

Minutes – 2011 Programmatic Agreement (PA) Annual Workshop for Calendar Year 2016

Date: Thursday April 27, 2017

Location: Guam Museum First Floor Multipurpose Room

Time: 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Attendees (alphabetical order, * indicates phone in):

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP): Katherine Kerr

Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) Government: Wesley Bogdan, Epi Cabrera and Frank Angel

CNMI HPO: Merti Kani and Jim Pruitt

Department of Chamorro Affairs (DCA): Johnny Sablan and Joseph Santos

Fuetsan Famalaoan: Vivian Dames

Guam Legislature: Vice Speaker Therese Terlaje, Sen. Frank Aguon, Sen. Regine Biscoe-Lee, Nicole Santos, James Servino, Billy Iglesias

Guam Preservation Trust: Joe Quinata* (then attended in person), Jolie Liston, McMichael Mutzk

Guam State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO): Lynda Aguon, Joe Garrido and John Mark Joseph

Headquarters Marine Corps: Jacqueline Rice, Natalie Pilon

Joint Region Marianas (JRM): RDML Shoshana Chatfield, Roy Tsutsui, LT Tim Gorman

Marine Corps Activity Guam (MCAG): Major Patrick, Lt. M. Warren, Lt. J. Kim, Uriah Perez, Albert Borja, Ronnie Rogers, Sandy Yee, David Snyder and Maria Cruz

Marine Forces Pacific (MARFORPAC): Ed Lynch, Amanda Peyton, Chris Harris

National Park Service (NPS): Paul Scolari

Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC) Headquarters: William "Bill" Manley

NAVFAC Marianas (NFM): Shawn Arnold, Rich Olmo, Catherine Norton

NAVFAC Pacific (NFP): Karen Desilets, Valerie Russel, Carly Antone*

Office of Economic Adjustment (Department of Defense, DoD): Gary Kuwabara

Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (OASN): CDR Jeff Powell

Office of the Governor (Guam): Robert Crisostomo

Note: These minutes reflect a summary of the 2011 PA Annual Workshop and supports more detailed information presented in the final workshop brief.

Opening Remarks

1. MCAG facilitator Ronnie Rogers introduced Commander JRM, RDML Chatfield. RDML Chatfield delivered opening remarks, thanked everyone present, and reviewed 2011 PA accomplishments briefly and encouraged theme of "best practices."

Review Workshop Agenda

2. Ronnie Rogers then briefly went through "housekeeping" items, welcomed the CNMI, and summarized the workshop agenda.

Prior Workshop Action Items Review

3. First item covered was to discuss past items from last year's Annual Workshop held at Nimitz Hill. These included Joe Garrido's request for work on Puntan Patgon, John Mark Joseph's request for educational signs, CAPT Jones support of a universal GIS database for DoD and SHPO (delivered by JRM to SHPO December 9, 2016), giving cultural resource awareness training slides to CAPT Jones and NPS, the NRHP nomination and completion of the Mahlac River Site, ongoing implementation of the Public Access Plan, passing along GIS shapefiles for various projects to SHPO, added research of concrete slabs in Live Fire

Training Range Complex (LFTRC) area for John Mark Joseph was completed, and the avoidance of LFTRC historic properties by moving an access road.

NDAA 17 – Guam Cultural Repository Discussion

4. The Guam Cultural Repository (GCR) was then discussed. Bill Manley expressed appreciation for the way all PA partners had worked towards obtaining Congressional authorization for facility construction. CDR Powell, from OASN perspective of providing oversight of the process, passed along his congratulations to all for joint efforts to secure funds.
5. Gary Kuwabara from DoD's Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) discussed the status and planning on the GRC. Congress appropriated \$12 million (a capped amount) in 2012 for the GCR. The GCR was one of five projects in the Congressional requested Economic Adjustment Committee (EAC) Implementation Plan (EIP). Four EIP projects have been "authorized." Next anticipated step is for the Office of the Governor to submit a GRC proposal to utilize the GRC funding for the construction, commissioning, and certification of the GRC. Everyone was mindful that current H2B visa issue was impacting the recently favorable bid environment. The FY2012 Appropriation is "X" funding, which means the funds are available until expended.
6. Vice Speaker Therese Terlaje asked if there were any written specifications on the Repository capacity. Gary K. answered yes. The Office of the Governor provided repository requirements at various time inclusive of the interactions with the EAC. At this point Senator Terlaje asked if a site had been chosen. Gary K. responded that the Office of the Governor had considered fifteen to eighteen sites. However, recently the University of Guam had surfaced as a possible site. OEA had a scheduled meeting with UoG as part of the continued due diligence process. Robert Crisostomo of the Governor's Office offered an invitation to Senator Terlaje to attend the meeting.
7. Ronnie R. asked Shawn Arnold for update on the DoD artifact storage situation who then responded that they are awaiting funds to pay NPS storage fees to house items, and also their plans to re-inter human remains. At this point, Senator Frank Aguon asked if records were kept, and where the records were located, to which Ronnie and Shawn responded that records were kept and are on file at the SHPO office.
8. Gary K. and Bill M. elaborated on earlier DoD efforts to locate all DoD archaeological collections from Guam and return them to Guam. Throughout the collections assessment and management process, DoD has taken care to keep all data and items together, and their locations accurately recorded throughout the process.
9. Robert C. then asked if \$12 million can be increased. Gary K. stated, Congress appropriated \$12.0 Million and that asking for an increase was not viable given the sentiments of the US Congress. The Office of the Governor and OEA are evaluating Design/Build or Design/Bid/Build as execution models to ensure the most cost efficient mechanisms. It was explained that completion of construction of the GCR by GovGuam is a desirable goal, but it is not a prerequisite for the relocation of the U.S. Marines from Okinawa, Japan.
10. Bill M. stated the PA commitment to bring all our artifacts back to Guam and curate in DoD compliant facility (NPS facility now) for current and ongoing archaeological data recovery may exceed capacity on Guam so the GCR is a unique and good response to problems that may result from buildup. When Robert C. asked if artifacts/remains were scattered, Bill M. and Shawn A. stated no, that all were accounted for and protected at two facilities.
11. Senator Terlaje read from PA statement that DoD would "advocate" to Congress to authorize the building of a full museum. Gary K. explained that this meant DoD would advocate but had no directive to mandate funding from Congress and / or other Federal agencies. Federal law requires DoD to protect (i.e. repository), but not required to provide display (i.e. museum) for artifacts. These efforts were communicated to Guam SHPO, and Lynda Aguon agreed with this statement.

12. John Mark Joseph urged that in selecting a site for the GCR, we must look 20 years to future needs, when expansion may be needed. All agreed.
13. Senator Terlaje returned to her question, and stated she doubted DoD operated in “good faith” when no federal funds were obtained for the museum. Kate Kerr of the ACHP asked for clarification of what “advocate for” means in this instance and suggested that DoD prepare a white paper on its efforts to advocate for museum funding from other federal agencies.
14. Joe Santos mentioned that original plans for a DCA complex was to have display (museum), repository (curatorial storage), and a burial facility, but agencies decided at the time that the display (museum) was not feasible.
15. Gary K. disclosed DoD and EAC engagements evolved over time. Convincing the US Congress on the need under Section 106 to protect artifacts uncovered on DoD footprint for buildup projects took considerable effort and engagement. However, there is no federal law requiring a museum (similar to the public health lab). He closed with DoD has done more for Guam under the 2011 PA, compared to comparable agreements in other States/jurisdictions.
16. Bill M. said DoD kept GovGuam informed during the process of planning for civilian infrastructure projects, and museum funding was subsequently obtained by GovGuam through other means.
17. DoD also provided funding to Guam utility upgrades, to assist with civilian quality-of-life improvements, associated to the buildup. This engagement helped the local Guam utilities.
18. Kate Kerr restated her request for a White Paper on DoD actions regarding Part B (advocacy for Museum funding by other agencies) mentioned by Senator Terlaje. Also a second White Paper to summarize past PA actions.
19. Gary K. surfaced the previous and ongoing coordination with NPS, in regards to constructing a certified repository. Paul Scolari (Interim NPS Superintendent) offered continued NPS assistance, similar to the Tucson Repository site visit. NPS will be a member of the Repository Intergovernmental Support Team (RIST).

Programmatic Mitigations

20. Mitigations were discussed, and Kate K. explained ACHP role to promote reuse of historic properties, to advise the president, oversee the Section 106 actions, serve as a signatory to the PA and provide oversight of PA implementation.
21. Ronnie R. stated discussion was on programmatic mitigations, not project mitigation, and therefore general and broad (not pertaining to one site or excavation). Programmatic mitigation include DoD assistance to SHPO in updating the Historic Preservation Plan (HPP) for Guam, preparation of a Guam Synthesis with every 5-year HPP and preparation of two NRHP (National Register of Historic Properties) nominations each year. DoD prepares nominations in consultation with the SHPO, package is routed up for approval at installation and Region level, to Bill M. in Washington D.C., then on to the DON Federal Preservation Officer and the NPS Keeper of the National Register. R. Crisostomo asked if NRHP status gives public access to sites on lands under DoD jurisdiction, and Bill M. responded that it does not, and further that NRHP listing does not confer additional requirements beyond what are imposed by determination of eligibility for listing.
22. Kate K. explained that while the ACHP has no role in National Register listing, the Keeper’s office is the final authority on questions of National Register eligibility.
23. In response to a question about Navy decisions about nominating historic and archaeological districts, Bill M. explained that Navy often identifies districts when they conform to the Criteria of Eligibility and meet NRHP standards. One issue that can affect proposed districts is how boundaries are defined, because NPS standards make clear that large areas that are non-contributing should be excluded.
24. Kate K. clarified that there are 5 types of NRHP properties (building, structure, object, site, and district)

25. Lynda A. stated that under Section 110 all eligible properties are to be nominated for listing in the National Register.
26. Bill M. agreed and added that the Section 110 has no deadlines for completion of the requirement to list, and all federal agencies are forced to prioritize actions based on available funding. Further, because the listing process affords no additional protections for historic properties and entails substantial effort to complete, the DON policy is to undertake listing only in special circumstances, such as the commitment in the 2011 PA.
27. Senator Terlaje asked if sites in Northwest Field and Finegayan (for the main cantonment – J-001B) are eligible for nomination or have been nominated. Ronnie R. replied any eligible sites are being fully data recovered, not nominated, as the buildup requires disturbance of the area for construction.
28. Bill M. stated that all DoD projects for buildup have PA Memos, and the latest (P-102 for electrical distribution) was made available to Workshop attendees today.
29. Joe Garrido stated that we should ask indigenous groups when determining eligibility, and do data recovery even if DoD says ineligible, as ancient villages existed, but not recorded other than in native lore or knowledge. He reiterated Senator Terlaje’s request for the \$25 million for federally funded museum.
30. John Mark J. asked that the website for PA Memo postings be made more “Guam centric” or user-friendly.
31. Dave Snyder started discussion of the Public Access Plan that is now up and running since started Dec. 30, 2016 per JRM instruction. Dave S. provided telephone 355-2013 for visit requests. He summarized that there are 44 sites on the plan, 9 do not need escort since they are off base, and 35 sites need escort and security check. There has been media promotion on TV and Radio. Dave S. discussed the process and forms needed for access. There are plans for a future brochure or advertisement, with potential expansion of efforts with NPS and Guampedia. John Mark J. asked to go to Naval Magazine sites sometime soon.
32. Joe G. discussed “confidentiality” saying he wants DoD to be required to let indigenous Chamorros know there are sites in certain locations, and he suggested that ARPA and confidentiality regulations just try to hide the existence of sites from the indigenous peoples. It was later relayed that federal law prohibits the DoD from disclosing exact nature and location of sites to the general public (only legislative branch of U.S. Government has the power to change federal law).
33. Discussion ensued describing the methods used with Native Tribes in the states, to protect sites from vandalism, as well as provide information on sites to tribal historians.
34. Dave S. moved on to discuss medicinal plant collection. So far 74 individuals with interest and status (*surahana/suruhanu*, traditional herbalists and others) are on a contact list for future opportunities to collect medicinal and cultural plants in areas slated for clearing. Dave S. has also arranged Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC) training for potential participants. The 74 individuals will be invited to mark trees for collection. Project contractors will cut trees marked and them to an area designated for carvers to pick up with their own transportation within a reasonable timeframe.
35. Dave S. explained that large group tours are not part of the Public Access Plan, but individuals can contact Public Affairs Officers for accommodation of large group visits for school-age children and similar events.
36. Ronnie R. and Sandy Y. have trained over 1700 personnel to-date, in cultural resource awareness and reporting protocol.
37. Ronnie R. mentioned that the Osteology report on all human remains in JRM collections has been completed (February 2016). Collections containing human remains are currently stored at a secure Navy facility, because they cannot be stored at the NPS facility.

How Well is the PA Working?

38. For the wider dissemination of PA Memos, it was noted that the Navy is currently notifying the Guam Legislature as well as the Mayor's Council of Guam.
39. Ideas for greater efficiency of PA Memo processing included combining vertical construction (buildings) into the horizontal construction to ease the SHPO review process (since once the ground footprint has been evaluated/consulted upon, the vertical building construction should have no (or minimal) Section 106 consultation issues.
40. John Mark J. requested that DoD increase the Area of Potential Effect (APE) of projects rather than have revisions to PA Memos. He also stated that if SHPO has already concurred with a determination of "No Historic Properties Affected" for a given area, no Research Designs for construction are needed (alluding to projects outside scope of 2011 PA, located on South Finegayan). Al B. responded that Navy will continue to find the balance between APEs that are too conservative (greater chance of triggering adverse effects) and APEs that reflect actual project impacts.
41. Joe G. suggested that the review time on SHPO's part may need to be increased. Al B. mentioned that the Navy has, as part of past practice, afforded more time for SHPO review in the face of extenuating circumstances if project schedules allow.
42. Al B. and Bill M. commented that Navy/Marine Corps teams have listened and continue listening to SHPO, in order to actively identify opportunities to ease workload.
43. Lynda A. inquired if Appendix E is regularly updated, and Navy's Ronnie Rogers explained that updates are provided on a regular basis (part of semi-annual reports). Again, SHPO requested that Project #s, IDs, Titles, SHPO RC#, etc. remain constant, and Navy confirmed that this has been the practice since last year's Workshop when SHPO first mentioned it.

US Marine Corps (USMC) Program Broad Overview - Biological Opinion – Natural Resources Projects

44. Endangered Species Act (ESA), Al B. noted the Biological Assessment (BA) for buildup went to USFWS, and the Navy hopes to finish up consultation in the summer of 2017, which would allow award of major construction projects for the base.
45. John Mark J. asked about moving the stones (latte fragments and lusong) and was informed that coordination is underway with contractor to move stones disturbed in the early post-WWII period out of the development footprint and onto secure staging area for later possible reuse as an interpretive display. Robert C. asked why it was so hard to get a contractor to move the stones, and Al B. and Ronnie R. explained the cultural sensitivities and beliefs related to ancient sites, even if previously disturbed.
46. John Mark J. suggested that Navy fully utilize the entire footprint of an Area Development Plan for areas such as North Ramp, the Main Cantonment, etc. as part of future Area of Potential Effect. It may beneficially reduce the evaluation time by SHPO and the consultation paperwork as more area can be considered reviewed and completed.
47. John Mark J. mentioned concern with the GWA pipes being installed along Routes 3 and 3A, and will check with Kate Kerr at ACHP. Navy subsequently noted that these projects are performed by GovGuam entities, outside the scope of the 2011 PA.
48. Ronnie R. and Al B. explained that three proposed natural resource-related projects have undergone or are planned for consultation with SHPO (native plant nurseries, replanting native species, and ungulate fence) to implement conservation measures under the Endangered Species Act. Discussion explained the nurseries were temporary (maybe 10 years) to nurture seedlings or transplants of native plants before they are transplanted out to the general Forest Enhancement area in Finegayan and protected from destruction by deer and pigs through construction of an ungulate fence and ungulate control. Al B. said approximately 1,000 acres will need to be restored.

USMC Project Outlook

49. Ronnie R. explained that supplemental consultation for MILCON P-715 and P-735 for construction of the LFTRC was done through the Range Mitigation Plan (RMP) per the 2011 PA. Extra research requested by SHPO at last year's Workshop was completed on concrete slabs to the northwest of the LFTRC, and they were still considered ineligible after this further work. The Data Recovery Report on the LFTRC was completed and delivered to SHPO along with interpretive booklet draft on January 24, 2017. DoD agreed to extend SHPO review period to June 2017. Potential upcoming consultation work in this area could include review of Surface Danger Zone (SDZ) signs, medicinal plant collection prior to clearing, and baseline status reports on sites that are to be monitored per the RMP.
50. Jolie L. asked what the APE is for the LFTRC at Ritidian, inquiring about noise in the SDZ. She suggested that intensive survey of US Fish and Wildlife Service-managed lands at Ritidian Point to evaluate potential for loss/impact. Joe S. agreed, for better community relationship and trust.
51. Al B. facilitated discussion of the need for more intensive surveys in the SDZ. Bill M. added that DoD was careful to follow ACHP guidance on what "reasonable and good faith effort" to identify historic properties for the LFTRC. Critically, the ACHP guidance calls for identification efforts that are commensurate with the anticipated effects, and it notes that there is no absolute requirement to identify all historic properties. Further, the RMP provides special measures address post-review discoveries and to monitor the condition of sensitive historic properties in the SDZ. Based on the guidance, DoD considers the level of effort it has applied as compliant with federal law.
52. Joe G. brought up a social issue stating there should be "compensatory mitigation" to fishermen who will not be able to fish off Ritidian for up to 39 weeks per year. Al B. stated this discussion with local fishermen should occur prior to and during early operation of the LFTRC, noting the Record of Decision (ROD) sets range operations at a maximum of 39 weeks out of the year, but actual schedules of when individual ranges are active with SDZs restricting fishing vessel transit routes are not yet exactly known.
53. Vivian Dames of *Fuetsan Famalaoan* asked what will be the cumulative negative effects to marine resources. Al B. mentioned that the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) covered this; to include low risks of marine resources impacts associated with lead from firing ranges with proper assessment, monitoring and/or cleanups. The environmental analysis can be accessed on the DoD website <http://guambuildupeis.us>.
54. J-755 (Urban Combat Training area in Andersen South) has finished the design work, to which SHPO previously concurred. Currently the PA Memo for the Construction and Operation Phase has generated comment from both the SHPO and the public and DoD is working on a response and the follow-on PA Memo to resolve adverse effects. The construction footprint APE is small and avoids all sites/historic properties. Since the operations will cover the full Andersen South installation, the next PA Memo (#2 to include mitigation for adverse effects) will lay out the mitigation/data recovery to gather all data from the eligible historic properties. Joe S. asked about the small landlocked parcel for GovGuam education. Al B. said that potential operations will be excluded from parcels under GovGuam control, such as fenced areas where GWA wells are located. When Robert C. asked if actual operational effects will be better known in the future, Al B. confirmed, and suggested touching base with JRM Chief of Staff (CAPT Grimes) to ensure no conflicts between GovGuam and DoD operations at Andersen South.
55. P-103, the potable well construction project on Andersen Air Force Base (AAFB) was discussed, mentioning that the footprint/APE was moved to avoid impacting any historic properties, and that historic properties near the APE will be monitored regularly to assess condition.
56. P-102 for the Harmon-AAFB Power Upgrade corridor has had 3 small areas added to its APE (for laydown and green waste staging area), in areas that have already been surveyed and consulted upon with SHPO. John Mark J. agreed low likelihood of issues since areas has been reviewed prior.

57. Related to P-290 munition storage project, John Mark J. mentioned Mason Architects projects to look at possible “munitions district” within AAFB Munitions Storage Area. (Bill M. mentioned in a post-meeting note that a nationwide Program Comment has resolved Section 106 requirements for such properties.)
58. J-200-2 will extend communication utilities to the LFTRC from North Ramp and a PA Memo would be required.
59. Ronnie R. mentioned Naval Base Guam (NBG) clinic next to new minimart and across from Chapel. At this point John Mark J. commented that a tunnel was found near the Charles King Gym (close proximity to clinic area) and this area should have been given “high” probability, not “low” (referring to the probability mapping from the 2008 PA). Consultation is already complete for the J-006 Medical/Dental Clinic.

Open Discussion

60. Vivian D. stated GovGuam recently tasked Guam Environmental Protection Agency (GEPA) to test soil for Agent Orange within DoD footprint and inquired whether any buildup project may affect Agent Orange testing sites. Al B. stated it is at the JRM level to coordinate Agent Orange testing areas, but based on maps seen during a visit at Guam EPA and timing of buildup projects, it is unlikely that there are conflicts. Nonetheless, Al B. will double-check with JRM environmental staff.
61. Joe S. presented a brief film showing some future plans for Hagåtña development.
62. John Mark J. stated the GIS from Navy does not line up and asked where these were acquired. He said he will need original maps and then need to georeferenced all maps. To this Jolie L. stated she/IARII did all JGBU GIS in 2010, to which John Mark J. stated they are still wrong. Joe S. and Al B. mentioned “GIS Users Group” and Al B. set out action item for Sandy Y. (DoD Liaison to SHPO) to work with JRM to check DoD GIS accuracy.
63. Ronnie R. discussed additional methods to distribute information to the public, to which Al B. suggested public subscription to a mailing list/email list for updates at <https://go.usa.gov/x5BQS>.
64. John Mark J. then brought up the concerns with the terms “consulting” and “concurring.” Kate K. explained that 36 CFR 800 defines consulting parties and added that although the public is not a consulting party, agencies must plan to inform the public and receive input, so their voice can be heard. Bill M. added that the 2011 PA includes several measures to ensure that the public is informed and has opportunities to comment. Al B. noted that a “re-invite” to all parties previously invited and a new invitation to Prutehi Litekyan were sent on April 24, 2017, and that consulting parties invited can sign on to the 2011 PA or a member of the general public can sign up to be part of the general mailing list. Additionally the public can keep up with all actions and consultations via the CRI website. Ronnie R. suggested checking in with consulting parties that were recently re-invited to join the DoD meeting with Guam SHPO when reviewing the semi-annual report.
65. Kate K. of ACHP defined the three types of parties to the 2011 PA: 1) Signatories - the necessary parties of the agreement which are DoD, ACHP, and SHPO, 2) Invited Signatories - representatives of agencies with specific responsibilities under the 2011 PA and 3) Concurring Parties – individuals and organizations are deeply involved in historic preservation. Only Signatories can amend or terminate the 2011 PA.
66. Kate K. thanked the CNMI SHPO, Mertie K., for attending and mentioned the CNMI Joint Military Training (CJMT) and 2010 ROD Tinian projects. She indicated that the 2011 PA may need to be amended, depending on the resolution of Section 106 consultations to support the CJMT project. Robert C. asked if CNMI will get a federally funded museum. Wes Bogdan of CNMI mentioned that even if there is no CJMT PA, the current 2011 PA for the buildup requires the DoD to seek \$1.7 million for the construction of a repository and cultural and interpretive center in the CNMI.
67. Joe G. requested DoD resurvey “slivers of land” around AAFB, especially coastal, where there are private or public land, not land under DoD jurisdiction. This needs checking with the Guam Department of Land

Management. Al B. stated that the request will be relayed to DoD real estate staff to consider, an clarified that this effort is not part of the 2011 PA.

68. Regarding the tree harvest prior to clearing, John Mark J. asked who will be responsible to guard the trees from theft. Dave S. and Joe S. stated that all carvers interested in trees will be notified of location and date, with arrangements for carvers to pick up as expeditiously as possible. Once delivered outside DoD jurisdiction, carvers have responsibility for the wood material.

Closing Remarks

69. Bill M. delivered closing remarks, thanking all participants for prior and current efforts. The 2011 PA's success is a direct result of PA Parties' willingness to partner on solutions and the Navy looks forward to continued engagement.

Action Items from April 27, 2017 Workshop

1. ACHP (Kate K.) would like a white paper on efforts to fund complete museum complex (VII.C.4.b). Wants to know what actions were taken and if more actions need to be taken. Bill M. and Gary K. have for action.
2. ACHP wants a summary of previous PA workshops. Would like to provide it to any new entities that sign on to the 2011 PA. Ronnie R. to provide minutes from prior workshops.
3. Have future discussion with 2011 PA parties on potential amendments as a result of CJMT Programmatic Agreement. MARFORPAC has for future action, any update on status to be provided in next Annual Workshop.
4. Offer public an opportunity to sign on to email list to get information. LT Gorman had previously offered to use electronic mailing list. Info was provided on flyer. DoD PAOs will provide link in PSA for PA Memos, SHPO Liaison will check for inclusion in PSAs as part updated procedures.
5. Joe G. requested that some compensation be offered to Fisherman's co-op as mitigation for loss of traditional access to fishing waters off northern Guam when ranges are active. MCAG has for action once ranges are in operation and the actual timeframe/nature of restrictions are known. Impacts can be specifically discussed as part of future engagement and outreach with affected community members (~CY 2024).
6. John Mark J. described problems with matching JRM and SHPO GIS. Al B. recommended continued engagement with Shawn A., recommended another meeting on GIS. Al B., Sandy Y. and Shawn A. have for action.
7. Regarding identifying a GovGuam staging area for tree harvest: Joe S. and Dave S. will coordinate on location.
8. Robert C. requested a list of major sites for public dissemination that might have been part of ancient villages. Joe G. added that they don't want every pottery scatter or similar minor sites, just substantial sites (names should be aligned with old place names e.g. Haputo, Dobo and Dadi). Sandy Y. will provide at earliest opportunity, as part of SHPO Liaison workload.
9. Robert C. suggested coordination between DoD PAOs and Governor's PAO to post information on the GovGuam TV channel. JRM/NFM/MCAG PAOs for action to engage with GovGuam.
10. John Mark J. requested that DoD consider increasing the APE of projects rather than have many revisions to PA Memos for subsequent changes to APEs. Sandy Y. will add as part of quality control procedures for PA Memos and relay concern to AAFB/NBG.