



Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific
 258 Makalapa Drive
 Suite 100
 Pearl Harbor, HI 96860-3134

**MILITARY RELOCATION TO GUAM AND CNMI
 PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT (PA) MEMO #2**

<p>Project: P-103 Water Well Development-Design and Construction SHPO Reference: RC# 2016-0122</p>	<p>Date: February 15, 2018 Comment Period Closed: March 26, 2018</p>
<p>Project Location: Andersen Air Force Base</p>	<p>Prepared By: NAVFAC Pacific</p>

PROJECT SUMMARY:

NOTE: This PA Memo has been amended from 2016 to reflect changes in the Area of Potential Effects (APE) that were necessary as a result of design requirements. In addition, the DoD has determined that due to the timing of this memo, construction of the water wells should also be included.

This project proposes to conduct design studies and construction of water well facilities at Andersen Air Force Base. The wells would provide approximately 1.2 million gallons of water per day, and would be used to support the increase in personnel, facilities, and operations associated with the military relocation.

Design efforts include topographical surveys, geotechnical surveys, exploratory well drilling, and possible munitions of explosive concern (MEC) removal. Specifically, design efforts require vegetation trimming, geotechnical borings (via auger or rotary wash drilling), mechanized excavation, and exploratory water well drilling to facilitate soil and groundwater sample collection.

Generally, geotechnical surveys for structures, buildings, tanks, and roads entail drilling borings with a truck-mounted drill rig using 20.2 to 30.5 centimeter (8- to 12-inch) diameter augers or using rotary wash drilling with temporary steel casings and drilling fluid. Total number of borings will vary depending on facility type from 1 to 5 borings for each structure. Boring depths vary, but generally range from 3.0 meters (10 feet) to 36.6 meters (120 feet). Test pits will be excavated every 229 to 305 meters (750 to 1,000) feet along future permanent roads, and in future permanent facility yard areas for the treatment/transfer pump station and water storage reservoir. Test pit depths vary, but generally range from 1.5 to 3.0 meters (5 to 10 feet).

Exploratory water well work entails drilling 25.4 centimeter (10-inch) to 30.5 centimeter (12-inch)

1 This PA Memo is required by Stipulation IV.E.2.a. of the PA as a means for interested members of the public to provide comments on the identification and evaluation of historic properties. Stipulation IV.E.1.b. of the PA requires the DoD to take into account comments received within 45 days of the date of the delivery of this PA memo to the SHPO and public notification via the CRI website.

diameter boreholes with a truck-mounted drill rig. Pump tests will be carried out at each borehole to develop and determine the water production capacity of the well. If test wells have sufficient yield, boreholes will be widened to 45.7 centimeter (18-inch) to 55.9 centimeter (22-inch) diameter. Water well test borehole and production borehole depths vary, but generally range from 140 meters (460 feet) to 180 meters (590 feet) depending on existing ground surface elevations and depth to the groundwater table.

Construction of the water well system consists of raw water transmission lines, water treatment, water storage, water transfer pump facility, a power and communications system, and treated water transmission lines. Two of the well sites will be equipped with generator buildings and the remainder of the well sites will be equipped with electrical buildings. Construction work includes site preparation, paving and construction site improvements, electrical and mechanical utilities, and MEC removal.

Site preparation consists of vegetation clearing and grubbing across the construction area. Paving and construction site improvements include site demolition, construction of access roadways, an emergency access roadway, and installation of a 2.5 meter high chain link fence with cable barriers, bollards, and deadmen for the emergency access roadway. Electrical utilities will require primary electrical distribution, secondary electrical distribution, transformers, exterior lighting, and telecommunications infrastructure. Mechanical utilities include fire protection water distribution lines. Removal of MEC involves metal anomaly detection and investigation requiring hand excavation by qualified unexploded ordnance consultants.

This project was identified after preparation of the Final Environmental Impact Study (FEIS) for the military relocation to Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) and Appendix E under various projects of the 2011 Programmatic Agreement (PA). In accordance with Stipulation I.E. of the PA, it is a new project associated with the Guam and CNMI Military Relocation (the Undertaking). This memorandum presents information to allow the Guam State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) to provide comments on the identification and evaluation of historic properties in the proposed project area and the determination of effect.

PROJECT LOCATION:

The proposed well field site at Andersen Air Force Base (AAFB) is located near Potts Junction and Route 9 on the west side of the Munitions Storage Area (MSA) as shown in Figure 1. This project was previously identified in Appendix E of the PA. Note that the area identified in Figure 1 depicts a general area suitable for release to the public, as the well locations are withheld for security reasons. A buffer zone is included in planning to allow the contractors to avoid historic properties and threatened and endangered plant species.

AAFB covers 6,275 ha (15,500 acres) and occupies a mostly flat, uplifted limestone plateau in the northern portion of the island of Guam. The Main Operations area in the eastern third of the base

-
- 2 This PA Memo is required by Stipulation IV.E.2.a. of the PA as a means for interested members of the public to provide comments on the identification and evaluation of historic properties. Stipulation IV.E.1.b. of the PA requires the DoD to take into account comments received within 45 days of the date of the delivery of this PA memo to the SHPO and public notification via the CRI website.

includes the main active airfield and an array of operations, maintenance and community support facilities, most of which are located along the South Ramp. The North Ramp area includes operations of the Navy's HSC-25, munitions storage in the former Strategic Air Command storage area, and parking apron space for contingency operations. The central third of the base is a Munitions Storage Area (MSA). The western third is Northwest Field, a WWII-era airfield that is currently used for fixed-wing aircraft, helicopter training, and various field exercises and bivouacs.

The total APE for P-103 is 19.87 hectares (49.1 acres).

IDENTIFICATION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES:

Scope of DoD Identification Efforts

In planning for the Undertaking, the Department of Defense (DoD) first conducted a data gap analysis to determine the need for supplemental identification and evaluation surveys and then conducted those surveys. In consultation with the Guam SHPO, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), National Park Service (NPS) and Concurring Parties to the 2011 Programmatic Agreement (2011 PA), the DoD has applied the results of those identification efforts to the siting/lay down of individual projects to avoid and minimize effects to historic properties to the extent practical. DoD has provided documentation of these efforts to the Signatories and Invited Signatories via Appendices D and E of the 2011 PA.

DoD surveys and evaluations have focused on project-specific APEs, defined consistent with 36 CFR §800.16(d) to include those portions of the island of Guam subject to direct and indirect effects of projects included in the Undertaking.

More specifically, the entirety of the P-103 APE has been subject to one or more of the historic property identification efforts listed in 36 CFR §800.4(b)(1), which may include background research, consultation, oral history interviews, sample field investigation and field survey. As such, results of identification and evaluation efforts in the vicinity of, and including the P-103 APE can be found in the following original studies of cultural and/or historic resources:

Church, M., J. Hokanson, J. Gallison, and M. Jennings

2009 Cultural Resources Survey of 297 Acres at Andersen Air Force Base, Guam. Prepared for AAFB, Guam. June.

Dixon, B. and S. Walker

2011 Cultural Resource Investigations Conducted in the Territory of Guam Supporting the Joint Guam Build-Up Environmental Impact Statement: Final Archaeological Surveys on Guam 2009 at Proposed Utility Sites, Harmon Property, and AAFB. Prepared by for Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific Division. Prepared by Cardno TEC, Inc.,

-
- 3** This PA Memo is required by Stipulation IV.E.2.a. of the PA as a means for interested members of the public to provide comments on the identification and evaluation of historic properties. Stipulation IV.E.1.b. of the PA requires the DoD to take into account comments received within 45 days of the date of the delivery of this PA memo to the SHPO and public notification via the CRI website.

Honolulu, HI.

Dixon, B., S. Walker, and R. Schaefer

2011b Final Report Cultural Resource Investigations Conducted in the Territory of Guam Supporting the Joint Guam Build-Up Environmental Impact Statement: Final Archaeological Surveys on Guam 2010 on AAFB, Prepared by the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific Division. Prepared by Cardno TEC, Inc., Honolulu, HI.

Dixon, B., T. Rudolph, A. Jalandoni, I. Nelson, M. Hroncich-Conner, S. Leary, R. Schaefer, E. Lash, M. Todd

2014a Draft Proposed Guam and CNMI Military Relocation 2012 Roadmap Adjustments SEIS Live-Fire Training Range Complex Footprint and Main Cantonment Alternatives and Access Route Options In-Fill Cultural Resource Studies. Prepared for the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific Division. Prepared by Cardno TEC, Inc., Honolulu, HI. 1 March.

Dixon B.

2015 Andersen Air Force Base, Guam National Historic Preservation Act Section 110 Cultural Resources Identification and Evaluation Studies, 2015. Prepared for the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Pacific Division. Prepared by Cardno TEC, Inc., Honolulu, HI. Forthcoming.

Yee et al 2004 Yee, S., D. Welch, and J. Allen

2004 Archaeological Overview Survey Report for Andersen Air Force Base, Guam. Prepared for 36 CES/CEVN, AAFB, Guam and Earth Tech, Inc., Honolulu, HI. Prepared by International Archaeological Research Institute, Inc. Honolulu, HI.

Results of the above identification efforts indicate that while there is one archaeological site within the APE, it was determined ineligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The water wells were designed specifically to avoid historic properties, and there are none located within the P-103 APE.

Following the DoD's initial submittal of PA Memo #1 on February 24, 2016, the Guam SHPO objected to the DoD's determination of effect due to a disagreement on the identification of historic properties, and submitted a letter of non-concurrence. Following a consultation meeting between DoD and SHPO staff on April 14, 2016, the Guam SHPO State Archaeologist requested that the DoD archaeologist provide spot monitoring within portions of the project area that occur near archaeological feature concentrations.

The Guam SHPO State Archaeologist toured the project area for the well field on May 18, 2016

4 This PA Memo is required by Stipulation IV.E.2.a. of the PA as a means for interested members of the public to provide comments on the identification and evaluation of historic properties. Stipulation IV.E.1.b. of the PA requires the DoD to take into account comments received within 45 days of the date of the delivery of this PA memo to the SHPO and public notification via the CRI website.

with DoD staff and concurred that the project will not affect historic properties. However, following DoD's submittal of the revised PA Memo #1 dated July 25, 2017, the Guam SHPO submitted written comments (letter dated September 11, 2017), that indicated any understanding that the DoD had following the April 14, 2016 meeting were invalid. Details on the comments and DoD responses appear in the section below.

Although no historic properties are within the APE for this project, in accordance with Stipulation VI.F. of the PA, the DoD has retained a full-time Archaeologist to provide site checks, oversee coordination and execution of the archaeological activities required in the PA, and provide quality control. In addition, the DoD archaeologist is also designated to respond to any inadvertent discoveries pursuant to Stipulation XII of the PA.

COMMENTS RECEIVED ON PA MEMO #1:

Comments received for PA Memo #1 (dated July 25, 2017) are presented below. The comment appears in standard text, and the DoD's response follows each comment in italics. All comments were submitted by the SHPO by letter dated September 11, 2017.

1. Our office did not agree with the no adverse effect determination presented in the previous PA Memo. The PA Memo states that in an April 14, 2016 meeting, our office agreed with DoD spot monitoring portions of the old APE although, no record of meeting, emails or letters supporting this position accompanied this PA Memo.

Based on your comment above, we understand that the SHPO objected to the previous PA Memo submitted in 2016. The revised PA Memo #1 dated July 25, 2017 refers to the April 14, 2016 meeting as a follow-on consultation where the State Archaeologist agreed to the finding of no adverse effect and requested spot monitoring in specific areas of the project. However, the DON recognizes that the SHPO was not present for the entirety of this meeting, and that the results may not be a reflection of the SHPO's position. Additional information on P-103 is being included in responses to comments 2 and 3.

2. Guam Historic Properties Inventory (GHPI) number 66-08-2894, is one of the Caiguat Sites that was never fully define [sic] in the SEIS as previously stated in our responses. Therefore, the eligibility of the site is unknown according to our records and was going to be avoided in the previous APE. The Caiguat Site boundaries are unrealistic, the figure shows that the pre-Contact Site follows the current DoD fenceline and does not continue beyond the fence. In reviewing the survey and site information on the other side of the fence, the sites found there do not match up to the Caiguat Site. There is clearly a disconnection between the sites recorded and the surveys conducted that have been presented to our office.

5 This PA Memo is required by Stipulation IV.E.2.a. of the PA as a means for interested members of the public to provide comments on the identification and evaluation of historic properties. Stipulation IV.E.1.b. of the PA requires the DoD to take into account comments received within 45 days of the date of the delivery of this PA memo to the SHPO and public notification via the CRI website.

To confirm, the current APE presented in the revised PA Memo does not avoid the ineligible site 66-08-2894 (shown with the temporary number assignment T-WAW-025 on the PA Memo figures). The site consists of pockets of red clay soil and a sparse scatter of Latte Period pottery sherds and tool fragments, surrounded by exposed bedrock outcropping and a higher elevation to the south. The site occupies a northwest/southeast trending ridge. While the eastern boundaries of the site are artificially drawn, it includes a greater area than the site truly occupies. This was accepted as the site boundary, although site 66-08-2894 and 66-08-2897 are clearly separated. The separation of the two sites is indicated by an abrupt change in vegetation and exposed bedrock, reflecting a change from midden to red clay subsoil on the north, with sites ending in the south. The Andersen Air Force Base Cultural Resources Manager and the MCAG Archaeologist conducted a field visit on December 4, 2017, and were able to verify that site 66-08-2894 and 66-08-2897 are distinct activity areas, and that site 66-08-2894 does not meet any of the eligibility criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

3. The sequential resurvey of the indirect portion of the Live Fire Training Range Complex (LFTRC) found two sites of some magnitude, where the LFTRC survey found no sites in the area. The findings of overlapping survey indicate to us that there are grave inadequacies in the surveys conducted in these areas. Also, buried features and burials have been found on the plateau since the presentation of Record of Decision. It should also be noted that Church et al. did not survey the 140 acre parcel as presented in this PA Memo, rather Church et al. only surveyed the perimeter for the fence line. This is a misrepresentation of the work conducted has been pointed out to NAVFAC PAC before and should not be repeated. Such misrepresentations reflect on the integrity of everything that NAVFAC PAC presents to our office. Therefore, due to the changes in the AP, new sites found in areas previously surveyed for the build-up, the inconsistencies and inadequacies of the previous surveys in this area, the subsurface finds and burials located on the plateau and the 90 degree angle of (GHPI) Number 66-08-2894, one of the Caiguat sites we require a resurvey for this revised project with systematic subsurface testing throughout the area.

The Well Development area has been sufficiently investigated for archaeological resources as part of DON's section 110 responsibility under NHPA in 2004 and 2014. NRHP eligibility assessments were completed as per 36 CFR 800.4(c)(1 and 2). The Church et al. polygon referenced in your comment was included in error, but this has since been resolved with our Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Specialist. The Church et al. survey referenced in this PA Memo still applies. The DON continues to work with the SHPO's office to reconcile the numerous geodatabases being employed by multiple users. The Guam Synthesis task order currently being completed focuses on refining the data and providing a geodatabase.

- 6 This PA Memo is required by Stipulation IV.E.2.a. of the PA as a means for interested members of the public to provide comments on the identification and evaluation of historic properties. Stipulation IV.E.1.b. of the PA requires the DoD to take into account comments received within 45 days of the date of the delivery of this PA memo to the SHPO and public notification via the CRI website.

DETERMINATION OF EFFECT:

Considering the information presented here, DoD has determined that this project will have no historic properties affected.

PLAN FOR RESOLVING EFFECTS:

No historic properties will be affected by the P-103 project. Therefore, no mitigation measures will be implemented.

7 | This PA Memo is required by Stipulation IV.E.2.a. of the PA as a means for interested members of the public to provide comments on the identification and evaluation of historic properties. Stipulation IV.E.1.b. of the PA requires the DoD to take into account comments received within 45 days of the date of the delivery of this PA memo to the SHPO and public notification via the CRI website.



- 8 This PA Memo is required by Stipulation IV.E.2.a. of the PA as a means for interested members of the public to provide comments on the identification and evaluation of historic properties. Stipulation IV.E.1.b. of the PA requires the DoD to take into account comments received within 45 days of the date of the delivery of this PA memo to the SHPO and public notification via the CRI website.

Military Relocation PA Memo Comment Form

2018

If submitting via e-mail, please click link and include all required information: criwebcomment@navy.mil

If submitting via postal mail, send to:

Attn: CRI Web Comments
Code EV23, NAVFAC Pacific
258 Makalapa Drive, Suite 100
JBPHH, Hawaii 96860-3134

Submitted comments will be posted on the Navy's Cultural Resources Information (CRI) web site. Information presented on the CRI web site is considered public. The sections highlighted in red are required.

Privacy Act Statement

Personal information will only be used to contact you regarding the comments you submit. This information will only be shared with another government agency if your inquiry relates to that agency, or as otherwise required by law. We will not create individual profiles or give your information to any private organization. While you must provide a valid e-mail address or postal address, please **DO NOT** include personally identifying information such as a social security number.

By submitting this comment form, you agree not to include content that is offensive in nature, such as profanity, personal attacks on individuals, and racist or abusive language.

PROJECT: P-103 Water Well Development - Design and Construction

SUBJECT: PA Memo #2 (February 15, 2018)

COMMENT PERIOD CLOSED: March 26, 2018

Date:

Name:

CRI User Name (if you don't want your real name to be posted on the CRI web site):

E-Mail Address:

or

Postal Mail Address:

COMMENTS:

Continue comments here:

Empty text area for comments.