

**Comments Received on PA Memo #2
P-103 Design and Construction of Water Well Development (AAFB)**

Comment Number	Comment Type	Name or UserID	Comment	Response
1	Email	David Lotz, NPS	Page 2 states the identification efforts were made in consultation with the National Park Service. Please provide the documentation of the National Park Service efforts regarding this.	This paragraph refers to consultation on the Undertaking, and these efforts were documented and provided to the Signatories and Invited Signatories via Appendices D and E of the 2011 PA.
2	Email	David Lotz, NPS	On page 3 is a statement that one archaeological site was identified and determined ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Please provide sufficient documentation for the readers to have a clear understanding of this archaeological site and the determination of eligibility [sic].	Please see the “Comments Received on PA Memo #1” section of the PA Memo. In response to Guam SHPO’s comment #2, the Navy has provided discussion on the site.
3	Email	David Lotz, NPS	On page 9 of the 2011 PA, section Iv. E. 2.b. states a requirement of ARPA and NHPA "prohibit Federal Agencies from publicly disclosing the exact nature and location of archaeological sites,," A reading of these statutes is that they are discretionary and procedural regarding ARPA. Please provide the documentation where this non-disclosure of this specific site in this memo has been made.	Documentation on non-disclosure of the site referred to in your comment is not made in the PA Memo. Section 304 of the National Historic Preservation Act does not apply to this site, as it is not an “historic property” defined in the regulations. The Archaeological Resources Protection Act’s confidentiality provisions Part 7.18 directs “The Federal land manager shall not make available to the public, under subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5 of the United States Code or any other provision of law, information concerning the nature and location of any archaeological resource, with the following exceptions: (1) The Federal land manager may make information available, provided that the disclosure will further the purposes of the Act and this part, or the Act of June 27, 1960, as amended (16 U.S.C. 469 through 469c), without risking harm to the archaeological resource or to the site in which it is located. (2) The Federal land manager shall make information available, when the Governor of any State has submitted to the Federal land manager a written request for information, concerning the archaeological resources within the requesting Governor's State....”
4	CRI Website	Senator Therese M. Terlaje	This substantial project includes the design and construction of a water well system located within the Anderson Air Force Base (AAFB) on the west side of the Munitions Storage Area (MSA), in order to supply a majority of water (over 1	Comments were submitted by the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) during the review period for PA Memo #1. Consultation pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires federal agencies to seek the views of the SHPO in identifying historic properties and assessing effects. Subsequent to receiving the

		<p>million gallons of water a day) to serve the increase in personnel, facilities, and operations associated with the military relocation. Additionally, P-103 proposes large-scale land clearing, construction, and ground disturbance that would have reasonably foreseeable effects on coastal uses, cultural resources, and natural resources including undue stress on the Guam Northern Lens Aquifer. This project proposes for the installation of a number of water wells, transmission lines, pumps, storage, water treatment, communications and power, which would cause significant alterations to the limestone forest as well as Guam's current public water system.</p> <p>The Guam SHPO did not agree with the "no adverse effect determination" presented in the previous PA memo. Furthermore the SHPO identified a number of inaccuracies in previous surveys for the APE for P-103, further probing the question if the Navy's finding that no historic properties are to be affected in the APE is accurate. Additionally, the participation of SHPO is required in consultations, and this memo reflects that further action took place without SHPO's participation.</p> <p>Therefore, I object to this proposed phase of P-103. All historic properties should be avoided, and this project should not proceed without final consensus and explicit approval by Guam SHPO. Furthermore, I urge DOD to respond to the requirement from the SHPO for a resurvey and further consultation for this revised project and APE. The surveys included in this memo are comprised of multiple studies by the same contractor. DOD may need to identify a diverse range of companies for future surveys.</p> <p>I also object to the removal of several acres of recovery habitat for threatened or endangered species within the APE. There are a number</p>	<p>Guam SHPO's comments, the DoD had three qualified archaeologists conduct a field visit and additional information was gathered. That information was provided to the Guam SHPO as well as presented in PA Memo #2. The DoD appropriately considered the comments received in identifying historic properties and assessing effects. The archaeological site located within the Area of Potential Effects does not meet National Register criteria for designation as an historic property. In addition, the DoD has provided sufficient documentation in accordance with 36 CFR § 800.11(d) to support the project's "no historic properties affected" finding.</p> <p>For clarity, Section 106 consultation and the PA Memo process stipulated in the 2011 Programmatic agreement is intended to seek views on the identification of historic properties and assessment of effects. Other types of comments are unable to be addressed through this process.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>of critical cultural resources including high-valued endangered species. Rare orchids and cycads, an ancient slow-growing tree that takes decades to mature and pollinate, and the Marianas Fruit Bat are some of those species and cultural resources that will be impacted within the APE.</p> <p>Lastly, the Northern Guam Lens Aquifer is a precious resource that must be protected. Rehabilitation is not a viable option. As I have previously stated in my comments for the Federal Consistency review for the same project, GWA should solely be in control of the pumping levels to ensure that increased pumping does not adversely affect the Northern Guam Lens Aquifer, or adversely affect the transmission of potable water to Guam residents outside of the base. GWA must at all times be authorized to adjust pumping levels to address changes in precipitation patterns due to climate change and long-term drought. Guam EPA should also have authority to decrease pumping levels to ensure the protection of the aquifer. Activities within the wellhead protection zone should also be approved by GWA and WERI, in addition to the Guam EPA.</p>	
--	--	---	--