

**ARMY ALTERNATE PROCEDURES (AAP)  
INTRODUCTORY MEETING MINUTES**

**11 August 2008**

Picatinny Arsenal Garrison Staff and Interested Stakeholders met 11 August 08 in Building 3002 (Directorate of Public Works [DPW]), Large Conference Room, from 0915 to 1155 hours. Lunch was served till 1245 with Site Tours resuming afterwards from 1300 to 1530 hours.

**Attendees**

LTC John Stack	Picatinny Arsenal Garrison Commander
Chris McDaid	Installation Management Command (IMCOM), Northeast Region, Cultural Resource Manager
Richard Havrisko	DPW, Director
Freddy Sanchez	Environmental Affairs Division (EAD)
Sybil Lusardi	Environmental, Armament Research, Development, and Engineering Center (ARDEC)
Sarah Killinger	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), Army Liaison for Army Environmental Command (AEC)
Dan Saunders	NJ State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)
Richard Walter	DPW, Engineering
Michael Maier	DPW, Master Planning
Chris Urbiola	Chugach Industries, Inc., Master Planning
Jack Lyons	DPW, Real Property
Luis Martin	Chugach Industries, Inc., Real Property
Carolyn Moran	Chugach Industries, Inc., Civil Engineering
Gil Myers	EAD
Jon Van De Venter	EAD
Jason Huggan	Chugach Industries, Inc., Environmental
Peg Shultz	Morris County Heritage Commission
Kathy Fisher	Morris County Heritage Commission
Marion Harris	Mount Hope Historical Conservancy/ Morris County Trust for Historic Preservation
Mary Habstritt	Society for Industrial Archaeology, Roebling Chapter

**Absent Members**

Larry Brady	Garrison Legal
Tom Solecki (Freddy Sanchez represented)	EAD, Chief
Terry Crummett	Chugach Industries, Inc., Project Manager
Vincent Maresca	SHPO
Greg Lattanzi	NJ State Museum
Carrie Fellows (Peg Shultz and Kathy Fisher represented)	Morris County Heritage Commission
Christine Williams	Jefferson Township Historical Society
Don Erickson	Historical Society of the Rockaways
Lynn Rakos (Mary Habstritt represented)	Society for Industrial Archaeology, Roebling Chapter

**Absent Members via Conference Call**

Tamara Francis	Delaware Nation of Oklahoma
Sherry White	Stockbridge-Munsee Community, Mohican Nation of Wisconsin
Greg Miller	Stockbridge-Munsee Community, Mohican Nation of Wisconsin
Dr. Brice Obermeyer	Delaware Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma
Karen Kaniatobe	Absentee Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma
Belinda Pryor	Shawnee Tribe
Chief David Stands with Song Hughes	Cherokee Nation of New Jersey
Richard O'Connor	National Park Service (NPS), Heritage Documentation Program

Mr. Jason Huggan called the meeting to order at 0915 hours.

**Summary**

Mr. Jason Huggan, Picatinny's Cultural Resource Manager with Chugach Industries, Inc. gave a presentation regarding the Garrison's decision to implement Army Alternate Procedures (AAP) to its Historic Properties and Section 106 Consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) under the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966. Section 106 (36 CFR 800) requires Federal Agencies to identify, evaluate, protect, and preserve Cultural Resources and Historic Properties. Implementation of the AAP should streamline the Section

106 Consultation process at Picatinny through the Certification of Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) within a Historic Property Component Plan (HPC). These SOPs and the HPC would be implemented on a 5-year cycle for undertakings such as Service Orders, Individual Job Orders (IJO), and other projects. These procedures will be tracked through the Picatinny Environmental Management System (PEMS). Additionally, Mr. Huggan discussed Picatinny's current Master Plan and Demolition List. This includes development for Base Realignment and Closure Actions (BRAC) (2005 Congressional Decision) as Picatinny is receiving additional operations and facilities.

Other topics discussed included Military Housing and the Residential Communities Initiative (RCI) managed by Balfour Beatty, Real Property and building lists, Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) and contaminated soil removal actions for CERCLA (Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act), new development and siting constraints, archaeological sites and Native American affairs, Geographic Information Systems (GIS) shapefiles, and curation and archaeological collections.

The meeting concluded with a windshield tour for Stakeholders of the following areas:

1. Administrative and Research Historic District,
2. Picatinny Lake Dam,
3. Picatinny Peak,
4. 600 Ordnance Area Historic District (604 - 620 Area),
5. Walton Cemetery,
6. Rocket Test (1500) Area Historic District, and
7. Naval Rocket Testing Area D (3600 Area) Historic District.

### **Agenda (Slide 2)**

Mr. Jason Huggan reviewed the AAP Meeting agenda as follows:

- Current State of Cultural Resources
- Alternate Procedures - How It Works and What It Means for Picatinny
- Undertakings
  - Service Orders
  - IJOs
  - PEMS
- New Construction
  - Master Plan
  - Mission, Garrison, and BRAC priorities
- Building Demolitions
- Archaeological Sites and Native American Affairs
- Curation and Archaeological Collections
- UXO investigations
- CERCLA Clean-up/Remediation Sites
- RCI and Balfour Beatty
- Timelines
- Real Property

- GIS
- SOPs
  - Proposed procedures for adverse effect, no adverse effect and no effect determinations within the HPC Plan over the next 5 years
- NHPA and AAP Process

### **Introductions**

Mr. Jason Huggan opened the meeting by welcoming the Stakeholders to Picatinny for this important meeting. LTC Stack introduced himself and discussed the importance of AAP implementation in executing Mission and Garrison actions, environmental and UXO constraints during new development, and the demolition of buildings. LTC Stack also explained that Mr. Huggan is the Cultural Resource Manager; however the installation also has a Historian, Dr. Patrick Owens. The remaining attendees introduced themselves.

### **Current State of Cultural Resources (Slide 4)**

Mr. Jason Huggan briefly reviewed the historical background of Picatinny Arsenal as follows:

- (1) Army Depot and Arsenal since 1880;
- (2) Prior to this, iron forges, farms, and mines existed in the vicinity dating to the Revolutionary War period;
- (3) Naval presence occurred over 315 acres of the Arsenal from 1891 to 1960;
- (4) In 1926, the Navy's Lake Denmark Powder Depot had a series of explosions during a lightning storm;
- (5) The Cold War period- intense Army, Navy, and private contractor rocket research, development, and testing;
- (6) Today - Joint Service Armament Research and Development Center occupying approximately 5,850 acres

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

- 630 acres have been surveyed for Cultural Resources across 152 Archaeologically Sensitive Areas and ~ 2,050 Sensitive Acres. These numbers have been revised from previous Integrated Cultural Resource Management Plans (ICRMP) as the latest installment for 2008 thru 2013 is being finalized;
- 27 archaeological sites have been identified of both prehistoric and historic nature;
- Approximately 90+ potential archaeological sites that have been historically mapped through research. These sites include homesteads, iron forge remains, dwellings, and isolated prehistoric resources that may or may no longer exist;
- One (1) cemetery, Walton Family and Hessian Soldiers Cemetery;
- 75-80% of structures have been assessed for NRHP eligibility;

- 102 contributing and 24 non-contributing buildings to five (5) large historic districts;
- Two (2) individually eligible buildings; and
- 1 individually eligible architectural resource which are the Arsenal's Cannon Gates.

### **AAP: How It Works and What It Means for Picatinny (Slides 5 - 6)**

Mr. Jason Huggan reviewed the basic strategy of implementing AAP at Picatinny. He explained it would streamline procedures satisfying the requirements of Section 106 (36 CFR 800) of the NHPA. Currently, the installation approaches Historic Properties on a case-by-case project basis; with AAP implementation in-place, Historic Properties and projects would be managed programmatically. He stated that this would implement better SOPs at the Garrison level within the ICRMP and would improve overall stewardship of Historic Properties through the HPC Plan.

Mr. Huggan continued to explain that AAP implementation would

- benefit the Stakeholders with more productive outreach allowing them to get in on the ground floor on the installation's projects;
- help define the procedures for the treatment of Historic Properties;
- align favorably with Mission requirements and goals for completing projects effectively and efficiently, and
- allow for better training to the Garrison workforce leading to overall improved processes.

Mr. Huggan concluded by stating that local decision-making would be undertaken by the EAD with Stakeholder involvement if warranted. Overall, he finished by asserting that projects would not change and would still need to meet certain design standards, appearance, and protocol, but what would change would be the timing of the consultation process and SOPs as the project is handled internally.

### **Undertakings (Slide 7)**

Mr. Jason Huggan reviewed daily undertakings at Picatinny to include Service Orders, such as general maintenance projects to buildings, grounds, and minimal excavations and disturbances; IJOs and larger planned projects, including new construction and design build strategies, alterations and renovations, and upgrades to comply with accessibility, safety, and Anti-Terrorism Force Protection (ATFP) standards needed for Army Military Command (AMC) and Dept. of Defense (DoD) installations.

Mr Huggan concluded that these projects are tracked in PEMS, which is an Internet-based environmental review and permitting system that disseminates the required procedures and guidance to complete projects. He finished by stating that the AAP, HPC Plan, and SOPs would be incorporated into the PEMS system allowing for more integrated tracking of projects procedures for reporting and better compliance driven standards for the Garrison workforce personnel.

### **New Construction (Slides 8 - 10)**

Picatinny's current Master Plan was explained by Mr. Jason Huggan. Currently, the installation has proposed 16 Mission oriented projects including test ranges and other ARDEC driven construction, 10 Garrison priority projects including administrative, recreational, housing, and other installation support upgrades and renovations, and four (4) BRAC related projects. He clarified further that of these 30 new construction projects, 13 are within the Short Range Program and are currently scheduled for design, 15 are Long Range Component and remain unscheduled at this time, and three (3) are ongoing on an annual basis for general roof, fence, and road repair.

Mr. Huggan proceeded to explain Master Plan actions have been in design in some form since 2004:

- Section 106 actions have been completed for three (3) projects
  - Child Development Center and
  - 2 separate projects occurring in the 640 Test Range area;
- Section 106 identification and evaluation actions occurring for 10 projects in stages with funding; and
- 11 projects have been determined to require no Cultural Resource investigation as they are proposed in existing and previously disturbed areas.

Mr. Huggan continued by stating that previously disturbed project areas require the implementation of SOPs during the construction process for the inadvertent discovery and unintentional excavation of unidentified Cultural Resources. It was also explained that SOPs are adhered to during UXO investigations that occur prior to construction.

Mr. Huggan further explained that of the 30 new projects, 3 have the potential to adversely affect Historic Properties eligible for the NRHP. These projects are:

- Dam Upgrades, scheduled to occur during 2009 at both Picatinny Lake and Lake Denmark Dams with archaeological monitoring as significant resources are expected due to historic iron forges in the vicinity. This project is required by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJ DEP), Dam Safety and Flood Control Board. Mr. Huggan proceeded to explain that Phase I archaeological surveys have been impeded at both locations as potential UXO concerns may also exist below the surface. As a result, ground penetrating radar and monitoring will be involved during the project for both buried UXO and archaeological features.

Ms. Marion Harris asked about the accessibility of research concerning previously identified UXO locations and explosion areas as they also are a developmental historical picture of the Arsenal. LTC Stack mentioned that this is being compiled by the Installation Explosive Safety Office. Mr. Jon Van De Venter further added that this would have to be approved by Security for its dissemination for public access and research purposes.

- Development and Site Construction Reasoning for the Demolition of Buildings 1510 and 1510B for BRAC actions. Mr. Chris Urbiola, Chugach Master Planning and Mr. Rich

Havrisko, DPW Director, proceeded to explain the following reasons for siting the new construction at the current Building 1510 footprint:

- similar existing and future Mission research and development area at Building 1530 and within remaining 1500 Area;
- size of new facility compared to Quantity Distance Safety Requirements as the new facility must be separated by an Unbarricaded Intraline Distance (ILD) of 66 ft from surrounding structures without requiring hardening of the proposed structure;
- Category One Waterways restrictions increasing from a 150 to 300 ft buffer, and surrounding tributary and wetlands restrictions in relation to an increase in impervious coverage and floodplains; and
- the renovation of existing buildings 1509, 1510, or 1512 being not feasible as these facilities would require major renovations and rehabilitations to meet current Safety requirements for OSHA, U.S. Army Technical Center for Explosives Safety, and Army Military Command. These buildings also have major asbestos and lead-based paint remediation issues inherently within.

As a result of these constraints, the footprint of Building 1510 was chosen as the best location for the new facility, while the adjacent structure, Building 1510B, was listed for demolition as it is within the ILD of the new structure. This requires a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between Picatinny and the SHPO for the mitigation documentation of the buildings meeting Level II of the Historic American Building Survey and the Historic American Engineering Record of the NPS. Additionally, Mr. Huggan mentioned that the new building in the 1500 Area would be built in-like design to other surrounding buildings.

- Enhanced Use Lease (EUL) of approximately 120 acres along Parker Road and the Main Entrance Gate. Of these 120 acres, approximately 15 to 20 acres have been surveyed for Cultural Resources and are complete for Section 106 actions. During this Phase I survey, a prehistoric archaeological site was identified and investigated at the Phase II level as not eligible for the NRHP. The remaining ~ 100 acres of EUL are proposed for future out-year development and are presently unscheduled at this time due to the current real estate market. Mr. Huggan concluded by stating that if EUL development continues, additional Phase I Cultural Resource Survey would be required. During this discussion, LTC Stack explained Army leasing such as EUL, electric, water, and lastly Military Housing and the RCI and Balfour Beatty maintenance contract agreement.

Mr. Huggan concluded by stating a Programmatic Agreement should be developed for both Master Plan and BRAC actions. He further clarified that this PA would assist the installation in working on parts of the AAP implementation as certain SOPs would be completed earlier in the AAP implementation process. Additionally, these PAs will assist Picatinny Garrison's current focus of development and demolition of buildings as part of the Army footprint reduction and consolidation program.

LTC Stack and Mr. Havrisko then gave a background on BRAC receiving actions at Picatinny. LTC Stack also went over the siting of new construction and the constraints involved from safety

arcs for quantity distance of explosive operations, CERCLA and soil contamination, SHPO, Category 1 Waterways, wetlands, Indiana Bat, and surrounding Mission similarity/conformity.

Further questions were then asked by Ms. Harris who inquired about the installations relationship within the Highlands Commission regulations. LTC Stack and Mr. Gil Myers responded by stating that Picatinny is exempt from the Highlands Preservation Area and instead located within the Highlands Planning Area. Additionally, Mr. Dan Saunders inquired upon the installation's communication with the EPA in relation to CERCLA actions. LTC Stack explained that the installation has a relationship with the NJ DEP and the EPA that meets quarterly known as the Environmental Restoration Advisory Board.

### **Building Demolition (Slide 11)**

Mr. Jason Huggan continued by explaining the installation's current demolition plan for both Master Plan and BRAC priorities, and severely deteriorated excess buildings no longer being used. Overall, approximately 240 to 250 structures are scheduled for demolition over the next 3 to 5 yrs. Some of these structures were listed for demolition over 10 years ago; however due to funding and contamination issues, the buildings have been left standing to natural neglect. Mr. Huggan continued by stating that of these 240 – 250 structures,

- 187 have been determined not eligible for the NRHP and require no further action except notification to the SHPO,
- 31 still need NRHP eligibility assessments,
- 20 have been determined eligible for the NRHP and require an MOA and HABS HAER documentation before disposal actions occur,
- 69 have already been approved with SHPO for demolition concurrence and
- ~ 120 still need SHPO approval.

LTC Stack further described the state of some of Picatinny's buildings, their abandonment and lack of operation in relation to the use of Base Operations funding in maintaining these depreciated structures. Mr. Huggan proceeded to explain that field research has shown these numbers are not accurate to the actual number of buildings already deteriorated to a demolished state. Additionally, due to discrepancies in Installation Real Property lists, some facilities remain on file that were approved for demolition years ago.

Mr. Huggan concluded by stating the installation should develop a Demolition PA to reduce the overall effect and the potential for multiple MOAs for proposed Historic Building demolitions. This PA will be wrapped into the Master Plan and BRAC agreement, therefore reducing workload and redundancy.

### **Other Undertakings & Concerns (Slide 12)**

Mr. Jason Huggan explained prehistoric archaeological sites at Picatinny and the overall Native American affairs in relation to Delaware and Stockbridge-Munsee Tribes ancestral ties. Thus

far, 17 prehistoric sites have been identified and 4 have been investigated at the Phase II NRHP Level with none determined eligible.

Mr. Huggan continued by stating from the 630 acres surveyed for Cultural Resources, an estimated total of ~ 12 boxes are currently stored on the installation. Overall, the future long-term curation solution will be off-site.

UXO investigations CERCLA soil clean-up and remedial action excavations were then discussed as they sometimes occur before archaeological surveys. As this occurs, SOPs are implemented for inadvertent discovery of unidentified Cultural Resources for later incorporation into Phase I Survey reports, if artifacts are recovered.

Finally, Mr. Huggan concluded with proposed revisions for the standing RCI and Balfour Beatty PA from 2004. Balfour Beatty took over management operations for Picatinny's housing in June 2008. The prior contract was held by Gary Michael Holloway (GMH) Military Housing, LLC. Balfour Beatty maintains all military housing on Picatinny, including five (5) historic quarters- 112, 113, 114, 115, and 3250. These historic quarters are in the process of being renovated by John Cullinane & Associates, Inc. (Maryland). Mr. Huggan explained that he would like to see the PA updated to include Balfour Beatty's name over GMH insertions, the occurrence of UXO investigations prior to archaeological survey, demolition and construction timeline, and Native American affairs with potential Tribal signatures.

### **Timelines (Slide 13)**

Mr. Jason Huggan proceeded with the installation's timeline for AAP implementation as follows:

1. 2008 - 2013 ICRMP approaching completion by the end of October 2008;
2. Revisions to the RCI and Balfour Beatty PA to be completed by the end of October 2008;
3. PA development for Master Plan, BRAC, and Demolition for completion before the end of March 2009. Another Stakeholder meeting is needed before completion. He mentioned that these additional Stakeholder meetings would involve local and regional people with a conference call session and may be located elsewhere besides Picatinny;
4. SOP development for AAP implementation and the HPC Plan with another Stakeholder meeting to occur by October 2009; and
5. Draft HPC Plan preparation with the last Stakeholder meeting to occur by April 2010,

Overall, Mr. Huggan estimates approximately 1 ½ to 2 Years for completion of AAP implementation with HPC Plan certification and finalization to occur by Summer 2010.

He also stated that dates for Public Meeting(s) should occur within this timeline and the final notice by approximately May 2010 during Draft review. He mentioned that developing the large PA for Master Plan and BRAC development, and the demolition list would allow the installation to work on finalizing SOPs and sections of the HPC plan earlier in the AAP implementation process.

Mr. Huggan concluded by stating that quarterly progress updates will be distributed by email to Picatinny personnel and Stakeholders to keep open dialogue between all involved parties during the process.

Finally, Mr. Dan Saunders mentioned that the AAP is a lot of work and if possible, he would like to see quicker implementation. Ms. Sarah Killinger responded by explaining similar time periods of implementation at other installations like Fort Benning, Fort Sam Houston, Alaska, and Fort Hood. She also discussed that the framework of Stakeholder meetings and future annual reports would build a strong relationship with Consulting Parties for further overall satisfaction of AAP and the SOPs at Picatinny. Ms. Killinger concluded by stating AAP clearly saves time and resources, and provides more of an overall picture of the installation's Historic Property actions to the Stakeholders and the public at large.

*BREAK (1030 - 1045): Some Picatinny Garrison staff departed the meeting. Stakeholders were given a map and tabular handout demonstrating areas of future undertakings and new construction in graphic relation to Cultural Resource Management concerns discussed.*

### **New Construction In-Depth (Slide 15)**

After the break, Mr. Jason Huggan reviewed the Cultural Resource Management concern areas in relation to the 30 new projects across the installation in detail. He also referenced several other projects including:

- Access Gate Upgrades for ATRP at the Main Entrance Parker Road Gate, Mount Hope Gate, Truck Gate, and the Escape Trail Gate;
- two 150' cellular tower locations (Section 106 completed); and
- a 150' radio tower for Test Range operations and communication.

At this time, Ms. Peg Shultz and Ms. Kathy Fisher inquired upon the dissemination of the required FCC New Tower Form 620 for SHPO for the cell towers. Mr. Huggan stated that SHPO concurrence was received in February and April 2008 and that their office (Morris County Heritage Commission) was notified by the Verizon subcontractor (E2PM, LLC). They could not recall this; as a result, Mr. Huggan will distribute copies of the SHPO documentation to the Stakeholders.

*Tasker: Distribute copies of Cell Tower SHPO documentation to Stakeholders.*

### **Real Property (Slide 16)**

Mr. Jason Huggan reviewed the current state of the installation's Real Property and existing building lists, which are compiled annually for the Installation Status Report (ISR) and the Integrated Facilities System (IFS). Mr. Huggan's research has shown that approximately ~ 846 buildings have been demolished since the 1969 Real Property Inventory, and of these ~ 483 were not assessed for NRHP with the majority being under 45-50 yrs of age at their suspected time of demolition. Mr. Huggan has comprehensively reorganized prior and existing Real Property data into a Historic Building Assessment Catalog, allowing for a more evolutionary and developmental picture for each industrial area. This catalog lists existing buildings, associated Real Property assets that include architectural supporting features, land, etc., and known demolished structures including documentation and/or interview confirmations. Prior ICRMP

building lists were not synchronized with the IFS and ISR systems, therefore lacking substantial data. He stated that this reorganization occurred due to the installation's unique history in relation to its military industrial areas and past operations that have ultimately led to contamination throughout many buildings resulting in abandoned, vacant, and closed areas and placement on the National Priority Listing for Federal Facilities (Superfund). Overall, accurate Real Property information and lists are a requirement and goal of the AEC and IMCOM for Heritage Asset reporting and auditing purposes. (To note, additional regulatory and compliance information can be found in Executive Order 13327, "Federal Real Property Asset Management".)

Mr. Huggan then went back to Slide 11, Building Demolition, for further reference and explanation of the Garrison demolition plan.

### **GIS and Spatial Standards (Slide 17)**

Mr. Jason Huggan discussed the installation's Cultural Resource GIS shapefiles which include

- identified archaeological sites,
- potential archaeological sites which are mostly historic sites from previous research and mapping,
- archaeological sensitivity areas which include surveyed areas and previously identified prehistoric sensitive areas in the Installation Waterways Experiment Station Report (1996), and
- historic buildings and districts.

Mr. Huggan proceeded stating that the installation still needs to gather data for isolated areas that were not defined as actual archaeological sites from prior Cultural Resource Management reports, Walton Cemetery headstones, and Real Property information to include existing and demolished structures. These additional shapefiles are needed to meet AEC and IMCOM's current spatial standard goals for data management (<http://www.versar.com/mcrad-com/secure/mcrad-com-files/main.htm>).

Furthermore, Mr. Huggan stated that he is also working on a layer depicting known stonewall locations giving insight to additional archaeological site locations. This layer is being distributed from previous hunting maps by Mr. Jon Van De Venter.

Overall the following Taskers came from this discussion:

- (1) *Distribution of copies of Cultural Resource Management reports to Morris County Heritage Commission for archival storage and public research access. Security check needed for this as Morris County access requirements may be different than SHPOs. It was stated from the Stakeholders that access of reports at just the SHPO is sometimes difficult.*
- (2) *Upon finalization, distribute GIS shapefiles SHPO (Kinney Clark) as part of their Pilot Project Initiative. Security check needed for this.*

### **Curation and Archaeological Collections (Slide 18)**

Mr. Jason Huggan discussed the state of archaeological collections and curation at Picatinny. Currently, ~ 10 to 12 boxes of artifacts are located at Building 319 (EAD) and 3128 (Warehouse Space). Both areas have HVAC units, are secure, and Building 319 is accessible to the public. This meets the installations' short-term needs and all artifacts are planned to be moved to Building 319 by Winter 2009. He also stated that copies of artifact catalogs still need to be sent to the State Museum. Furthermore, Mr. Huggan added that Historic Conservation and Interpretation, Inc. has approximately ~ 2 more boxes of potentially eligible collections for 2 historic sites identified in 1986 and 1994.

Mr. Huggan then stressed the need for a curatorial repository to the Stakeholders as the installation is actively doing archaeological surveys leading to more collections in the future. This led to the discussion of Morris County Heritage Commission's (Ms. Peg Shultz and Ms. Kathy Fisher) archival storage area being a possible long-term solution if it is in compliance with 36 CFR 79.

*Tasker: Copy of regulation 36 CFR 79 to determine if Morris County Heritage Commission's archival storage area is in compliance.*

### **Standard Operating Procedures (Slides 19 - 20)**

Mr. Jason Huggan discussed several proposed SOPs for adverse effect, no adverse effect and no effect determinations for HPC Plan over the next 5 years to include the following:

- Service Orders and General Maintenance - including Interiors
  - Exempt Undertakings for Buildings
- IJOs, Annual Work Plan (AWP) Projects, Renovations and Alterations
  - ATFP, Safety, and Accessibility Upgrades
  - Rehabilitations and User Upgrades
  - Unified Facilities Criteria and Building Codes
  - Design Build
  - Exterior Colors of Buildings, including matching brick patterns
- Historic District Fluidity / Continuity
  - Viewsheds
  - Landscaping
  - Character Features (ie. Sidewalks, etc.)
- RCI and Balfour Beatty Management
- Real Property Actions
  - Conversions
- Historic Building Assessment Standards
  - Identification and Eligibility
- Demolition of Non-Historic and Historic Buildings
  - Mothballing
  - Alternative Mitigations
  - HABS/HAER Documentations
  - Reuse of Demolition Debris

- Archaeological Survey Standards
  - New Construction and Determination of Area of Potential Effects
  - Exempt Excavations - UXO, CERCLA, Geo-Technical Borings, Wetland Delineations, etc.
  - Phase I Identification
  - Phase II Evaluation
  - Curation and Artifact Storage, including Turning Collections Over to Picatinny
  - Data Sharing and Dissemination of GIS Data and Reports
- Resolving Adverse Effects and Inadvertent Discoveries
  - Emergency Actions and Post Review Incidences
- Desired Condition of Historic Districts, Buildings, and Archaeological Sites
  - Monitoring
  - Cemetery Maintenance
  - Acceptable Losses
- Coordination, Consultations, and Meetings
  - Tribal Relations
  - Site Visits and Tours
  - Public Outreach

After these SOPs were presented, Mr. Dan Saunders mentioned that SHPO has Building Assessment and Archaeological Survey Standards already in place. Mr. Huggan concurred stating that Picatinny's standards would be similar to SHPO's, yet applicable to our Installation's needs. Mr. Huggan continued by stating the SOPs would be fashioned similar to Fort Benning and Sam Houston's HPC Plan and made applicable to Picatinny's conditions. Ms. Sarah Killinger then asked Mr. Huggan to distribute copies of Fort Benning and Sam Houston's HPC Plan to the Stakeholders.

*Tasker: Copies of Fort Benning and Fort Sam Houston's HPC Plans to Stakeholders for further information.*

### **NHPA and AAP Process (Slide 21)**

Mr. Jason Huggan concluded the presentation by demonstrating to the Stakeholders the process for AAP implementation. He explained that a work flowchart would be developed for project proponent(s) with SOPs detailed. After receiving the project, the proponent would input it into PEMS which would follow the NEPA process with determinations given as such-

- Green Flag, No Effect;
- Green/Yellow Flag, No Adverse Effect with Conditional Approval;
- Yellow Flag, Potential Adverse Effect; and
- Red Flag, Adverse Effect and Project Revision.

During this, Mr. Chris McDaid explained the determination of effect process and if/when an MOA would be needed to the attention of the Stakeholders.

Finally, Mr. Huggan detailed that these projects would be tracked and managed by the Cultural Resource Manager and IT. Additionally, metrics would be reported to AEC, IMCOM and the Stakeholders either every 6-months or annually upon further agreement.

*LUNCH (1155 - 1245): A short brief was given by Mr. Chris McDaid of the nationwide Army policy towards Cultural Resources and the management of Historic Properties.*

### **Site Visits (Slide 22, 1245 - 1530)**

After lunch, Mr. Jason Huggan took the Stakeholders and interested Picatinny personnel on a windshield tour of Historic Property areas of the Arsenal to demonstrate some of the key points and projects discussed during the meeting. The following areas were visited:

1. Administrative and Research Historic District,
2. Picatinny Lake Dam,
3. Picatinny Peak,
4. 600 Ordnance Area Historic District (604 - 620 Area),
5. Walton Cemetery,
6. Rocket Test (1500) Area Historic District, and
7. Naval Rocket Testing Area D (3600 Area) Historic District

Two areas were not included during the tour due to time constraints- Lake Denmark Dam and the Biddle forge farm homestead.

*The AAP Introductory Meeting adjourned at 1530 hours.*

### **Follow-up Items for next AAP Meeting:**

*The following taskers should be completed to the Stakeholders:*

- (1) Distribute copies of Cell Tower SHPO documentation to Stakeholders;*
- (2) Distribution of copies of Cultural Resource Management reports to Morris County Heritage Commission for archival storage and public research access. SECURITY VERIFICATION TAKING PLACE for Morris County's access requirements compared to SHPO's;*
- (3) Distribute GIS shapefiles SHPO to Mr. Kinney Clark to support their Pilot Project Initiative. SECURITY VERIFICATION TAKING PLACE;*
- (4) Send Morris County Heritage Commission a copy of 36 CFR 79 to determine if their archival storage area is in compliance as a curatorial repository of Picatinny's archaeological collections. COMPLETE; and*
- (5) Distribute copies of Fort Benning, Fort Sam Houston, and Alaska's HPC Plans to Stakeholders for further information.*