



Preserving America's Heritage

MINUTES

SUMMER BUSINESS MEETING

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

JULY 14, 2016

WASHINGTON, D.C.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

401 F Street NW, Suite 308 • Washington, DC 20001-2637
Phone: 202-517-0200 • Fax: 202-517-6381 • achp@achp.gov • www.achp.gov

MEETING
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
Russell Senate Office Building, Kennedy Caucus Room
Washington, D.C.
July 14, 2016

PROVISIONAL AGENDA

Call to Order 10:30 a.m.

- I. Chairman's Welcome
- II. Section 106 Issues
 - A. Federal Agency Support for SHPOs and THPOs
 - B. Small Federal Handles
 - C. Broadband on Federal Property
 - D. Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act
- III. Historic Preservation Policy and Programs
 - A. Building a More Inclusive Preservation Program
 - B. Preservation50 and the ACHP Public Policy Initiative
 - C. Policy Statement for Resilient Communities
 - D. White House Council on Climate Preparedness and Resilience
 - E. U.S Report for Habitat III
 - F. Historic Preservation Legislation in the 114th Congress
 - 1. Historic Preservation Fund Reauthorization and ACHP Amendments
 - 2. FY 2017 Interior Appropriations
 - 3. National Defense Authorization Act
- IV. ACHP Native American Affairs Committee Activities
- V. New Business
- VI. Adjourn

IN ATTENDANCE

Milford Wayne Donaldson, Chairman
Terry Guen
Dorothy Lippert
Lynne Sebastian
Robert Stanton
Jordan Tannenbaum
Brad White

Architect of the Capitol

Represented by:
Michelle Kayon
Deputy Director,
Planning and Project
Management

Secretary of Defense

Represented by:

Maureen Sullivan
Deputy Assistant
Secretary of Defense
(Environment, Safety &
Occupational Health)

Secretary of Education

Represented by:

Ursula Wright
Associate Assistant
Deputy Secretary for
Special Projects

Administrator, General Services Administration

Represented by:

Beth Savage
Director, Center for
Historic Buildings,
Public Buildings
Service

Secretary of Homeland Security

Represented by:

Jeffrey Orner
Management
Directorate Chief
Readiness Support
Officer

Secretary of the Interior

Represented by:

Michael Bean
Principal Deputy
Assistant Secretary for
Fish, Wildlife, and
Parks

Secretary of Transportation

Represented by:

Barbara McCann
Director, Office of
Safety, Energy, and
Environment

Secretary of Veterans Affairs

Represented by:

Stella Fiotes
Executive Director,
Office of Construction
and Facilities
Management

President, National Conference of State Historic
Preservation Officers

Elizabeth Hughes
Maryland SHPO

Native American Member

Leonard Forsman
Chairman, Suquamish Tribe

Chairman, National Trust for Historic Preservation

Represented by:

Thomas Cassidy
Vice President for
Government Relations
and Policy

OBSERVERS

Managing Director, Council on Environmental Quality

Represented by:

Ted Boling
Senior Counsel

General Chairman, National Association of Tribal Historic
Preservation Officers

Represented by:

D. Bambi Kraus
NATHPO President

President, ACHP Alumni Foundation

Katherine Slick

Historic Preservation Consultant

In attendance and participating in the meeting were ACHP Executive Director John M. Fowler; Reid Nelson, Ron Anzalone, ACHP office directors; Colleen Vaughn, Federal Preservation Officer, Department of Transportation; Nancy Boone, Federal Preservation Officer, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

PROCEEDINGS

Chairman's Welcome

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) Chairman Milford Wayne Donaldson opened the summer business meeting at 10:35 a.m. He asked Robert Stanton to lead the Pledge of Allegiance. The Department of the Interior (DOI) holds the proxy for the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Chairman Donaldson holds the proxy for Vice Chairman Teresa Leger de Fernandez. The agenda was adopted. Chairman Donaldson appointed Shayla Shrieves recorder for the meeting. He also welcomed Jordan Tannenbaum as the new council member. He noted Dorothy Lippert and Terry Guen were reappointed. The chairman asked Mr. Tannenbaum, Dr. Lippert, and Ms. Guen to come to the front for the formal swearing-in ceremony.

The previous meeting's minutes were adopted with a motion by Maureen Sullivan and second by Elizabeth Hughes. Chairman Donaldson asked Michelle Kayon to give an overview of the Kennedy Caucus Room and updates from the Architect of the Capitol. Ms. Kayon also mentioned Preservation Day is happening September 23 in the Capitol Visitor Center, and the ACHP will be involved.

John Fowler welcomed new ACHP public affairs specialist Matt Spangler. He also discussed new positions in the Office of Federal Agency Programs—Blythe Semmer is the new senior program analyst, Katry Harris is the training coordinator, and Ira Matt is moving into the program analyst position.

Chairman Donaldson noted the newest Section 106 Success Stories. With 57 stories completed, he encouraged members to submit their ideas for more stories to reach the goal of 106. Also, the White House recently designated four new Preserve America Communities. There are 904 communities designated.

Chairman's Award Report

Mr. Stanton described the Chairman's Award presentation from the previous night. The award was presented to the U.S. Department of Energy, East Tennessee Preservation Alliance, and Dover Development Corp. for rehabilitating the historic Alexander Inn in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, used during the Manhattan Project. Mr. Stanton said the project spoke to what can be accomplished through private-public partnership and developing a project that benefitted the community. He stressed the importance of the community contributing to saving this historic structure.

Federal Agency Support for SHPOs and THPOs

Chairman Donaldson reminded members that at the July 2014 meeting, the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers (NCSHPO) board addressed the membership on the challenges they face in meeting the demands of federal agencies in the Section 106 process. He and Chairman Forsman heard the same issues from Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs) at two tribal summits. A consistent theme emerged from all of these: core funding for tribal and state historic preservation programs is inadequate to meet the demands placed on THPOs and State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs). The Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) is the source of federal support for state and tribal preservation programs. Authorized at \$150 million per year, the annual appropriation has never approached that amount, and the gap increases every year. At the July 2015 meeting, the members adopted an action plan to find near-term ways to bolster support for the critical work the SHPOs and THPOs do in the Section 106 process. This essentially means looking at ways federal agencies can assist SHPOs and THPOs in carrying out key Section 106 responsibilities and related activities.

Reid Nelson came to the table to report on the Federal Agency Programs (FAP) Committee discussions. He said staff is nearing completion on guidance that will implement a major piece of this action plan, addressing the issues of fees in Section 106 reviews, compensation in general, and when accepting such compensation may or may not be a conflict of interest. After the draft is complete, it will be shared with the National Park Service (NPS) to make sure it comports with their views on compensation in Section 106 reviews.

The FAP Committee also talked about finding efficiencies in Section 106 reviews. The committee spent time discussing how to identify program alternatives and other efficiencies in Section 106 reviews that might relieve overburdened and underfunded SHPOs and THPOs from repetitive reviews on undertakings that may stand little chance of affecting historic properties. The committee suggested several options:

- First, staff should do a broad survey with NCSHPO, the National Association of Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (NATHPO), and Federal Preservation Officers (FPOs) to identify what sort of programs or activities might be good candidates for program alternatives that might exempt or speed up certain types of reviews.
- Second, the ACHP should work to make the development of Programmatic Agreements less burdensome, in part by educating stakeholders on their benefits, sharing examples of good agreements, and demystifying what it takes to develop one.
- And, finally, the ACHP should underscore the importance of federal agency staff that develop and implement such agreements being adequately trained.

Mr. Nelson said federal agencies will need to be a prime player in all of these discussions, given that they are directly responsible for carrying out such reviews.

Chairman Forsman added he is encouraged that attention is being brought to supporting THPOs and SHPOs. He suggested working creatively to provide more help to the tribal governments as they try to fulfill the requirements of their mission and the public mission to take into account the impacts of projects on historic properties. Bambi Kraus said there are 167 tribes now operating THPO programs; she reiterated that the level of funding is still not enough and hoped people do not get complacent about

increasing funding. Ms. Hughes said looking at agreement document opportunities is important. Looking for ways SHPOs and THPOs can provide digital data that is accessible through GIS data layers is going to be an important efficiency mechanism.

At this time Ted Boling joined the meeting.

Tom Cassidy mentioned the Senate went above the budget request for SHPOs, and three amendments were adopted in the House Interior appropriations bill for historic preservation items the previous night. Mr. Fowler said it is rare the Congress goes above what the Administration asks for, so the real battleground in getting increased funding is within the Administration. Federal agencies are impacted by the availability of resources for SHPOs and THPOs, and it affects the efficiency of the delivery of their programs.

Barbara McCann offered information on the FAST Act. She said there is new Department of Transportation guidance out on Section 1312, which allows the use of local government funding for environmental reviews. Mr. Nelson liked the idea of a national inventory, including sharing information in better ways. He said it is an important way to relieve workloads for the entire preservation community.

Ms. Sullivan said having a good national inventory will be essential to this streamlining effort. She suggested that an ACHP meeting with the Office of Management and Budget budget examiner could be joined by agency designees in order to emphasize the broad need from the agencies' perspective.

Chairman Donaldson introduced Mr. Boling from CEQ.

Small Federal Handles

Chairman Donaldson said a longstanding issue in the Section 106 process has been the extent of federal agency responsibilities when there is only limited federal involvement in a project, such as a Corps of Engineers' permit. The FAP Committee has been working on ways to better deal with that.

Mr. Nelson mentioned ACHP deliberations with the Army Corps of Engineers over the last year demonstrated that the greatest challenge in bridging the gap between the requirements of ACHP regulations and those of the Corps' "Appendix C" will be in resolving different perceptions about what level of effort is appropriate in identifying historic properties and resolving effects to them. This happens when federal involvement in a project is limited, or, in other words, when there is a "small federal handle." Knowing this issue had implications well beyond the ACHP and Army Corps, about five months ago the ACHP started to address the issue of "small federal handles" by convening a work group of federal agencies and Section 106 participants to strategize the best path forward. The workgroup has met regularly, and their conclusions and ideas include the following:

- The ACHP has little practical leeway in redefining the definition of "undertaking," which was of initial interest to some agencies.
- The opportunity to assist agencies in tailoring their efforts to the "size of the federal handle" lies primarily in how the agency defines the Area of Potential Effects (APE) and in determining what constitutes a "reasonable and good faith effort" to identify historic properties within that APE; and
- Agencies would like some form of regulatory relief in the form of a Program Comment, PA, or some other program alternative that defines a path forward for them.

The FAP Committee agreed that some form of guidance or instruction would be useful, and that focusing it on "reasonable and good faith efforts" to identify historic properties and resolve effects to them would be a productive approach. Some members also expressed concern about the development of a program alternative as a first step, suggesting that it might be impractical to find a one size fits all solution for the whole federal family until the key issues here have been addressed in some form of guidance. It was also

noted that federal agencies will need to show more flexibility in expanding their sometimes narrow approaches to defining APEs and consider at least some level of effort to identify historic properties within these APEs.

Mr. Tannenbaum asked if there was already ACHP guidance on reasonable and good faith efforts. Mr. Nelson said this was produced in 2011, but it is a very general statement not tied to the level of federal involvement.

FAST Act

Ms. McCann said the bill passed in December and the Department of Transportation (DOT) has been implementing the different provisions. Section 1301 requires the alignment of Sections 106 and 4f, and DOT issued a white paper on this and is trying to further identify the alignment opportunities for that process. Mr. Boling said it seems like a promising effort. Section 1303 is about exempting certain bridges from the Section 106 process. She said the department is making good progress on implementing the provisions and working collaboratively with the ACHP and other stakeholders. Ms. Hughes encouraged DOT to provide direct guidance to state departments of transportation on how those funds can be used to partner with SHPOs to develop streamlining opportunities.

Colleen Vaughn said there is currently a provision within the Federal Highway Administration statutes that allows states to use federal funding in support of liaison positions or actions that accelerate environmental decision making. Members agreed on the need to work together to ensure this is clearly communicated and followed through.

Building a More Inclusive Preservation Program

Chairman Donaldson summarized the ACHP business meeting in March in Tampa, which showcased the mix of cultures that made up the cigar industry in that part of Florida. The ACHP had in-depth discussions with members of the community about the importance of their heritage and the challenges facing them in preserving that heritage. Mr. Stanton said staff developed a set of recommendations to guide the ACHP and its many partners in trying to achieve more diversity within the preservation movement.

He moved that the ACHP adopt the recommendations as set forth in the meeting book and that Chairman Donaldson share these recommendations with the President and the incoming Administration. Ms. Guen seconded it.

Mr. Stanton said the recommendations establish a framework to track progress. Chairman Donaldson said this is setting the foundation to look at all groups. Mr. Stanton said the Communications, Education, and Outreach (CEO) Committee had considerable discussion on the definition of the term “inclusiveness.” He said staff is going to develop a working definition and include some components of what inclusiveness may look like on the ground including employment, additions to the National Register, contractors doing preservation work, history, the whole gamut that includes conservation and inclusiveness in the preservation movement.

Ms. Guen said the preservation community needs to reach out to people in a way they find relevant. She did not see a lot of priority in reaching out to the grassroots, in the “actions for others” recommendations. She said there are different values and different cultural experiences emphasized depending on the group, and they are very idiosyncratic. It is hard to say that current preservation efforts among these groups constitutes a movement, because people are just starting to self-identify through their families that they are part of a greater cultural or ethnic whole.

Mr. Cassidy reminded members to think about the budget, part of which could be a significant expansion

of the National Park Service's underrepresented communities competitive grant program, to tell more of the stories of more Americans. Michael Bean said Secretary Sally Jewell has been committed to telling stories of all Americans.

Mr. Stanton asked whether there are lessons the U.S. can learn from other countries' successes and if there is something directly applicable to what the ACHP members are discussing. Mr. Fowler pointed out the essays regarding Preservation50 in the meeting book. Ms. Guen added she feels historic preservation coupled with a deeper understanding of heritage is a key to tolerance. She said what the ACHP is looking at here is vital to building that base of tolerance for the next 50-100 years for this country. The motion passed unanimously.

Youth Engagement

Mr. Stanton said as a follow-through to the youth strategic plan the CEO Committee reexamined the opportunities to move forward. He determined there may not be a great deal of sharing of information across the government of employment opportunities for youth, and the ACHP will need to share success stories. Also, the committee will work up some parameters for mentoring youth. He suggested having a presentation by another federal agency at a future business meeting that includes an overview of what they are doing to further youth engagement. Mr. Stanton mentioned the email he is planning to send to council members highlighting the fact that the youth strategic plan was endorsed, and actions are underway. He will be asking each council member to share it with the leadership of their respective organization, recommit themselves to support the youth strategic plan, and perhaps give the ACHP some examples of what they are doing. These could be summarized on the youth website.

Mr. Fowler introduced the three summer interns: Saralyn Salisbury-Jones in the Office of General Counsel; Mariel Rodriguez in the Office of Communications, Education, and Outreach; and Corey Lentz in the Office of Preservation Initiatives. The ACHP Alumni Foundation supports the intern program.

Mr. Tannenbaum suggested mentors could also come from the ranks of ACHP former staff members who could add to this effort.

Preservation50

Brad White said in the morning meeting preceding the business meeting a number of important topics were touched upon, including public-private partnership, community engagement, inclusion, and specific needs of the agencies to help them articulate the economic and other benefits of historic preservation within their own organizations. There will be a fuller report of the convening on Preservation50 as soon as staff puts together notes. A steering committee has been established, and the agenda can be moved forward with assistance and oversight from that group.

Policy Statement for Resilient Communities

Chairman Donaldson reminded members that the ACHP produced a report on historic preservation and rightsizing in 2014. That report looked at the challenges older American cities had confronting population loss and economic change. The ACHP has been working on the policy statement. Mr. White said the committee is in the final stages of developing the policy statement, and he had hoped to ask for a vote for its approval today. The policy statement was published in the *Federal Register* in March for public comment. Thirteen comments were received, and the policy statement was modified in response to these comments. A member comment came from HUD earlier in the week, and they drafted a new principle that would encourage more flexibility in applying standards and criteria during the Section 106 process. He handed it out to members at the table. He suggested deferring the final vote today. In two weeks, the policy statement will be sent around for an unassembled vote.

Nancy Boone came to the table. She said what the proposal attempts to do is to recognize in distressed neighborhoods they want to be looking at the overall preservation of the neighborhood. In some instances, that may require more flexibility than would normally be applied in the Section 106 process.

Mr. Tannenbaum said he feels the Section 106 process is flexible, so the government can already be responsive to particular and unique needs and customized requirements. He asked what is contemplated through this that is not already part of the process. Ms. Boone said many people in the field know that, but there is still a perception that the process is very rigid. This principle would be a way to state that flexibility to a wider audience who right now does not believe it is true.

Mr. Fowler said regardless of the outcome of the policy statement, it may be wise for the ACHP to work with HUD to produce an informational piece with examples of the inherent flexibility of the Section 106 process. It could be shared with developers who might be scared off by historic properties for affordable housing projects. Ms. Boone agreed that any way to get the word out is needed.

Ms. Hughes said she has concerns about this new principle since she heard that the audience for this piece is developers and the users of HUD programs so they are not scared away by the process. The way she sees the language is that it is directed to SHPOs, Certified Local Governments, and consulting parties telling them that they need to be flexible and ease up on the standards. She said there already are a lot of challenges working with HUD programs when local governments see demolition as the solution to "historic property problems." She said she would hate to see this used by those partners as a way to not do their due diligence when it comes to taking into account local community's concerns about historic properties or SHPO concerns.

Mr. White said this is an attempt to provide more flexibility so demolition is not the only approach that is taken. He suggested reading it in the context of the entire policy statement.

Legislation

Mr. White said in the interest of trying to allow the agencies to take positions that are consistent with Statements of Administration Position, he had four motions to offer.

He moved that the ACHP objects to Section 2855 of the House version of the National Defense Authorization Act (H.R. 4909) and directs the chairman to convey to Congress its objections and to advise Congress on the importance of maintaining the current historic designation process in order to ensure that federal agencies comply fully with Section 106 (54 U.S.C. 306108) and Section 110 (54 U.S.C. 306101-114) of the NHPA.

Ms. Sullivan seconded it. There were no objections to waiving the roll call vote, and the motion passed unanimously with a voice vote.

The next motion he made was that the ACHP objects to Section 10006 of the House version of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act (H.R. 5293) and directs the chairman to convey to Congress its objections and to advise Congress on the importance of maintaining the current historic designation process in order to ensure that federal agencies comply fully with Section 106 (54 U.S.C. 306108) and Section 110 (54 U.S.C. 306101-114) of the NHPA.

Mr. Tannenbaum seconded it. Ms. Sullivan explained that none of the funds can be used to designate or expand a heritage asset. She said it is consistent enough with the things they are already objecting to, that she is comfortable with the motion. Mr. White said it only applies to several counties in southeast Colorado.

Lynne Sebastian asked if anyone has talked to (bill sponsor) Rep. Ken Buck to see what the problem is

that he is trying to solve with this legislation. Ms. Sullivan said she suspects it is oil and gas leasing-related. Dr. Sebastian said sometimes if people just sit down and talk together about a problem they can come up with a mutually agreeable solution. She said she hates to just say, “We’re going to vote against it,” and she would like to know if there is a way to find out what the problem is and suggest a different solution. Ms. Sullivan said she could speak offline with Dr. Sebastian about some of the background of this highly political case.

There were no objections to waiving the roll call vote, and the motion passed with a voice vote. There was one abstention by Dr. Sebastian.

For the third motion, Mr. White moved that the ACHP objects to Sections 123, 443, and 453 of the House version of the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act (H.R. 5538) and directs the chairman to convey to Congress its objections and to advise Congress on:

- the importance of maintaining the current historic designation process in order to ensure that federal agencies comply fully with Section 106 (54 U.S.C. 306108) and Section 110 (54 U.S.C. 306101-114) of the NHPA;
- the importance of the President’s ability to protect resources on federal land through designation of National Monuments; and
- the benefits to stewardship of historic properties anticipated from finalization of the Bureau of Land Management “Planning 2.0” rule published in the *Federal Register* on February 25, 2016.

Mr. Cassidy seconded it. There were no objections to waiving the roll call vote, and the motion passed unanimously with a voice vote.

Finally, Mr. White moved that the ACHP reiterates its objections to legislative provisions that would restrict the President’s ability to designate National Monuments or that would undermine the current historic designation process, such as those included in the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act (S. 3068/H.R. 5538), and directs the chairman to request that the Administration support this position.

Mr. Tannenbaum seconded it. There were no objections to waiving the roll call vote, and the motion passed unanimously with a voice vote.

Ms. Sullivan thanked the staff for explaining the motions and the Administration’s positions on them in the meeting book as well as in follow-up discussions after the committee meeting. Agencies thus could have the time to do their due diligence and participate fully in the voting.

White House Council on Climate Preparedness and Resilience

Chairman Donaldson noted that the ACHP is a member of the Council on Climate Preparedness and Resilience (CCP&R), and while the CCP&R has acknowledged the challenges of climate change to the nation’s cultural heritage, the topic has not received much attention.

Mr. White discussed the Preservation Initiatives Committee’s three issues. The first was U.S. preparations for Habitat III, the UN Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development which will take place in Quito, Ecuador, in October. It was raised by Andrew Potts of US/ICOMOS and subsequently by the ACHP with HUD. The second has to do with the Resilience Roadmap being prepared by senior staff of the member agencies from the CCP&R, and yesterday CEQ staff contacted the ACHP to discuss ways to address some concerns in the document. Finally, the committee talked about climate action plans and the request by Chairman Donaldson recently to ACHP member agency designees to raise this issue with their agency sustainability or CCP&R representatives to try to ensure they are aware of the cultural resources dimension relevant to those plans.

Regarding Habitat III, historic preservation was not mentioned at all in the U.S. plan, and Ms. Boone was helpful in directing ACHP staff to the people at HUD responsible for U.S. participation. As a result of those discussions, the ACHP has made inroads in getting historic preservation included in other parts of HUD's work having to do with Habitat III.

Dr. Lippert said part of her work deals with Alaska Native Villages, which in some parts of the state are literally falling off into the ocean. This affects all levels of their culture when they have to move far away from their original homes. She said that is what she looks at when looking at climate change and historic preservation. Planning for sea level rise and how climate change affects historic preservation work is very important.

At this time, Ms. Sullivan left the meeting.

Native American Affairs Committee Activities

Chairman Donaldson reminded members the ACHP signed an agreement with the Seminole Tribe that allowed them to substitute their tribal procedures for the standard Section 106 regulations. The members agreed that further guidance was needed, both for the development of such procedures and for how the ACHP would handle these agreements internally. The Native American Affairs Committee has been working to address these matters.

Chairman Forsman said the committee has taken responsibility for developing internal procedures for reviewing 101(d)(5) agreements as well as guidance for Indian tribes interested in entering into such agreements with the ACHP. He proposed the members adopt a set of simple procedures to guide the internal review of proposed 101(d)(5) agreements. The sole purpose is to ensure that reviews are coordinated among the members and staff in a timely manner, and that they create some predictability, where possible. He said it is important to have these internal procedures in place before beginning to develop external guidance.

The committee had a good discussion about policy concerns related to Section 101(d)(5) in the meeting yesterday but has more to consider. He hopes to bring these to the full membership in the fall. When the policy issues are ironed out, staff will then begin work on guidance to inform Indian tribes what to expect in requesting to enter into such agreements with the ACHP.

Chairman Forsman moved that the members adopt the internal ACHP procedures. Dr. Sebastian seconded it. Mr. Bean said DOI had expressed concern for the need for adequate prior review, and he said these procedures addressed these concerns. DOI would like to be engaged at the earliest possible time. There were no objections to waiving the roll call vote, and the motion passed unanimously with a voice vote.

Broadband on Federal Property

Mr. Nelson returned to the table to discuss broadband. He said The ACHP has for some time been a member of a federal workgroup convened by the White House Office of Science and Technology that was tasked with identifying efficiencies in environmental reviews for broadband projects, a key priority for this Administration. As part of this effort, the ACHP has taken a number of steps in the past to support the development of program alternatives for the delivery of broadband projects that are funded or licensed by the federal government, mostly off federal property, and the ACHP is now turning attention to broadband projects that occur largely on federal property.

The FAP Committee discussed how the ACHP might take some of the efficiencies realized under earlier program alternatives and apply them to federal properties, where the agencies, players, and processes are different than those faced by project proponents working off federal lands. The idea of a Standard Treatment has now emerged in the workgroup's deliberations, so he walked the committee through what a

Standard Treatment might achieve. Such an approach would put in place measures that could be used to define APEs, site and design certain types of facilities, address colocation, and perhaps put in place measures for installing cable and lines that would provide consistency and common sense measures for avoiding effects to historic properties.

When a federal agency used the Standard Treatment, it would essentially have the endorsement of the ACHP on that approach and thereby ensure consistency while speeding up consultation. He said the FAP Committee heard from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) which has agreed to partner with the ACHP in developing such a Standard Treatment, that a consistent approach to building out broadband facilities on federal properties would be a great benefit to them and other agencies.

It will be the first Standard Treatment for the ACHP. It will be available to anyone who has a project on federal property that meets the criteria. Chairman Donaldson asked to make sure the SHPOs are involved in the process. Ms. Guen mentioned landscape protocols are important to integrate into the Standard Treatment measures. Jeff Orner said DHS is happy to keep supporting this. Mr. Nelson said many agencies already have agreements, and that is why the Standard Treatment approach is best.

Adjourn

Chairman Donaldson said the next meeting is November 30-December 1 in Washington, D.C. The meeting adjourned at 1:10 p.m.