
- 12 Projects have location(s) pending; and
- 8 Projects have a Cultural Resource Survey and/or Historic Building Assessment already completed.

FRP Long Range Analysis and MILCON Construction Policy (Slides 27-30)

Mr. Jason Huggan discussed on the Facility Reduction Program (FRP) demolition list within the Long Range Analysis of the RPMP. The purpose of the RPMP Long Range Analysis is to describe current real property conditions and future facility requirements for the installation. From this analysis, the FRP has revealed that roughly 80% of Picatinny's buildings were constructed during or before 1960 and are approaching the end of their useful lives for the mission they were originally constructed for. Many of these production facilities have since been decommissioned and left for neglect. As a result, these buildings are now scheduled for demolition as they do not fit the design of current missions at Picatinny.

Mr. Huggan gave an overview of the One-for-One Sq. Ft. Military Construction (MILCON) policy of disposing of facilities to offset each sq ft of new construction added to the real property inventory. This disposal policy limits real property growth by improving stewardship of Operation & Maintenance funds and reduces sustainment of excess facilities. Army Regulation (AR) 415-15, "Army Military Construction Program Development and Execution" (June 12, 2006) requires this 1-to-1 disposal. Additionally, *Assistant Sec. of the Army, Installations & Environment Memorandum*, "Policy on Demolition of Facilities" (January 31, 2003) reinforces to ensure new MILCON projects will not increase the size of the installation's real property inventory. It was also added later by Mr. Christian Urbiola that AR 420-1 authorizes that the repair cost (or repair plus construction project cost for a combined undertaking) should not exceed 50% of the replacement cost of the facility for projects whose funded costs are greater than \$750,000 (Section 2-16).

Mr. Huggan concluded MILCON policy by summarizing that the disposal of excess and obsolete facilities makes additional funds available by reducing infrastructure sustainment requirements, eliminating health and safety hazards, and contributes to more efficient and cost effective use of facilities by consolidating activities in certain areas of the installation. It was discussed later, that FRP is needed across DoD as a whole to reduce its overall carbon footprint of utilized and non-utilized space.

Garrison Commander LTC Stack discussed how Garrison's are typically funded 70% as priority is for the soldiers and mission. Typically installations do not fund buildings that are not being utilized. Additionally, the need to upgrade buildings for mission operations is due to ATFP requirements, explosive safety regulations, and to reduce operations in certain enclosed areas of the Arsenal by consolidating activities.

Mr. Huggan discussed the FRP list in its entirety as ~ 300 buildings are currently listed for demolition. The active demolition list for Fiscal Years (FY) 2009 and 2010 is 185 buildings. Overall, of these ~ 300 buildings: 223 have been determined not eligible for the NRHP, this includes 5 non-contributing structures within larger Historic Districts; 130 have been approved for demolition with the NJ HPO; 7

require a NRHP eligibility assessment; 40 are under 45 to 50 yrs of age and not within larger Historic Districts (considered on a case-by-case basis for NRHP eligibility assessments); and finally 26 have been determined eligible for the NRHP as contributing properties to larger Historic Districts. In reference to Ms. Elizabeth Merritt's question, Mr. Huggan stated that of the 26 buildings determined eligible, the majority are Cold War era contributing buildings within the Former Army Rocket Test (1500) Area, and the NARTS Test Areas D and E Historic Districts. Mr. Huggan also mentioned of the 40 buildings under 45 to 50 yrs of age, the majority of these structures do not require assessment as they are small auxiliary structures of larger Building Areas that have previously been determined not eligible. In particular to Historic Building assessments, all of Picatinny's Building Areas have been evaluated for the NRHP except the 3700 Trailer/Lodging Area developed in the late 1970s (separate from Cultural Landscape evaluations).

Alternative Mitigations (Slide 31)

Mr. Jason Huggan explained the current proposed method of evaluating the 26 determined NRHP eligible buildings for demolition approval is to perform HABS/HAER documentation to the Level II Standard. If the installation continues to perform these HABS/HAER documentations, it would cost Picatinny over an estimated \$200K+ (National Park Service HABS/HAER Division has not responded to correspondence from Picatinny in regards to this consultation effort). The question was asked about what the installation's responsibilities are for proposing to demolish these historic buildings as the NJ HPO requires a Structural Conditions Analysis and AEC requires a Life Cycle Cost Analysis. In reference to this, Ms. Katherine Kerr later stated that the installation has to show in some way why one facility is being demolished compared to another and how replacement costs are being accounted for appropriately. She also stated that these analyses should be part of the RPMP agreement document. Mr. Christian Urbiola later reminded the group of AR 420-1's requirement authorizing repair costs to not exceed 50% of the replacement cost of the facility for new projects whose funding costs are greater than \$750,000 (Section 2-16).

Mr. Huggan proposed various alternative mitigations for the RPMP agreement document to performing HABS/HAER documentations for historic building demolitions listed within the FRP; for instance,

- Local/Regional Museum Exhibits displayed at the Denville Historical Society & Museum, Faesch House, Jefferson Twp. Museum, and Community Children's Museum, along with other Morris County Museums (ie. Acorn Hall). These museum exhibits could also be joined with lesson plans for school fieldtrips. ***Ms. Marion Harris asked what kind of materials might be proposed for display; Mr. Huggan referenced the current display at Building 1 could be used as an example and that he would investigate the feasibility of loaning out these materials from Building 1, and other similar concerns (Tasker).***
- Historic District Signage and Recognition through pamphlets or brochures;
- Historic Context Documentation related to Picatinny's Cold War efforts and historic rocket industry. A book entitled "Picatinny Arsenal: The Firepower Story" (2003) was passed around as an example of a similar historic context document. ***Mr. Huggan stated that he would investigate distributing other copies of this book to the interested Stakeholders and their Organizations (Tasker); and***
- Preservation Plan/Historic Structure Reports (NJ HPO requirement).

Mr. Huggan later stated that the RPMP agreement document needs to ensure that the agreed upon mitigative effort(s) be completed within one FY as headquarters does not fund significantly long-term mitigation projects.

Lastly, Mr. Huggan stated that other Stakeholders could not be present at today's meeting that may have other recommendations for proposed mitigations to HABS/HAER documentation; for example: Jefferson

Twp. Hist. Society (could not attend), Rockaway Hist. Committee (Borough Society), Wharton Hist. Society, Morris County Preservation Trust (organizing effort to update County Historic Sites Survey with a visit planned at Picatinny), and the New Jersey Aeronautics Committee of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics (Picatinny has been dedicated as a significant site of historic aerospace research and development). *It was discussed later by Ms. Peg Shultz (Morris County Heritage Commission) that Picatinny could submit a memo requesting the interests of other regional historical organizations in the consultation efforts of the RPMP agreement document and the AAP process (Tasker).*

On a separate but related note, Ms. Kerr asked about the installation's boundary and encroachment issues in reference to easements; LTC Stack responded that Picatinny is investing in encapsulation projects and cannot purchase outside properties as there are adjacent communities to its boundaries.

Timelines (Slide 32)

Mr. Jason Huggan stated that the timeframe for the proposed RPMP agreement document should be six (6) months to ensure signature by the end of 2009. Overall, the installation does not want to lose focus with their future consultation effort of AAP (see pgs 4-5). *It was discussed later with the Stakeholders if a public meeting was required before the RPMP agreement document is finalized; the Stakeholders rescinded that meeting with them suffices for the larger public's interests.*

Closing Remarks (Slide 34)

Mr. Jason Huggan closed the meeting by summarizing the purpose of the meeting was to come to terms on developing an agreement document for the RPMP to include the FRP building demolition list. Mr. Huggan stated some of the required stipulations for the agreement document should be as follows:

- defining the Stakeholders/Interested Parties;
- mitigative efforts for the loss of Historic Properties per the FRP;
- protecting Historic District Viewsheds for new RPMP projects and FRP demolitions that may cause adverse effects;
- ensuring proposed renovations to historic buildings occur with an in-kind design towards the preservation of the Historic Property itself and the surrounding Historic District;
- Cultural Resource Surveys and Historic Building Assessment as needed within defined APEs;
- SOPs for inadvertent discoveries; and
- status reports and monitoring of the agreement document itself;

Mr. Huggan concluded that the RPMP agreement document should be a living document beyond 5 years with amendments as needed to allow for long range initiatives of Picatinny to function effectively. *It was discussed later that a follow-up meeting is needed to further resolve the consultation efforts of the RPMP agreement document, and its required stipulations and mitigative efforts.*

Facilities Tour (Slide 33, 1430-1700)

After lunch, Mr. Jason Huggan took the Stakeholders and interested Picatinny personnel on a tour of Historic Districts and project areas of concern discussed during the meeting. The following areas were visited with subsequent discussions:

1. Rocket Test (1500) Area Historic District (windshield tour) - *discussion of buildings listed for demolition to include 1509, 1509A, 1510A, 1511, 1513, 1514, 1515, 1517, 1517A, 1518, 1518A, 1519, 1520, 1520, 1521, 1522, and 1529 (non-contributing) as part of FRP and also MILCON exchange of 1-to-1 demolition for the construction of a new Pyrotechnics Facility (construction*

- phase) within the 500 Area. Furthermore, it was discussed by Mr. Huggan for information from DPW on why certain other buildings (ie. 1512, 1512A, 1521, 1522, 1527, 1528, etc) are not listed for FRP demolition as they are adjacent to the above-listed buildings (Tasker);*
2. NARTS Area D (3600 Area) Historic District - *discussion of buildings listed for demolition to include 3603, 3608, 3611, 3612, 3616, 3617 (NARTS Area E), 3618 (NARTS Area E) as part of FRP. It was discussed if equipment from historic buildings could be used for part of a larger museum exhibit; Mr. Huggan commented that this is feasible as long as the equipment is no longer operational and decommissioned in some way to ensure there is no further liability to it. A similar discussion followed for information from DPW on why certain buildings are not listed for FRP demolition as they are adjacent to the above-listed buildings;*
 3. Navy Hill (windshield tour) - *discussion of 1926 UXO explosion areas of concern;*
 4. Picatinny Lake Dam - *discussion of Dam Upgrade projects and proposed archaeological monitoring in relation to construction work adjacent to the Dam and Spillway areas themselves. Mr. Vincent Maresca (NJ HPO) suggested archaeological trenching prior to the Dam Upgrades to investigate soil stratigraphy(s) for potential iron forge features. The needs for this trenching is being investigated per the latest set of construction plans by Mr. Huggan and Mr. Maresca; and*
 5. Administrative and Research Historic District (windshield tour) - *discussion of ACS renovation (Design-Build) to Building 119, NJ HPO review time periods, and the request for proposal (RFP) for the project. It was determined that a letter should be drafted initiating the consultation effort for the proposed renovation project as part of the installation's list of Stimulus related projects (Tasker).*

Additionally, the demolition of various portions of above-ground steamlines across the installation was discussed; Ms. Kerr expressed her thoughts on allowing portions of the steamlines to remain in place in certain areas of the Arsenal as not only parts of historic districts, but also artistic features for community relations and future landscape development.

One area was not included during the tour due to time constraints- Lake Denmark Dam.

The RPMP and FRP agreement document meeting adjourned at 1700 hours at the Visitor Center.

Follow-up Items for next RPMP Meeting:

1. Ensure up-to-date information on the status of AAP consultation is submitted to the National Trust for Historic Preservation and Preservation New Jersey. *COMPLETE (BY EMAIL);*
2. Investigate funding requirements to perform Installation-wide Cultural Landscape Analysis, as potentially a stipulation for the RPMP agreement document. *IN PROCESS, NEED TO ESTIMATE COSTS FOR PERFORMING ANALYSIS;*
3. Assemble accurate list of stimulus projects from DPW to evaluate the needs for a potential separate agreement document. Submit letter to the NJ HPO initiating the consultation effort for the proposed Stimulus projects (Building 119 ACS renovation project, Dam Upgrades, etc.). *IN PROCESS OF ASSESSING POTENTIAL ADVERSE EFFECTS TO THE LIST OF STIMULUS PROJECTS;*
4. Investigate method(s) of loaning historic materials and artifacts on display at Building 1 to interested regional museums and other similar efforts. *IN PROCESS WITH ARDEC HISTORIAN;*
5. Investigate distribution of "Picatinny Arsenal: Firepower Story" book to interested Stakeholders and their Organizations;

6. Submit memo(s) to Morris County Heritage Commission (Attention to Ms. Carrie Fellows per Ms. Peg Shultz) requesting their assistance in regards to the interests of other regional historical organizations in the consultation efforts of the RPMP agreement document and the development of the AAP process. *COMPLETE (BY EMAIL)*;
7. Gather additional information from DPW on why certain facilities are not listed for FRP demolition, ie. Buildings 1512, 1512A, 1521, 1522, 1527, 1528, etc. *IN PROCESS WITH DPW REAL PROPERTY.*

*****Follow-up RPMP meeting will be held off-site from Picatinny, with a conference call session if needed- tentatively planned for the week of August 17th to the 21st. The Morris County Cultural Commission was discussed as a feasible alternate meeting location per Ms. Peg Shultz. *****