



***Department of Defense Response to  
Executive Order 13287, “Preserve America,”  
Section 3: Reporting Progress on the  
Identification, Protection, and Use of Federal  
Historic Properties***

---

Includes Information on the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force  
fiscal years 2017-2019

**September 2020**

## Introduction

This report satisfies the requirements of Section 3(c) of Executive Order (EO) 13287, “Preserve America,”<sup>1</sup> for the Department of Defense (DoD). The Preserve America EO directs each Federal agency with real property management responsibilities to submit reports on its “progress in identifying, protecting, and using historic properties in its ownership.” The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) developed questions to assist Federal agencies in meeting the reporting requirements of the Preserve America EO. The DoD’s consolidated answers to those questions posed by the ACHP includes information on the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force for fiscal years (FYs) 2017-2019.<sup>2</sup> This report references policy and guidance documents from the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and the Military Departments. These documents provide the framework necessary to balance and integrate proactive management of cultural resources with all aspects of the military mission. This report also provides summary data on the DoD Cultural Resources Program.

The DoD is a large and complex Federal agency with the critical mission to provide the military forces needed to deter war and to protect the security of the United States.<sup>3</sup> The DoD’s installations and facilities are critical pieces of this national defense mission. The DoD manages the largest portfolio of real property assets (structures and buildings), which includes historic properties, in the Federal government. In FY 2019, DoD managed nearly 573,000 facilities (buildings, structures, and linear structures), on over 4,500 sites, across almost 26.3 million acres.<sup>4</sup> This information is also contained in the *Base Structures Report*; the most recent version available is from FY18. In FY18, DoD’s land and property portfolio included over 585,000 facilities, located on over 4,775 sites worldwide, covering over 26.9 million acres.<sup>5</sup>

The DoD is proud of its rich history and seeks to act as a productive and responsible steward of the lands and resources it manages. The DoD historic property portfolio includes 45 individual National Historic Landmarks, 3,032 National Historic Landmark contributing properties, 2,370 individual and contributing historic assets listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), nearly 16,000 historic assets determined eligible for inclusion in the NRHP, and over 134,000 recorded archaeological sites.<sup>6</sup> The DoD works to maintain, promote, and interpret the cultural resources it manages, to support the defense mission through the preservation of the country’s military heritage for future generations. Cultural resources are mission enhancing assets that connect our fighting men and women with their proud history and traditions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Available at: <https://www.achp.gov/digital-library-section-106-landing/preserve-america-executive-order-13287>.

<sup>2</sup> Included within the Military Departments are their Reserve components. This report also includes property under the direct management of the Secretary of Defense, e.g., the Pentagon Reservation.

<sup>3</sup> Mission of the DoD can be found on its homepage: <https://www.defense.gov/Our-Story/>.

<sup>4</sup> This data was obtained from the DoD Agency Financial Report for FY 2019, page 2, which is available at: [https://comptroller.defense.gov/Portals/45/Documents/afr/fy2019/DoD\\_FY19\\_Agency\\_Financial\\_Report.pdf](https://comptroller.defense.gov/Portals/45/Documents/afr/fy2019/DoD_FY19_Agency_Financial_Report.pdf).

<sup>5</sup> Specific information on DoD’s real property inventory is available in the annual *Base Structure Report* (BSR). The most recent BSR available is FY 2018 which is available at:

<https://www.acq.osd.mil/eie/Downloads/BSI/Base%20Structure%20Report%20FY18.pdf>. Previous BSRs can be found here: [http://www.acq.osd.mil/eie/BSI/BEI\\_Library.html](http://www.acq.osd.mil/eie/BSI/BEI_Library.html).

<sup>6</sup> Data for these historic properties was obtained directly from DoD’s Real Property Assets Database (RPAD) FY 2019 records.

## Identifying Historic Properties

---

**1. Building upon previous Section 3 reports, have your identification methods changed during this reporting period? Approximately what total percentage or portion of inventory has now been surveyed and evaluated for the National Register, and does this represent an increase from your agency's 2017 progress report?**

*In addressing this question, agencies are encouraged to evaluate their progress in identifying and evaluating historic properties.*

The Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Sustainment (OASD(S)) consolidates all DoD real property assets in its Real Property Assets Database (RPAD) annually. Appendix 1 summarizes real property asset data reported in the RPAD for FYs 2017 - 2019.

The DoD evaluates its real property facilities and land to identify NRHP-eligible historic properties when mission-supporting undertakings require it and through proactive survey and planning efforts. Asset evaluation for historic significance is prioritized by the age of the assets, their proximity to mission activities, and their mission use. Using these prioritization methods and management practices, the DoD continues to evaluate its properties for NRHP eligibility, and thereby improve the accuracy of its real property and heritage asset data collections. These identification methods remain unchanged during this reporting period.

Appendix 1, Table 3 reflects total numbers of DoD real property facilities, including land, buildings, and structures, categorized by the nature of their assigned historic status. It is difficult to precisely report how many historic properties were identified during the reporting period due to expected fluctuations in such a large property portfolio. Results are further limited by the type of data OSD collects. However, it is possible to assess trends in the available data. One way to evaluate DoD historic property data trends that are related to the identification of historic properties is to look at the number of assets coded DNE (Determined Not Eligible for Listing). Between FYs 2017-2019, the number of real property facilities coded DNE increased from 78,589 to 79,010. While this is not directly the identification of historic properties, it does show the NRHP evaluation of older real property that was identified, evaluated, and found not to be eligible for the NRHP—a valuable metric to assess the progress and health of the DoD Cultural Resources Program. The number of contributing resources to NHL districts also increased over the reporting period from 2,683 to 3,028; this shows a certain increase in the identification of historic properties. The DoD also inventories and performs basic reviews or physical assessments on all its real property assets, regardless of historic significance, on a recurring basis every five years; historic properties are similarly inventoried and reviewed every three years. (Note: this is a routine facility and operations maintenance assessment and is not a NRHP evaluation.)

The DoD also annually reports on historic properties not classified as facility-based real property, and therefore not recorded in RPAD. These assets are typically archaeological sites of varying NRHP significance. Table 1 reflects all archaeological sites that have been identified on DoD land, regardless if they have been evaluated for NRHP significance, and includes the total number for all reporting years. Throughout the DoD Components, archaeological sites which have been identified but not yet evaluated are typically managed the same way as those sites determined eligible for listing in the NRHP.

**Table 1 –Total Number of Identified Archaeological Sites on DoD Land, FYs 2017-2019**

	FY17	FY18	FY19
Total number of archaeological sites identified <sup>7</sup>	132,768	134,481	134,323

The DoD continues to make progress in better understanding the nature of its real property assets. These assets include NRHP eligible historic properties, as well as properties that have not been evaluated for NRHP eligibility. Table 2 shows details on real property assets that have not been evaluated for NRHP eligibility, differentiating between ‘Not Evaluated’ (NEV) assets that are 50 years old or older, and those that are less than 50 years old.

**Table 2 - DoD Buildings/Structures Not Evaluated for Historic Status, FYs 2017 - 2019<sup>8</sup>**

Age	FY17	FY18	FY19
NEV Greater than or equal to 50 years old	41,540	41,216	39,447
NEV Less than 50 years old	218,512	212,406	217,213
Total not evaluated for historic status	262,124	253,644	256,667

The number of assets greater than 50 years old not evaluated for NRHP eligibility decreased from FYs 2017 – 2019 overall, but this shows only a small change. It is also important to note that the numbers in Table 2 fluctuate as DoD assets age, are removed from service, and evaluations are completed. Progress trends in evaluating these assets can be difficult to discern by only comparing three years at a time. The 2017 DoD Section 3 Report provided similar data for FYs 2014-2016. The change from 42,749 in FY 2014 to 39,447 in FY 2019, reflects a steady gradual decrease in unevaluated older assets and illustrates the Components’ successful efforts to effectively manage historic property through their cultural resources programs.

The DoD also assesses its progress on archaeological site identification and evaluation through analysis of the number of acres surveyed for archaeological sites each year, and the number of acres available for survey. Please note, the difference between the total number of DoD-managed acres and those acres available for survey reflect the number of acres that cannot be surveyed for archaeological sites, because of safety or other concerns. Table 3 illustrates DoD progress in surveying acreage for archaeological sites, and the number of acres yet to be surveyed.

<sup>7</sup> From the Knowledge-Based Corporate Reporting System (KBCRS) and Non-Site-Level Information Collection System (NSLICS) databases: <https://kbcrs.denix.osd.mil/main.cfm> (Internal DoD site only).

<sup>8</sup> Data for the chart was obtained from DoD’s RPAD records.

**Table 3 - DoD Acres Surveyed for Archaeological Sites, FYs 2017 - 2019<sup>9</sup>**

	<b>Total DoD Military Department managed acres</b>	<b>Acres available for archaeological survey</b>	<b>Acres surveyed for archaeological sites</b>	<b>% Surveyed</b>
FY17	26,435,897	9,904,587	21,377,032	46%
FY18	26,295,260	9,924,152	21,400,604	46%
FY19	26,307,460	9,784,837	20,852,586	47%

The data in Table 3 demonstrates that the percentage of DoD lands surveyed for archaeological sites increased slightly between FY 2017 - 2019 by 0.6%. The DoD continues to survey land for the presence of archaeological resources as projects and funding permit.

*Subquestion 1.1: What sources of digital information about the location of historic properties does your agency use? Is the information internal to the agency, managed by a State Historic Preservation Office or other state agency, shared, or from another source? In what aspect of your agency's preservation work is geospatial information about historic properties most used?*

The DoDI 8130.01, "Installation Geospatial Information and Services (IGI&S)," establishes policy, assigns responsibilities, and provides governance procedures for IGI&S.<sup>10</sup> Under Enclosure 2, each installation will "establish a trusted authoritative data source (ADS) for all geospatial data and products produced, acquired, or maintained to fulfill EI&E missions," and the Military Departments will "provide for the creation and maintenance of geospatial data describing the location of...cultural resources..." as required by DoDI 4715.16, "Cultural Resources Management."<sup>11</sup> Under Enclosure 5, DoDI 4715.16 states that "[all] installations with cultural resources will have information available in a [Geographic Information System (GIS)]." These mandated sources are internal to the Department. Table 4 shows most archaeological sites on DoD land have locations recorded within a GIS system, and as seen in Table 5, the majority of installations with cultural resources have historic real property assets recorded within a GIS system. The Department's geospatial information about historic properties is mostly used for planning and resource management purposes, including revisions and updates to installations' Integrated Cultural Resource Management Plans and National Environmental Policy Act studies.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Archaeological survey data was obtained from the Knowledge-Based Corporate Reporting System (KBCRS) and Non-Site-Level Information Collection System (NSLICS) databases: <https://kbcrs.denix.osd.mil/main.cfm> (Internal DoD site only).

<sup>10</sup> DoDI 8130.01 available at: [https://fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/i8130\\_01.pdf](https://fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/i8130_01.pdf).

<sup>11</sup> DoDI 4715.16 available at: <http://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodi/471516p.pdf>.

<sup>12</sup> See Slide 8 of the "2015 Policy Update for the Defense Installations Spatial Data Infrastructure (DIDSI)" presentation at [https://proceedings.esri.com/library/userconf./proc15/papers/1365\\_404.pdf](https://proceedings.esri.com/library/userconf./proc15/papers/1365_404.pdf).

**Table 4 – Archaeological Sites in a GIS System, FYs 2017 - 2019<sup>13</sup>**

	Total DoD Military Department managed acres available through a GIS System	Archaeological sites mapped	Recorded archaeological sites	% in a GIS System
FY17	8,640,433	130,081	132,768	98%
FY18	8,862,049	129,905	134,481	97%
FY19	8,911,287	130,504	134,323	97%

**Table 5 – Installations with Historic Real Property Assets in a GIS System, FYs 2017 - 2019<sup>14</sup>**

	Installations with cultural resources	Installations with historic real property assets in a GIS System	% in a GIS System
FY17	330	241	73%
FY18	337	265	79%
FY19	338	266	79%

**2. Has your agency implemented any policies that promote awareness and identification of historic properties over the last three years?**

*Subquestion 2.1: Describe any new policies, or new benchmarks or performance measures instituted to meet existing requirements.*

No new policies, benchmarks, or performance measures were instituted within the last three years to meet existing requirements. Although no new policies were implemented, the Department continued to review existing policies and guidance and made administrative changes to various instructions, such as DoDI 4715.16, “Cultural Resources Management,” DoDI 4710.02, “DoD Interactions with Federally-Recognized Tribes,” and DoDI 4710.03, “Consultation Policy With Native Hawaiian Organizations.”<sup>15</sup>

*Subquestion 2.2: Federal agencies are encouraged to share information about whether evaluation of the effectiveness of existing agency policies, procedures, and guidelines that promote awareness and*

<sup>13</sup> Archaeological survey data was obtained from the Knowledge-Based Corporate Reporting System (KBCRS) and Non-Site-Level Information Collection System (NSLICS) databases: <https://kbcrs.denix.osd.mil/main.cfm> (Internal DoD site only).

<sup>14</sup> Archaeological survey data was obtained from the Knowledge-Based Corporate Reporting System (KBCRS) and Non-Site-Level Information Collection System (NSLICS) databases: <https://kbcrs.denix.osd.mil/main.cfm> (Internal DoD site only).

<sup>15</sup> DoDI 4710.02, “DoD Interactions with Federally-Recognized Tribes,” and DoDI 4710.03, “Consultation Policy With Native Hawaiian Organizations,” can be found on the DENIX Native American Affairs Program website: <http://www.denix.osd.mil/na/policy/>.

*identification of historic properties has led to improvements during the reporting period or planned updates not yet implemented.*

The DoD currently has no new information to share. The DoD is committed to sound and dynamic stewardship of the cultural resources for which it is responsible, as well as compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and other cultural resources statutes, laws, regulations, and executive orders. The DoD cultural resources management policy, DoD Instruction (DoDI) 4715.16, "Cultural Resources Management," provides overarching policy direction and assigns responsibilities to the DoD Components. Additionally, the Military Services issue Service-specific cultural resources management policy and guidance implementing DoDI 4715.16 for their own programs and installations.

*Subquestion 2.3: For the last three years, estimate the percentage of historic property identification completed in the context of Section 106 for specific undertakings and programs versus that completed for unspecified planning needs ("Section 110 survey").*

The DoD does not collect this specific data. Section 106 compliance accounts for the majority of the DoD's historic property identification. Historic property identification and evaluation efforts relating to Section 110 are often part of an installation specific Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP), and Section 110 projects are contingent on mission needs, funding, and personnel availability.

**3. How has your agency employed partnerships (with federal or non-federal partners) to assist in the identification and evaluation of historic properties over the last three years?**

*Agencies are encouraged to examine their policies, procedures, and capabilities to increase opportunities for partnership initiatives involving non-federal collaboration and investment and report on their progress.*

In DoD, partnerships are not routinely used at the Department level to identify and evaluate historic properties. DoDI 4715.16 promotes partnerships with Federal, tribal, State, and local government agencies; professional and advocacy organizations; and the general public.

At the installation level, the Military Departments can work with partners to improve their cultural resources programs. As stated in DoDI 4715.16, the Departments shall:

- "Establish appropriate partnerships with government, public, and private organizations to promote local economic development and vitality through the use of DoD historic properties in a manner that contributes to the long-term preservation and productive use of those properties.

Where installations manage lands historically or culturally affiliated with American Indian, Alaska Native tribes, or Native Hawaiian organizations (NHOs), the installations frequently partner or consult with those groups to identify and evaluate cultural resources and sacred sites. Guidance for this effort, including when to consult tribes and NHOs, what laws trigger the requirement to consult, who should be involved, how to address culturally sensitive information and tribal protocols, and how to record the results of consultations is addressed in DoDI 4710.02, "DoD Interactions with Federally-Recognized

Tribes,” and DoDI 4710.03, “Consultation Policy With Native Hawaiian Organizations.”<sup>16</sup> Compliance with the NHPA is emphasized throughout DoDI 4710.02, DoDI 4710.03, and the related Military Service-specific policies on consultation.

The DoD assists uniformed and civilian personnel in expanding their tribal consultation skills, which are necessary to establish and maintain effective working relationships with tribes and NHOs, through the American Indian Cultural Communications and Consultation Course and the Native Hawaiian Cultural Communication and Consultation Course. These trainings are offered annually to installations upon request. Additionally, the Military Departments can enter into cooperative agreements, as permitted by 10 U.S.C. 2684.

The DoD Legacy Resource Management Program (Legacy), established in 1990, has facilitated partnerships with both the DoD cultural and natural resources programs. On an annual basis, Legacy provides funds for projects related to the management of cultural and natural resources on military installations.<sup>17</sup> This program fosters the development of partnerships, leveraging the knowledge and talents of individuals outside of DoD to contribute toward the improvement of the cultural and natural resources management of military lands. The Legacy funding level has remained low in the last several years with \$3.9 million in FY17, \$3.5 million in FY18, and \$3.5 million in FY19. In the last three years, about a half million has been spent on three integrated (natural and cultural resource combined) projects and around \$1.3 million has been spent on eight cultural resources projects.

*Subquestion 3.1: Have any partnerships involved the collection, exchange, or co-management of geospatial data about historic properties in your inventory? If so, please briefly describe the partner(s) and protocol for data transfer and long-term data management. Is the geospatial data accessible to others outside your agency?*

As stated in the response to Question 1 above, DoDI 8130.01, “Installation Geospatial Information and Services (IGI&S),” establishes policy, assigns responsibilities, and provides governance procedures for IGI&S.<sup>18</sup> Enclosure 2 of the Instruction states that the IGI&S will provide mechanisms for geospatial data “to be made visible, accessible, understandable, trusted, and interoperable throughout their lifecycles for all authorized users (to the maximum extent allowed by law or DoD policy) at the headquarters level as well as across the federal data sharing environment, including the Geospatial Platform.” Under Part II, the Instruction defines the Geospatial Platform as:

“A shared technology environment that provides access to trusted geospatial data, services, and applications for use by government agencies and their partners to meet mission needs. As an Office of Management and Budget Shared Services initiative, one of the major goals of the Geospatial Platform is to enable agencies to easily and inexpensively publish their spatial data, analytical tools, and applications within a shared commodity cloud-computing environment. In partnership with data.gov, the Geospatial Platform provides search and discovery capabilities for geospatial data and services of the Federal Government as well as data and services made available by State, regional, local, and tribal governmental partners.”

---

<sup>16</sup> DoDI 4710.02, “DoD Interactions with Federally-Recognized Tribes,” and DoDI 4710.03, “Consultation Policy With Native Hawaiian Organizations,” can be found on the DENIX Native American Affairs Program website: <http://www.denix.osd.mil/na/policy/>.

<sup>17</sup> More information on Legacy is available at: <https://www.denix.osd.mil/legacy/home/>.

<sup>18</sup> Available at [https://fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/i8130\\_01.pdf](https://fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/i8130_01.pdf).

An organization within the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Sustainment (OASD(S)), the Defense Installations Spatial Data Infrastructure (DISDI) Program is responsible for coordinating, standardizing, and leveraging geospatial information and analytics across DoD's global business mission areas to better manage installations and the warfighter support infrastructure.<sup>19</sup> Geographic information systems (GIS) and geospatial data have transformed how DoD operates and manages installations, ranges, and training areas, as well as, how it accounts for a vast real property portfolio, including historic properties. Through policy, guidance, standards and direct use of geospatial information in the Joint Information Environment (JIE), DISDI enables the sharing and interoperability of high-quality installation geospatial data across all levels of DoD to support the National Defense Strategy. The National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) is the Department's geospatial functional manager. The NGA relies on DISDI to govern the IGI&S community in compliance with the policies and guidelines established by NGA. Today, DISDI leads the Department's effort to mature and fully implement the Spatial Data Standards for Facilities, Infrastructure, and Environment (SDSFIE).<sup>20</sup> Geospatial data management and sharing within DoD and by DISDI includes geospatial data on historic properties. The DISDI Portal is a comprehensive, access-controlled, online viewer, catalog and access portal for the authoritative geospatial datasets pertaining to DoD energy, installations, and environment missions worldwide; this portal is restricted to authorized DoD users.

Access to sensitive archaeological and sacred site data within the Department's GIS systems are restricted to qualified personnel; such information is further protected at the request of affiliated tribes/NHOs, in accordance with the memorandum, "Guidelines on Maintaining the Confidentiality of Information about Indian Sacred Sites," issued by Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Environment (ODASD(Env)) in 2018.<sup>21</sup> This memorandum directs DoD Components to "respect tribal desires to keep information about [culturally sensitive] locations confidential to the extent legally possible," and provides general guidelines for doing so.

---

<sup>19</sup> Available at: [https://www.acq.osd.mil/eie/BSI/BEI\\_DISDI.html](https://www.acq.osd.mil/eie/BSI/BEI_DISDI.html).

<sup>20</sup> Available at: <https://www.sdsfieonline.org/Components/DISDI>.

<sup>21</sup> Available at: <https://www.denix.osd.mil/na/policy/dod-policies/guidelines-sacred-sites-2018/18-S-1199%20cleared%20DoD%20Sacred%20Sites%20Confidentiality%20Guidelines%20March%202018..pdf>

## Protecting Historic Properties

---

**4. Have the programs and procedures your agency has in place to protect historic properties, including compliance with Sections 106 (54 U.S.C. 306108), 110 (54 U.S.C. 306101-306107 and 306109-306114), and 111 (54 U.S.C. 306121-306122) of NHPA, changed over the reporting period in ways that benefit historic properties?**

*Agencies are encouraged to describe any changes over the last three years in the manner in which the agency manages compliance with Sections 106, 110, and 111 and to share successes in this area.*

The DoD has not changed its process for complying with Section 106, 110, and 111 in the past three years. The DoD continues to follow the guidelines established in DoDI 4715.16, "Cultural Resource Management," for complying with NHPA and all other cultural resource statutes, laws, regulations, and executive orders.

*Subquestion 4.1: How has the number of full-time cultural resource professionals in your agency assigned to help the agency fulfill its responsibilities under the NHPA changed over the last three years?*

The DoD does not collect this type of information. Most installations have a government civilian employee designated as the CRM, and many installations retain multiple government or contract employees as cultural resources subject matter experts. Such staffing levels can be found similarly replicated in other DoD Component regions, commands, and headquarters.

*Subquestion 4.2: Has the distribution of responsibilities to federal agency employees, contractors, and applicants for compliance with Sections 106, 110, and 111 changed over the last three years?*

The distribution of responsibilities remains unchanged. As a land managing agency, DoD employees and ultimately installation Commanders are responsible for compliance with Sections 106, 110, and 111 of NHPA. As necessary and when appropriate, DoD will engage and oversee contractors performing work pursuant to Sections 106, 110, and 111 of the NHPA, such as archaeological and historic properties surveys.

**5. How has your agency employed partnerships to assist in the protection of historic properties over the reporting period?**

*Agencies frequently work with SHPOs, Indian tribes, Native Hawaiian organizations, certified local governments, and other organizations to protect and manage historic properties. Agencies are encouraged to examine their policies, procedures, and capabilities for public-private initiatives and investment and report on their progress.*

*Subquestion 5.1: Does your agency partner with friends groups, Preserve America Stewards, colleges or universities, or other organizations on site-specific preservation strategies? If so, how are such groups involved in historic property protection?*

Information on DoD's policies concerning partnerships can be found in the response to Question 3, above.

**6. How has your agency used program alternatives such as Programmatic Agreements, Program Comments, and other tools to identify, manage, and protect your agency's historic properties over the last three years?**

The DoD's use of program alternatives remains unchanged over the last three years. The DoD still has several nationwide Program Comments including programs for Capehart-Wherry Housing, Ammunition Storage Facilities, and Unaccompanied Personnel Housing, as well as a nationwide Programmatic Memorandum of Agreement (PMOA) for World War II Temporary Buildings. These program alternatives have been effective tools to manage large numbers of like resources. Additionally, many installations have PAs with SHPOs for routine maintenance and other common activities. These program alternatives have been effective in helping DoD manage its resources and more effectively communicate with stakeholders. The DoD is developing plans to ascertain management solutions for Cold War facilities and activities associated with maintaining and managing those assets.

*Subquestion 6.1: Has your agency developed any new Section 106 program alternatives or revised existing program alternatives during the reporting period? For what projects or programs?*

After entering consultation with the ACHP in 2019, this past July, the Army submitted to the ACHP *Program Comment for Army Inter-War Ear Historic Housing, Associated Building and Structures, Landscape Features 1919-1940*. The Program Comment (PC) addressed management actions (including repair, rehabilitation, renovation, and demolition) for the entire inventory of 3,200 Inter-War historic housing units constructed between 1919 and 1940. The ACHP adopted the PC on September 4, 2020, and the Army is now implementing the PC.

*Subquestion 6.2: What effects have program alternatives produced in terms of resource protection and time and cost savings for the agency's Section 106 review responsibilities? How does your agency measure the effectiveness of program alternatives, if the agency uses them?*

The DoD does not quantify the effects of its program alternatives. The DoD does, however, track the number of assets which are included in a Program Comment using the historic status code "Eligible for the purposes of a Program Comment (ELPA)" in RPAD (see ELPA figures in Appendix 1, Table 3).

## Using Historic Properties

*Section 4(a) of EO 13287 states federal agencies will ensure the long-term preservation and use of federal historic properties as assets and, if possible, to contribute to local economies and communities through proper management.*

### **7. How do your agency's historic federal properties contribute to local communities and their economies, and how have their contributions changed over the reporting period?**

*Subquestion 7.1: Has consideration of local economic development in your asset planning changed over the last three years? If so, how?*

Consideration of local economic development has not changed over the last three years. The Military Departments maintain legal jurisdiction of their property for the U.S. Government and derivative decisions are made at that level. All of DoD's project planning or infrastructure development decisions are made according to the defense mission, not local economic development considerations.

*Subquestion 7.2: Does your agency use historic properties to foster heritage tourism, when consistent with agency mission? If so, please describe any new heritage tourism efforts during the reporting period and whether they include public access to historic properties.*

The DoD considers its historic properties to be assets that support the military mission and does not use them for economic development or heritage tourism purposes. No new heritage tourism efforts were made during the reporting period.

### **8. What other laws, regulations, or requirements (other than the NHPA) most directly affect your agency's strategies to protect and use historic properties? What factors have influenced agency decision making on the continued use or re-use of historic properties during the last three years?**

As previously noted, DoD continues to follow the guidelines established in DoDI 4715.16, "Cultural Resource Management," for complying with NHPA and all other cultural resource statutes, laws, regulations, and executive orders. Regarding continued use and re-use of historic properties, Enclosure 2 of DoDI 4715.16 states that DoD shall "ensure that readiness, sustainability, and cost-effectiveness policies and the military mission are facilitated through the maximum continued and adaptive use of cultural resources," and DoD is to "maximize reuse of historic buildings and structures, where justified by an objective analysis of life-cycle benefits and costs, before disposal, new construction, or leasing in accordance with [DoD Directive (DoDD) 4165.06, "Real Property," and DoDI 4165.70, "Real Property Management]."<sup>22</sup>

<sup>22</sup> DoDD 4165.06 available from <http://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodd/416506p.pdf>; DoDI 4165.70 available from <https://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodi/416570p.pdf>.

*Subquestion 8.1: What factors are considered in agency decisions about disposing of or retaining historic properties?*

DoDD 4165.06 and DoDI 4165.70 provide DoD policy on the acquisition, management, and disposal of real property, while DoDD 4165.06 and DoDI 4165.72, “Real Property Disposal,” are the Department-wide policies for disposal of all DoD real property, including historic assets.<sup>23</sup> The DoDI 4165.72 directs the DoD Components to “establish programs and procedures to dispose of real property that conform to applicable law and the policies, guidance, and procedures provided by and pursuant to [DoDD 4165.06] and [DoDI 4165.72].”<sup>24</sup> The DoD Components have policies with more detailed requirements on the disposal process relevant to their business practices.

The criteria for disposal actions are applicable to all types of real property. DoDI 4165.72 directs the following procedure to dispose of real property:

“The programs of the Military Departments shall ensure that... real property for which there is no foreseeable military requirement, either in peacetime or for mobilization, and for which the Department of Defense does not have disposal authority, is promptly reported for disposal to [GSA]... in accordance with applicable regulations of those agencies.”<sup>25</sup>

The disposal procedures include several factors to consider in addition to the obvious legal requirements. DoDI 4165.72 reinforces the uniqueness of disposing of historic properties:

“Disposal of real property may include disposing of associated interests in real property such as authorized by section 2668a of title 10, U.S.C. [Easements: granting restrictive easements in connection with land conveyances], including those needed to comply with the requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act.”<sup>26</sup>

Appendix 1, Table 4 shows the percentage of historic assets in the DoD’s disposal track for FY17-19, and historic assets account for an incredibly small portion (approximately 3% for the past three years) of DoD’s real property identified for disposal. Such data reflects the retention and predominant continued use and re-use of historic properties across the Department.

***9. Does your agency use, or has it considered using, Section 111 (now 54 U.S.C. § 306121) of the NHPA or other authorities to lease or exchange historic properties?***

*Subquestion 9.1: If so, please provide information on how often the authority is used and describe any uses of such authority over the last three years to outlease historic properties.*

*Subquestion 9.2: Does your agency have protocols to identify historic properties that are available for transfer, lease, or sale?*

*Subquestion 9.3: Are there obstacles to your agency using Section 111 or other authorities to enable the continued use of historic properties in your inventory?*

<sup>23</sup> DoDI 4165.72 available from <http://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodi/416572p.pdf>.

<sup>24</sup> Section 4.3.1., DoDI 4165.72.

<sup>25</sup> Section 5.1., DoDI 4165.72.

<sup>26</sup> Section 5.1.6., DoDI 4165.72.

DoD does not issue policy or guidance to preclude the use of Section 111 of the NHPA by the Military Departments. However, the Military Departments have not made extensive use of that authority, preferring instead to use “Enhanced Use Leasing” under 10 USC §2667. This codified allowance is a special statutory authority specific to DoD, and while DoD uses it extensively, it is not often utilized for historic property leasing. The Military Departments have found that Enhanced Use Leasing has the potential for more flexible use.

As stated above, DoD Directive (DoDD) 4165.06, “Real Property,” DoDI 4165.70, “Real Property Management,” DoDI 4165.72, “Real Property Disposal,” provide protocols for identifying real property assets that are available for transfer, lease, or sale.

*Subquestion 9.4: Does your agency generally retain the proceeds from Section 111 leases for the purposes of managing historic properties in the agency’s inventory? Have these proceeds increased in the last three years?*

The DoD does not collect this data.

## Successes, Opportunities, and Challenges

---

### **10. Provide specific examples of major successes, opportunities, and/or challenges your agency has experienced in identifying, protecting, or using historic properties during the past three years.**

*Agencies are encouraged to identify particular successes they have achieved, as well as any challenges or impediments encountered, in their efforts to improve inventory of historic properties, protect historic properties, or use historic properties during the reporting period. Do such challenges or successes suggest opportunities to enhance the federal government’s leadership role in historic properties stewardship at the agency or government-wide level? Case studies that highlight, exemplify, or demonstrate agency achievements should include images if available. Agencies are encouraged to include examples of how partnerships have been used to assist in their historic properties stewardship.*

The DoD Components continue to work toward more efficient management of their cultural resources. Examples of successes include:

#### **Successes**

- The Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment published DoD Manual 4715.05, Volume 1, Overseas Environmental Baseline Guidance Document (OEBGD): *Conservation*, on June 29, 2020.<sup>27</sup> This manual, known as the OEBGD, implements policy, assigns responsibilities, and provides standards to protect human health and the environment on enduring installations under DoD control outside the United States. It is composed of multiple volumes, each addressing specific areas of environmental management including conservation as found in Volume 1. Volume 1 identifies environmental standards for installations to ensure the protection and

<sup>27</sup> Available at: [https://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodm/471505\\_vol1.pdf?ver=2020-06-29-151300-670](https://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodm/471505_vol1.pdf?ver=2020-06-29-151300-670)

management of historic and cultural resources as well as the conservation of natural resources and species at risk. This document reissues and cancels DoD 4715.05-G, OEBGD, published May 1, 2007.

- The Air Force implemented standardized and electronic Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan (ICRMP) templates in late 2015 and requires all existing and newly developed ICRMPs to utilize the template. This standardization of ICRMPs and web centralization allows quick review by installations, the Air National Guard, and the Air Force Civil Engineer Center, which reduces data call response time and staff churn; allows in-house updates; allows intra-Service sharing of lessons learned; and creates a more uniform set of standard operating procedures. The Air Force employed updated standard and overseas ICRMP templates in late 2018.
- Air Force Manual 32-7003, “Environmental Conservation,” published in April 2020, provides updated guidance and procedures for cultural resource and natural resource programs at Air Force installations.<sup>28</sup>
- Fort Shafter, Honolulu, Hawaii is one of the Army’s crowning installations for historic and architectural significance, and Fort Shafter’s Palm Circle National Historic Landmark District is the jewel in that crown. In recognition of this special status, the rehabilitation of Palm Circle Residences Six and Seven, on Palm Circle Drive in the National Historic Landmark District was carefully planned, coordinated, and executed by the Army’s privatized housing partner, Lendlease. The goal of the project was to rehabilitate these National Historic Landmark status homes’ exterior and interior while modernizing certain elements such as electrical and plumbing systems, kitchens, bathrooms, and air conditioning. The rehabilitation met the goal and resulted in livable, comfortable grand, historic residences in full conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The Historic Hawaii Foundation recognized Lendlease’s rehabilitation efforts at Palm Circle with a 2020 Preservation Project Award.<sup>29</sup> Please see Appendix 2 for more information on this success.
- At the Defense Supply Center Richmond in Richmond, Virginia, the historic Bellwood House is being restored. The Bellwood House, originally known as New Oxford and later Auburn Chase, evolved from an early 19th-century antebellum plantation into a modern 20th-century farm and dairy operation. The two-story, five-bay house is considered an excellent vernacular interpretation of Early Classical Revival style in Piedmont Virginia. Norfolk District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers awarded a \$3.28 million contract to Facility Support Services for renovation of Building 42, its official depot designation. The house – built between 1790 and 1804 and listed as a state and Chesterfield County landmark – was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1978. Restoration work began in May of 2020 and the project should be completed in a year. Please see Appendix 3 for more information on this success.

### Challenges

- Department-wide, there is an ongoing effort to clarify historic preservation responsibilities for historic properties leased to Military Housing Privatization Initiative

---

<sup>28</sup> Available at: [https://static.e-publishing.af.mil/production/1/af\\_a4/publication/afman32-7003/afman32-7003.pdf](https://static.e-publishing.af.mil/production/1/af_a4/publication/afman32-7003/afman32-7003.pdf).

<sup>29</sup> More information on the Historic Hawaii Foundation 2020 Preservation Project Award is at: <https://historichawaii.org/2020/06/12/u-s-army-garrison-hawaii-rehabilitates-two-historic-residences-on-palm-circle-at-fort-shafter/>

(MHPI) partners. The DoD is coordinating with Counsel, Components, and MHPI partners to ensure preservation as well as healthy and safety responsibilities are met for these properties. On August 16, 2019, the DoD Historic Preservation and Privatized Housing Workshop provided an opportunity to have open dialogue between MHPI Partners and DoD leadership, staff, and legal counsel responsible for housing and historic preservation policy and compliance.

- In 2019, the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) reviewed DoD practices on its military installations and published report GAO-19-335, *Defense Infrastructure: Additional Actions Could Enhance DoD's Efforts to Identify, Evaluate, and Preserve Historic Properties*.<sup>30</sup> After visiting 10 installations, the GAO found that DoD's historic property data is inconsistent in cases of homes previously transferred to private developers, and developers did not try to identify historic significance. People working in preservation believed maintenance personnel did not always know what work was allowed on historic buildings. The GAO made seven recommendations to DoD to enhance its efforts to identify, assess, and preserve historic properties. The DoD concurred with these recommendations and submitted a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to GAO. In accordance with the CAP, the DoD Components are actively taking "steps to ensure installation personnel verify that private developers are identifying and evaluating privatized properties for historic significance, as appropriate," and installation personnel "conduct a physical inventory of historic properties every 3 years, including an assessment of each property's condition to ensure that facilities that have been identified and evaluated as historic are inventoried." The ODASD(Env) is working "in collaboration with the military departments, [to] develop and disseminate department-wide or service-wide guidance, on training related to historic preservation to installation personnel, including information on roles and responsibilities."

---

<sup>30</sup> Available at: <https://www.gao.gov/assets/700/699833.pdf>

## Appendix 1: DoD Federal Real Property Profile Data<sup>31</sup>

---

**Table 1: FYs 2017 - 2019 – Number of Assets (Land, Buildings, and Structures)**

Fiscal Year	Number of Assets
FY 2017	439,980
FY 2018	426,003
FY 2019	443,947

**Table 2: FYs 2017 - 2019 – Percentage of Asset Types (Land, Buildings, and Structures)**

Asset Type	FY17	FY18	FY19
Land	14% (62,494)	14% (59,624)	13% (59,551)
Buildings	52% (228,087)	51% (218,652)	52% (229,151)
Structures	34% (149,398)	35% (147,726)	35% (155,244)

**Table 3: FYs 2017 - 2019 – Percentage of Assets (Land, Buildings, and Structures) with Historic Status**

Historic Status <sup>32</sup>	FY17	FY18	FY19
Determined Not Eligible for Listing (DNE)	18% (78,589)	18% (76,181)	18% (79,010)
Individual National Historic Landmark (NHLI)	<1% (66)	<1% (64)	<1% (68)
Contributing Element of an NHL District (NHLC)	<1% (2,683)	<1% (2,738)	<1% (3,028)
Individual National Register Eligible (NREI)	1% (3,946)	1% (3,746)	1% (3,919)
Contributing Element of NRE District (NREC)	3% (11,170)	3% (11,232)	3% (12,080)
Individual National Register Listed (NRLI)	<1% (204)	<1% (200)	<1% (208)

<sup>31</sup> Data for these tables were obtained from DoD’s RPAD records.

<sup>32</sup> The names used throughout this report are those that were used in Real Property Information Model (RPIM) 10.0.

<b>Historic Status<sup>32</sup></b>	<b>FY17</b>	<b>FY18</b>	<b>FY19</b>
Contributing Element of NRL District (NRLC)	<1% (2,065)	<1% (1,528)	<1% (2,042)
Non-Contributing element of NHL/NRL District (NCE)	<1% (2,265)	<1% (2,334)	<1% (2,430)
Eligible for the purposes of a Program Alternative (ELPA)	9% (40,383)	9% (38,518)	8% (36,374)
Not Evaluated (NEV) <sup>33</sup>	68% (298,600)	68% (289,139)	67% (289,339)
Not Routinely Assessed (NAR) <sup>34</sup>	<1% (8)	<1% (322)	1% (6448)

**Table 4: FYs 2017 - 2019 – Percentage of Historic, Evaluated (Not Historic), and Not Evaluated Assets in Disposal Track**

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Historic Assets</b>	<b>Evaluated (Not Historic) Assets</b>	<b>Not Evaluated Assets</b>
FY 2017	3% (1,644)	3% (2,612)	2% (6,077)
FY 2018	3% (2,021)	1% (1,164)	2% (7,233)
FY 2019	3% (1,751)	2% (1,660)	2% (7,233)

<sup>33</sup> NEV numbers represent all assets not evaluated regardless of the age or type of facility.

<sup>34</sup> NAR numbers represent all assets that are not routinely planned to be evaluated for eligibility.

## Appendix 2: Rehabilitation of the Army's National Historic Landmark Housing at Palm Circle, Fort Shafter, Hawaii

---

**Introduction:** Fort Shafter, Honolulu, Hawaii is one of the Army's crowning installations for historic and architectural significance, and Fort Shafter's Palm Circle National Historic Landmark District is the jewel in that crown. In recognition of this special status, the rehabilitation of Palm Circle Residences Six and Seven, on Palm Circle Drive in the National Historic Landmark District was carefully planned, coordinated, and executed by the Army's privatized housing partner, Lendlease. Palm Circle received its name by the majestic Royal Palm trees which frames the large parade field that were brought from Cuba as a symbol of the Army's victory in the Spanish-American War. Palm Circle Quarters six and seven are two-story, 4,500 square foot residences designed and built in the Hawaii Plantation style, stemming from the sugar and pineapple industries in Hawaii. Complete with wrap-around lanais and maid's quarters, these residences were constructed by the U.S. Army in 1907. The foundation of these houses consists of an in-ground concrete basement with the rest of the house supported by post-and-piers allowing for an accessible crawlspace. The structure of these residences is framed in old-growth redwood, including the rafters, which are milled in detail befitting the era of original construction and allow for a functional attic space. Built-in 1907, these elegant historic homes are now referred to as Palm Six and Palm Seven at Palm Circle, Fort Shafter.

**Historical Significance:** Fort Shafter dates to 1902 when the U.S. Army began planning the first permanent post in the then Territory of Hawaii. The land that would become Fort Shafter was used as a dairy, grazing land, and growing feed. Construction started in 1905 of what was first called Kahuiki Military Reservation. Palm Circle was the original cantonment area of the Kahuiki Military Reservation, later renamed Fort Shafter, after Medal of Honor recipient Gen. William R. Shafter. Shafter served in the Civil War and Spanish-American War. Fort Shafter was the first permanent Army installation in the Hawaiian Islands, established in 1907. During World War II, Palm Circle housed the offices and quarters of the commanding general and his staff, U.S. Army Forces, Pacific areas, which included all Army forces in the Central and South Pacific. Notably, Palm Circle was one of the very few places on Oahu apart from downtown Honolulu that enjoyed full electric service in 1907. Quarters Six and Seven are original homes to Palm Circle and have housed Army officers since 1907. Quarters Six is also noted for being the home of one of America's most prominent generals and war heroes, George S. Patton, who resided in the home as a colonel in the 1930s.

**Description of Properties:** Palm Circle Residences Six and Seven sit gracefully on the large oval-shaped lawn ringed Royal Palms and Palm Circle Drive and are two of the fifteen classic quarters that line the perimeter of this famous landmark. Carefully designed by the Quartermaster of the Army, both the regal landscape and the Colonial Revival buildings reflect the Edwardian village at Palm Circle. This design successfully provided a close-knit community on the new base with the barrack buildings and support structures on one side of the parade field and the stately officer's homes on the other. The U.S. Army originally constructed the homes in 1907, using an American-Edwardian architectural design. While these architects used Quartermaster plans from the mainland, they did modify designs to suit Hawaii's unique climate. The Palm Circle homes featured large verandas, generous overhangs (to help with the sun and rain), and soaring ceilings to help in relief from the warm evenings. The horizontal wood siding on the exterior of the homes is of redwood, and the interior originally made of Douglas fir. The original interior wall partitions are finished with a wood lathe covered in plaster. Each home features a full kitchen, butler's pantry, two interior staircases with carpet runners, three full bedrooms,

an office area, three full bathrooms, main-floor powder room, living room, dining room with built-in china hutch, entry foyer area, a full basement for laundry and storage, an exterior cellar storm door, an open rear lanai with rear entries into both the kitchen and maid's quarters. The doors, windows, and main flooring of these residences are all made from Douglas Fir, with the windows generally being one-over-one, double-hung sash style.

**Historic Rehabilitation Accomplishments:** The goal of the project was to rehabilitate the residences, retain their historic significance while making the homes livable for the 21st century. The rehabilitation of Palm Circle Six and Seven was carried out full compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties:

- Each house received restored or replaced wood floors, plaster walls, historic windows, new bead-board walls, and ceiling in the grand kitchen.
- Both homes received complete plumbing, electrical, and HVAC upgrades as well as refurbished windows, doors, new flooring, lanai, and veranda.
- The wrap-around lanai was constructed to be open to the elements, but during a renovation during the 1930s, they were enclosed. These spacious grand verandas and lanais were rehabilitated to maintain the 1930 appearance with plantation shutters for the wrap-around lanai windows
- Non-historic elements such as jalousie windows were replaced with period appropriate windows.
- The bathroom flooring includes white 1" hexagonal tile, and the kitchen and pantry areas have 10" porcelain tiling.
- All in-wall plumbing, electrical lines, and data lines were replaced and completely concealed; new antique replica plumbing and light fixtures such including push-button style light switches were installed where existing antique fixtures could not be retained.
- Kitchens feature new cabinetry and quartz counter-tops, appliances; and period-appropriate hardware and finishes.
- Each residence in Palm Circle has a single chimney that extends from the basement foundation and protrudes through the roof, and since these chimneys are no longer operational, they were capped with a copper lid.
- All window AC units were replaced by a new central AC system completed with period style oil rubbed bronze grilles and registers.
- The homes were finished with appropriate paint reflective of their historic significance.
- Rehabilitation of the designed landscape surrounding the housing completed the project.

**Summary:** Residences at Palm Circle welcome the highest-level officials of the Army and it is essential that these National Historic Landmark properties retain the historic character while meeting current needs. The goal of the project was to rehabilitate these National Historic Landmark status homes' exterior and interior while modernizing certain elements such as electrical and plumbing systems, kitchens, bathrooms, and air conditioning. The rehabilitation met the goal and resulted in livable, comfortable grand, historic residences in full conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. These homes were rehabilitated by the Army's housing privatization partner, Lendlease, with the care attention to detail that a National Historic Landmark property deserves.



Figure 1: Rehabilitated Palm Quarters 6, Front Facade, Source: U.S. Army



Figure 2: Rehabilitated Palm Quarters 7, Front Facade, Source: U.S. Army

## **Appendix 3: Defense Supply Center Richmond – Bellwood House**

---



US Army Corps  
of Engineers®

@norfolkdistrict

Feature Story

# Bellwood Manor House set for \$3.28M renovation

Norfolk District, Defense Logistics Agency team up to preserve historic landmark at Richmond depot

By [Vince Little](#)

Published May 12, 2020



Norfolk District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is managing a \$3.28 million restoration of Bellwood Manor House at the military supply depot in Richmond, Virginia. The house has been listed on the National Register of Historic Places since 1978. Restoration work is expected to begin later this month and the project should be completed in a year. (Courtesy photo)

NORFOLK, Va. – The historic Bellwood Manor House at Defense Supply Center Richmond is getting a face-lift.

Norfolk District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers awarded a \$3.28 million contract to Facility Support Services for renovation of Building 42, its official depot designation. The house – built between 1790 and 1804 and listed as a state and Chesterfield County landmark – was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1978, according to the Defense Logistics Agency.

Restoration work is expected to begin later this month and the project should be completed in a year.

“This renovation is necessary and important primarily because we have an obligation to maintain historic structures that are on the National Register of Historic Places,” said Mike Eck, DLA Installation Operations project manager. “It is also needed to make repairs and prevent further deterioration of the structure. ... Our partnership with USACE is critical to the success of the project, which has been in the works since 2012.

“It’s been headed by two project managers at DSCR in succession and two from the Corps of Engineers. The collaboration has been excellent throughout the process.”

Eck said the Bellwood house, originally known as New Oxford and later Auburn Chase, evolved from an early 19th-century antebellum plantation into a modern 20th-century farm and dairy operation. The two-story, five-bay house is considered an excellent vernacular interpretation of Early Classical Revival style in Piedmont Virginia.

Capt. Katherine Huffmyer spent nearly two years as project manager in Norfolk District’s Military Construction Division. She recently left for a new assignment in Utah.

“This contract is critical for the district, because it’s the only historic landmark remaining at Defense Supply Center Richmond,” she said. “The Corps of Engineers will play a critical part in ensuring this project maintains the historical significance of the Bellwood Manor House. It’s a project that has undergone many changes over the years, but it was extremely important to get it awarded. We had a wonderful team that put in a lot of hard work to get it to the finish line.

“It’s such an interesting story how this club and manor has evolved.”

During the Civil War, the property was home to Maj. Augustus Drewry, a Confederate officer who constructed Fort Darling, or Drewry’s Bluff, a fortification east of the house responsible for preventing Union troops from traveling up the James River to Richmond, the Confederacy’s capital. It was the site of two battles – and the Bellwood house served as Gen. P.G.T. Beauregard’s headquarters in 1864 during campaigns in Petersburg and Richmond.

The manor hosted an important meeting when Beauregard, Gen. Braxton Bragg and Confederate President Jefferson Davis met there to strategize on Richmond’s defense.

The property was purchased in 1887 by James Bellwood, a Canadian farmer, who sought refuge in

Virginia's more temperate climate. Under his watch and through pioneering agricultural practices, Bellwood and his sons transformed the plantation into a modern farming showplace and renowned farm and dairy operation.

"He turned the property into a nationally recognized, modern, progressive farm that utilized innovative farming techniques to create one of the most productive farms in Virginia prior to World War II," Eck said.

A remnant of the Bellwood family's interest in nature is the elk herd, still cared for on installation grounds.

Because of its proximity to the James River and established railroad lines and roads, the estate was purchased by the federal government in 1941 for use as a military supply depot, under Army Quartermaster Corps command. It's now known as Defense Supply Center Richmond.

Today, Bellwood Manor is used for command meetings, functions and informal training sessions. The house is also site of the Officers' Club.

"DLA and Defense Supply Center Richmond identified it as a priority project due to its use for significant ceremonies and command gatherings," Huffmyer said. "They also want to ensure its preservation as a historical building."

She said the contractor is responsible for ensuring the renovation work is done in accordance with plans and drawings approved by the State Historic Preservation Office, which include some structural work, as well as interior and exterior refurbishment.

"The Bellwood project has seen many hurdles in getting to the point of construction award," she added. "But fortunately, it will finally begin the process toward restoration and preservation of its historical significance."

Virginia    Norfolk District    USACE    U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
North Atlantic Division    USACE NAD    MILCON    Bellwood Manor House  
Defense Supply Center Richmond    DSCR    DLA    defense logistics agency  
Chesterfield County    National Register of Historic Places



2020 Department of Defense Response to:

Executive Order 13287, "Preserve America,"  
Section 3: Reporting Progress on the  
Identification, Protection, and Use of  
Federal Historic Properties

---

Office of the Under Secretary of Defense  
For Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics