



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Hugh C. Miller, Director

Department of Historic Resources

221 Governor Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

TDD: (804) 786-1934
Telephone (804) 786-3143
FAX: (804) 225-4261

February 10, 1993

Teresa K. Kines
U.S. Army Research Laboratory
Engineering, Plans and Services Branch
2800 Powder Mill Road
Adelphi, MD 20783-1145

Re: Proposed EMP Simulator Relocation, Woodbridge Research Facility
Prince William County
VDHR File No. 92-2664-F

Dear Ms. Kines:

Thank you for your letter of December 1, 1992 and the supplementary information and photographs that you provided on January 16. The detailed information concerning the Army EMP Simulator Operation (AESOP) has allowed our agency to consider the potential significance of that structure and provide the following comments:

National Register Eligibility

We concur with your agency's determination that the AESOP is eligible for National Register listing as a structure under Criterion A for its "significant contribution to the broad patterns of history during the Cold War period" as stated in your letter of December 1. In addition, we believe that the AESOP is also eligible under Criterion C since it "provides the largest free-field radiating, horizontally polarized EMP environment available for conducting tests on mobile and/or transportable electronic systems," also stated in your letter of December 1. It is this latter element of its character that apparently distinguishes the AESOP from the other EMP simulators operated at the Woodbridge Research Facility during the 1970s and 1980s. Though AESOP operated from 1974 to 1988, we concur with your determination that it is of exceptional significance in a manner that is consistent with National Register guidance for evaluating properties less than 50 years of age.

We are unable, however, to concur with your determination that "no other standing buildings or structures except the AESOP simulator are eligible for listing on the Register" at Woodbridge. Your letter of December 1 lists several buildings that were associated with the AESOP (Buildings 202, 211, and 306) and the accompanying report describes several other EMP simulators that were operated at Woodbridge. To resolve the remaining National Register eligibility issues

(excluding archaeology), we recommend that additional information be provided to address the following questions:

1. Was Building 306, the EMP Command and Control Building, merely a "shell" to house test equipment or was its design an integral part of the AESOP?
2. Were any of the other buildings specifically associated with operation of the AESOP, or, were they associated with EMP testing in general? Were they associated with other functions such as facility administration or communications?
3. For the more general purposes of the Base Reallocation and Closure (BRAC) program, two "historic contexts" are appropriate for assessing the significance of the Woodbridge Research Facility. The first and most recent of these contexts is EMP testing (1970s and 1980s) and is directly related to the AESOP and other simulators. The second context is related to the communications function of the Woodbridge Research Facility under other Army commands during the 1950s and 1960s. In relation to this second context, how much of the communications infrastructure still exists? In other words, what is the integrity of any resources associated with the earlier communications function of the Woodbridge Research Facility? In anticipation of the BRAC program, information concerning the original and more recent functions of the buildings at Woodbridge should be compiled. "Historic" and current photographs of each of the buildings also should be submitted as accompanying documentation to a narrative.

Effect

We concur with your agency's determination that relocation of the AESOP will have an adverse effect on that historic property. Following our conference call on January 27, we provided suggestions for a draft Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to Paul McGuff of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Fort Worth District. We look forward to reviewing the completed draft of the MOA and assisting your agency in completing the Section 106 process for this undertaking in close cooperation with the Advisory Council.

If you have any questions concerning our comments, please contact Antony Opperman or Mary Harding Sadler of our staff.

Sincerely,



H. Bryan Mitchell
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer

cc: Paul McGuff, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Mary Shipe, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers