

**Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3
Section 106 Consultation
Fort Wainwright, AK**

**Section 106 Consultation Kick-Off Meeting
15 December 2011**

Participants

Alaska Office of History and Archaeology

Judith Bittner, State Historic Preservation Officer
Summer Rickman, Historian

National Park Service, Alaska Regional Office, U.S. Department of the Interior

Grant Crosby, Historic Architect

Tanana Yukon Historical Society

Elizabeth Cook

U.S. Bureau of Land Management

William Hedman, Archaeologist

Fairbanks North Star Borough Historic Preservation Commission

Al Renfroe, Commissioner

Fort Wainwright, Alaska

Col. Ronald M. Johnson, Garrison Commander
Michael Meeks, Director, DPW
Gary Larsen, Chief, Conservation Branch
Carrie McEnteer, Chief, NEPA Branch
Lisa Graham, Cultural Resources Manager
Mary Shanks, Historian
Matthew Sprau, NEPA Coordinator
Jason Webb, Structural Engineer
Sean Bogren, Project Manager

The Louis Berger Group, Inc.

Hope Luhman, Cultural Resources Manager
Debra McClane, Cultural Resources Lead

U.S. Army Environmental Command

Kristin Leahy, Architectural Historian

By Telephone:

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

Katharine Kerr, Department of Army Case Manager

The objectives of this meeting were to describe the undertaking and to discuss the Section 106 process and the proposed schedule. The meeting also addressed the need for a Programmatic Agreement and the integration of the Section 106 and National Environmental Policy Act

processes in support of preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement. The meeting agenda and handout materials are attached to these meeting notes.

Welcome and Introductions

Col. Ronald Johnson, Fort Wainwright (FWA) Garrison Commander, welcomed the participants to the Section 106 (National Historic Preservation Act) consultation kick-off meeting. He noted that the upcoming project presents a complex problem set and that FWA staff are approaching the project very seriously. Rather than just “going through the process,” Col. Johnson stated that FWA is looking for solutions. As funding is growing smaller, he encouraged participants to be creative in the way they approach the project.

Judith Bittner, Alaska State Historic Preservation Officer, stated that she was pleased that FWA was having a meeting specifically addressing the Section 106 process for the project and that she appreciated the integration of the cultural resource and Department of Public Works (DPW) staff. She reiterated Col. Johnson’s request for innovative solutions and possible partnerships on the project.

Lisa Graham, FWA Cultural Resources Manager, then asked the remaining meeting participants to introduce themselves.

Description of Undertaking/Identified Historic Properties

Graham and Mary Shanks, FWA Historian, presented a brief history of the construction and the historical uses of Hangars 2 and 3. Jason Webb, FWA Structural Engineer, presented information concerning the February 2011 fire that occurred in Hangar 2 and the post fire report that he submitted. Webb noted that a failure in the electrical system caused the fire. He also noted that in 2004, a similar fire occurred at Hangar 6 that destroyed that building.

Programmatic Agreement

Graham stated that the outcome of the Section 106 consultation is a Programmatic Agreement (PA). She stated that the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, which is occurring concurrently with Section 106 consultation, will result in a decision on the preferred alternative for the disposition of the hangars. She stated that the Section 106 process will be looking at several options and will focus on planning for various alternatives because it is the Department of the Army’s preferred approach to complete the Section 106 process prior to completing the NEPA process. The PA, as a result, will set up an “if/then” scenario for the different options.

Graham presented a tentative Section 106 consultation schedule with meeting goals and outlined the meeting schedule and benchmarks for the process (attached). Summer Rickman, Alaska Office of History and Archaeology, will serve as the State Historic Preservation Office’s technical point of contact as the PA is developed.

Bittner stated that the PA should capture the process of project benchmarks and note where decisions are made (a process-oriented document). Graham noted that the staff will need to be flexible in crafting the document and that the complexity of the project warrants a large document.

Michael Meeks, FWA DPW, stated that there is a possibility of changes within the proposed alternatives for reuse. Graham stated that the reuses of the hangars potentially would be an alternative proposed in the PA and that the PA could encompass those different options.

Col. Johnson stated that he would like to investigate partnership-type initiatives and understands that such agreements will be dependent on funding, timing, and existing regulations.

Integration of Section 106 and NEPA Environmental Impact Statement

Carrie McEnteer, FWA Chief, NEPA Branch, discussed the integration of the NEPA and Section 106 processes that are occurring for the project. She stated that the two processes feed each other and that the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) developed through the NEPA review will address the effects of the various alternatives on cultural resources. She stated that NEPA provides the overall framework that will help to keep the Section 106 process on-track. By including the Section 106 agreement document (the PA) in the Draft EIS, the entire picture of the project and the processes will be presented to the public and to the decision maker.

Kristin Leahy, U.S. Army Environmental Command, asked whether a preferred alternative would be included in the Draft EIS. McEnteer stated that a preferred alternative would be included only if one had been identified by that time; there is no requirement to have a preferred alternative at the time the draft is released.

Leahy asked whether an adverse effects determination has been made. Graham responded that no findings were included in the initial letter to consulting parties, but that in January or February (2012) such a letter would be sent out. Leahy noted that because of the hangars' condition, even a reuse would have an adverse effect. Therefore, a determination of adverse effect will be the first step in this process. Meeks seconded the assertion that renovation might also be considered adverse. Graham noted that some of this information was covered in the recent Aviation Stationing PA.

Leahy noted that the PA would set forth an "if/then" scenario; in essence, the two options are reuse and demolition and the PA should set forth mitigation steps and further consultation for how FWA will handle different scenarios once a decision is made regarding the future use/disposal of the hangars. McEnteer noted that the Army requires that the PA be complete before the Final EIS is issued and before the Record of Decision (ROD) is signed.

Leahy asked for clarification on the goals of the February and March Section 106 meetings. Graham noted that there was a lot of information passed out to the meeting participants and that she wanted members to be "up to speed" by the February meeting and that the March meeting would involve more discussion on adverse effects and brainstorming paths. Col. Johnson stated that consulting parties do not have to wait for meetings to move ahead with discussions regarding possible partnerships or transfers. He noted that FWA would find out quickly whether anyone is interested in these propositions and that the team needed to present decision makers with the pertinent information.

Graham noted that McEnteer had sent out query letters to the U.S. Bureau of Land Management and the National Park Service (NPS) concerning the possibility of a funding partnership agreement for renovation of either hangar in exchange for use of the facility. [Col. Johnson left meeting.]

Bill Hedman, U.S. Bureau of Land Management, noted that his agency does have a need for warm storage and shop space and that he would pursue the matter with his agency. Grant Crosby, NPS, noted that he had not been aware that interagency use was under consideration, but that he would also pursue this with his agency. Hedman also suggested contacting the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as a potential partner.

Leahy reminded participants that at present the buildings are condemned and that estimated renovation costs are \$35 million per hangar. She asked what a new hangar (new construction) would cost. Webb stated that the newest hangar at FWA (presently under construction) cost \$17 million and that he has the specific cost per square foot information for that project.

In light of the price difference, Leahy asked how the team would develop viable alternatives, what alternatives are worth chasing, and where the line would be drawn in pursuit of these alternatives. McEnteer stated that the NEPA process would assist with some of these issues. The NEPA scoping process determines which alternatives are viable. Meeks noted that there is added value to the agencies in using the hangars: the value of location (beside an active airfield) and the value of a cultural resource.

Discussion of Schedule and Documents on CD

Graham noted that each meeting participant was given a set of documents that included updated building reports, the proposed Section 106 schedule, and a CD with several background documents on the hangars (see attached).

For the next meeting (February), Graham asked that Crosby and Hedman follow up with their agencies on possible partnership; that a letter be sent to U.S. Fish and Wildlife; and that participants forward to her suggestions for other agencies that should be contacted.

Katharine Kerr, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, stated that she had some comments on the Section 106 process but that she would append these to the meeting notes when they are sent out.

Graham adjourned the meeting and stated that the group would reconvene at Hangar 2 for a tour of the facility.

Next meeting: 2 February 2012 [teleconference] – Present and Discuss APE, Identified Historic Properties, and Potential Adverse Effects

Attachments:

Agenda, 15 December 2011

Tentative Section 106 Consultation Schedule and Meeting Goals

Building 3005 [Hangar 3], Building Inventory

Building 3008 [Hangar 2], Building Inventory

Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3: Photographs

Section 106 Consultation Background Documentation, Disposition of Hangars 2 and 3 CD containing:

Citizen Guide to Section 106

World War II Heritage of Ladd Field Historic Context Report

Ladd Field NHL Nomination 1984

Condition Assessment and Rehabilitation Plans, Hangars 2 and 3—2008

Building 3008—Building Survey

Building 3005—Building Survey

Draft Reuse Study

Official Fire Report 3008

Hangar 3 Structural Assessment Report—2011

Hangar 2 After Fire Structural inspection Report—2011

Hangar 2 Inspection Report

Hangars 2 and 3 Photos

