



**ACHP COMMITTEE MEETINGS
SUMMARY OF EVENTS
Meetings via Zoom
December 2021**

PRESERVATION INITIATIVES COMMITTEE

ACHP Strategic Plan Update

Committee Chairman Rick Gonzalez called the Preservation Initiatives (PI) Committee to order on December 13. He noted that, as discussed at previous meetings, the ACHP should prepare for updating the agency's strategic plan, which is due to the Office of Management and Budget in February 2022. However, since the exact timing of Professor Sara Bronin's confirmation as chairman is not known, a revised plan will not be finalized and adopted until after she is confirmed. He indicated that the ACHP can request an extension of the plan submission deadline. Meanwhile, ACHP members can develop ideas for her consideration on how the current plan might be updated.

Chairman Gonzalez explained that the staff has reviewed the existing, two-year-old plan and flagged areas that may need attention, including modifications to advance Biden-Harris Administration goals. Each committee is reviewing items in their purview. He asked the members if anything had been missed which should be addressed and asked them about the items flagged by staff.

Regarding the plan's Cross-Cutting Objective, Katherine Slick (ACHP Foundation) noted that any change to the language needed to carefully consider what wording to use regarding social justice and equity. She asked if the focus is limited to righting past or current injustices or on something more forward looking. Ann Walker (Preserve America Youth Summit) said "equity" is the term most used at the state level now. ACHP Vice Chairman Jordan Tannenbaum said ethnic "hyphenated Americans" also are important stakeholders and should be referenced. John Finley noted the cross-cutting objective should focus on telling the full American story and engaging all constituencies, and that he felt the current language works fine.

Office of Preservation Initiatives (OPI) Director Dru Null explained that the staff suggested an additional reference to climate change be included in the plan, since the current reference focuses only on federal agency climate initiatives. There was general agreement on that point. Ms. Slick also suggested a new climate strategic objective should address not only policies regarding the impact of climate change on historic properties, but also the importance of retaining historic properties and making them more energy efficient.

Ms. Slick suggested that the language in Section II(F) of the plan about infrastructure and energy development may be too limited and should be expanded to address additional issues. Also, in Section (IV)(C), she advised that the proposed revision would make the strategic objective too narrow in focus by not allowing for involvement in initiatives that might originate from Congress rather than from interagency activities. As discussion of the plan came to a close, Ms. Null noted that any additional written comments on the plan are welcomed.

Proposed ACHP Action on Pending Legislation

Chairman Gonzalez noted that motions had been drafted regarding ACHP action on three pieces of legislation and posed the question of whether the PI Committee should recommend adoption of these motions at the business meeting.

Frederick Jobs and Historic Preservation Training Center Land Acquisition Act

Ms. Null summarized the provisions of the Frederick Jobs and Historic Preservation Training Center Land Acquisition Act, which would authorize the National Park Service Historic Preservation Training Center to acquire property for an expanded facility. The legislation would support increased traditional trades training as promoted by the ACHP's Policy Statement on Promotion and Value of Traditional Trades Training. There was a general consensus that Chairman Gonzalez should introduce the draft motion for approval at the business meeting.

Yes In My Back Yard Act

Ms. Null summarized the provisions of the Yes In My Back Yard Act, which would require communities receiving Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) to report to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) on their progress toward implementing specified land use policies to remove barriers to affordable housing. Earlier versions of the bill had portrayed historic preservation as a barrier. The ACHP worked with the housing nonprofit Up For Growth, the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers (NCSHPO), and the National Trust for Historic Preservation to get revised language in the bill to instead encourage use of historic properties for affordable housing.

Ramona Bartos (NCSHPO) supported the positive outcome for historic preservation in the revised language to counter the perception that historic preservation is an obstacle to affordable housing development. Shaw Sprague (National Trust for Historic Preservation) said other bill provisions may have a negative impact on retaining historic building stock, for example, incentives for pre-fabricated construction. He indicated that the National Trust is not yet ready to endorse this bill. Erik Hein (NCSHPO) questioned whether the ACHP's capital with Congress should be spent on supporting the bill. The general consensus was to table this motion in order to fully explore all implications of it for historic preservation, further examine other concerns about the current language, and possibly suggest other tweaks to the current language where there are historic preservation-related concerns.

SMART Leasing Act

Ms. Null summarized the provisions of the Saving Money and Accelerating Repairs Through (SMART) Leasing Act, which would create a pilot program to allow federal agencies to lease underutilized nonexcess real property and related personal property. The proposed legislation is silent about historic properties. The draft motion calls for outreach to Congress on the benefits of addressing preservation in the bill. Joan Brierton (GSA) indicated that the General Services Administration (GSA) was not involved in drafting this legislation. GSA already has a robust program addressing leasing of historic buildings under Section 111 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Vice Chairman Tannenbaum noted the past success of the Coast Guard in using Section 111's leasing authority. Likewise, the Army used Section 111 in leasing historic buildings at the Forest Glen National Seminary property. Mr. Sprague indicated the importance of considering how the Historic Tax Credit would apply to leases under the SMART Leasing Act. There was a general consensus that Chairman Gonzalez should introduce the draft motion for approval at the business meeting.

Climate Change and Historic Preservation Task Force

Vice Chairman Tannenbaum described the first meeting of the task force, which was productive, and said the group will convene again in January. Ms. Null summarized the three main areas of concern that the task force will be addressing:

1. Climate change damage to historic properties and how to adapt and increase resiliency

2. Impacts to historic properties which may be caused by renewable energy development
3. Reuse and retrofitting of historic properties to help reduce climate change

Ms. Null also provided background on the Administration's climate change initiative America the Beautiful, which seeks to conserve 30 percent of the nation's land by 2030. Its principal focus is on natural resources, but the ACHP is working to integrate the consideration of cultural resources. During the week of December 6, the ACHP hosted four listening sessions on this topic at the suggestion of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). Two were for tribal and Native Hawaiian leaders, and two were for other stakeholders. Ms. Null explained that the ACHP will summarize the input received and provide it to the America the Beautiful Interagency Working Group, in which the ACHP participates.

Shasta Gaughen (NATHPO) stressed that tribal ancestral trust lands should not be counted as part of the 30 percent. She advocates going beyond that to address tribal stewardship, traditional use, and tribal co-management of public lands. An unintended consequence of marine protected area rules has been preventing tribal access for traditional uses. Conserved should not mean "off limits." Ms. Null noted that this concern was raised in the listening sessions; the effort should not be about creating wilderness that is untouchable. Dr. Gaughen said land is a cultural resource; that the distinction between natural and cultural is artificial. Vice Chairman Tannenbaum suggested looking at the example of New Zealand, where rivers and fish spawning areas are protected as cultural resources as well as natural resources. Ms. Bartos agreed that they are not mutually exclusive. Holistic land management and involving local governments are key. Also important are buffer lands around cultural resources, including for flood protection. Chairman Gonzalez suggested looking at the example of Costa Rica, which does protect 30 percent of its land. Mr. Sprague stressed that it is important to articulate why it is imperative to preserve cultural resources, stressing the fact of their loss to erosion, fire, flooding, etc.

At the committee's request, OPI has researched what climate change and historic preservation resources, guidance, and planning are currently available through State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) websites. Judy Rodenstein summarized the results of the survey and described the material attached to the report in the meeting book. One document includes links to examples of guidance, training, and technical assistance related to disaster planning, climate change mitigation, and adaptation. The other attachment excerpts SHPO planning documents related to climate change and historic preservation. These are arranged topically and hopefully will be of use to SHPOs as they develop future comprehensive plans as well as engage in joint planning with other state agencies.

Chairman Gonzalez noted that state access to emergency funds is very slow, and post-disaster there is typically a rush to demolish everything. Planning language that deals with how to approach historic properties needs to be embedded in county and local plans. Cory Kegerise (NPS) noted that current guidance on preparing state comprehensive preservation plans includes a requirement to address disaster planning and response. The information assembled as part of the study can help National Park Service (NPS) staff in working with the states and potentially developing templates for states to use in addressing the issues.

New Business

Vice Chairman Tannenbaum asked for information on a Native American Consultation Resource Center proposed in the pending Build Back Better bill. Ms. Null indicated that the bill would provide \$33 million to NPS for such a center over a 10-year period. The bill also would provide \$25 million to NPS for preservation grants to states and Indian tribes over the next five years. Ms. Slick asked how the proposed Center would differ from the work already being done by the ACHP. Caroline Henry (DOI) recommended the ACHP speak to Bryan Newland, Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, for further information on the proposed Center.

NATIVE AMERICAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

ACHP Strategic Plan Update

Committee Chairman Reno Franklin convened the meeting on December 13. He explained that each committee has been asked to review the 2019 Strategic Plan and consider what, if any, modifications are needed. Since ACHP Chairman-Nominee Sara Bronin has not yet been confirmed, these are preliminary discussions. The copy of the plan in the meeting book reflects initial staff recommendations for updates. Office of Native American Affairs Director Valerie Hauser explained that the suggestions regarding tribal and Native Hawaiian actions are to ensure the plan aligns closely with Biden-Harris Administration goals.

America the Beautiful Initiative

Chairman Franklin acknowledged that the committee has had several discussions about this initiative, formerly referred to as the 30x30 Initiative, and expressed excitement about recent developments. The ACHP has been named to an interagency working group that will help guide the Administration's efforts under this initiative. As a member, the ACHP was asked to host listening sessions to solicit public comments on the extent to which cultural resources should be included. The ACHP had two listening sessions for tribal and Native Hawaiian leaders on December 7 and 9 and two listening sessions for the public on December 9 and 10. The tribal sessions elicited meaningful comments and generated excitement about the possibilities presented by this initiative. The feedback was positive, and there was some discussion about potential partnerships as well as opportunities to change the narrative regarding tribes and Native Hawaiians. Dr. Gaughen added that tribal representatives do not want the Native American sites that have already been protected to count as 30 percent of protected land. Instead, they want other, new sites to be identified for conservation. Vice Chairman Tannenbaum observed that it was interesting to hear the discussions about natural and cultural resources being one and the same. He also mentioned that the discussion about wilderness areas was enlightening, explaining that wilderness areas are not actually pristine but have been managed for millennia by Native peoples. He also found the discussion about a potential fifth National Register criterion to address Native sites to be interesting.

Traditional Knowledge Initiative

Chairman Franklin explained that the ACHP has joined an interagency working group established by CEQ and the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy. The working group will be developing government-wide guidance on the integration of traditional ecological knowledge (TEK). Chairman Franklin also reminded the committee of the publication of the ACHP's information paper on traditional knowledge and plans to develop formal guidance on how to respectfully consult with Indian tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations about integrating TK in Section 106 decisions. The guidance proposed by the working group, however, is a change to reach a broader audience.

Ira Matt talked about the first meeting of the working group which addressed foundational issues such as how to develop the guidance by November 2022 and make it useful for federal staff. The ACHP suggested dropping "ecological" to be more consistent with the way indigenous peoples view it. Interagency group members are leaning toward not developing a definition of it, much like the ACHP. There was also a discussion about including Indian tribes in the initiative to ensure a Native voice in the guidance. The next meeting of the working group will take place the second week of January.

Chairman Franklin talked about this initiative being a meaningful opportunity for tribes. He is interested in hearing how the confidentiality of sensitive information will be handled. Dr. Gaughen expressed cautious optimism about the initiative. She also announced that Mr. Franklin has been elected chairman of his tribe, the Kashia Band of Pomo Indians.

White House Tribal Nations Summit Update

Chairman Franklin opened the discussion with regret that the ACHP was not actively involved in the Summit despite all the work done by the ACHP to support Administration initiatives. He mentioned that the Summit took place virtually over two days and hopes it can take place in-person next year. Chairman Franklin mentioned two White House announcements at the Summit of relevance to the ACHP, the new Sacred Sites MOU and the new Treaty Rights MOU. He explained that both MOUs replace previous MOUs from the Obama Administration and signal the Administration's commitments to the protection of sacred places and upholding treaty rights. He then asked Ms. Hauser to offer additional information.

She explained that new agencies were added to each MOU which is a significant development. While a great deal of work had been done under the original Sacred Sites MOU, not much was accomplished under the Treaty Rights MOU because it was signed at the end of the Obama Administration. Despite that, individual signatories had done quite a bit of work regarding treaty rights, and this information is being captured in a report to be submitted to the executive director of the White House Council on Native American Affairs. Ms. Hauser also acknowledged Ms. Henry from the Department of the Interior, Alicia Sylvester from the Department of Defense, and Chris Koeppel, formerly from the Forest Service but now with the ACHP for their help in continuing work under the Sacred Sites MOU in the previous Administration.

FEDERAL AGENCY PROGRAMS COMMITTEE

Committee Chairman Jay Vogt called the meeting to order on December 14 and welcomed participants. He called roll and then asked Office of Federal Agency Programs (OFAP) Director Reid Nelson to provide updates on staffing and recruitment. Mr. Nelson introduced the new Assistant Director, Federal Property Management section, Chris Koeppel. Mr. Koeppel said it was a great honor to be at the ACHP, that he is looking forward to working with both new and familiar faces. It has been a terrific experience meeting all the Federal Preservation Officers (FPOs).

Jaime Loichinger introduced Raina Regan as the new liaison to NPS. Ms. Regan was an ACHP intern several years ago. She thanked everyone for the welcome and explained that she will be working with the NPS assistance programs and the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Finally, Mr. Nelson reported that the agency is still in the process of recruiting an Army liaison and that Rachael Mangum continues in that position until a new staff member is on board. At that time, she will transition to a program analyst position in the Federal Permitting, Licensing, and Assistance section.

Vice Chairman Tannenbaum welcomed all participants and asked everyone to think about the challenges presented by the infrastructure bill regarding Section 106 reviews. He said he was looking forward to hearing everyone's perspectives.

Implementation of Program Comment Review Panel Recommendations

Blythe Semmer noted that since the member panel issued recommendations in September, the staff has worked to integrate the recommendations into the ACHP's existing materials. This involves trying to align public-facing online materials with the recommendations as well as revising internal staff checklists. Currently a staff working group is circulating revision drafts internally. One of the panel's key recommendations was to reach out to agency staff and other key stakeholders for their examples of best practices, so the staff working group expects to contact stakeholders as development of these materials proceeds. The effort is more than simply redoing the Program Comment webpage. Rather, the staff is trying to integrate the recommendations into all the ways Program Comments are discussed in guidance, training materials, webinars, and other places. The effort is benefitting from current work with development efforts for new Program Comments, which provides a feedback loop with agencies about where clarification is needed.

Chairman Vogt encouraged members to submit good examples of Program Comment development processes to staff. He noted that the process of developing the recommendations was controversial and that the panel worked hard to discuss topics of concern in providing recommendations for a better process. Mr. Nelson said the goal now is to strengthen and refresh technical assistance and recommendations for all of the program alternatives available in the Section 106 regulations in addition to that for Program Comments. Nationwide Programmatic Agreements are a particular focus to make sure information about those is also up-to-date. He said he hopes ultimately the information on the website for all five program alternatives will be modernized to help agencies be fully aware of the pros and cons of each approach.

Strategic Planning Preparation

Chairman Vogt noted that the ACHP must update its strategic plan by February, as long as the new ACHP chairman is confirmed by then. He turned to Dr. Semmer, who referenced the meeting book paper and that members are being asked for preliminary feedback now. Concrete revisions will wait until the new chairman is on board, though this effort allows members to provide recommendations to her so she can proceed with strategic plan revisions quickly once she starts. It is possible to request an extension from the Office of Management and Budget in the event the agency head is not in place far enough in advance of the February deadline to complete revisions. Members are asked to tell staff what they think about those areas flagged for adjustments and to offer any additional ideas on needed changes.

Chairman Vogt asked members whether they were in agreement with the staff suggestions for areas of changes and whether they would like to add anything else. Dr. Gaughen reflected on the last time the ACHP updated the strategic plan. She recalled that the members spent about an hour debating language in the cross-cutting objective about engaging all constituencies. The annotated draft in the meeting book proposed considering expanding the reference to underserved communities and communities seeking environmental justice. Dr. Gaughen agreed with the staff recommendation to be as inclusive as possible and expand definitions for greater inclusivity. She supports the callouts for explicit inclusion of tribes in the objectives. For the climate change objective, she would be interested in seeing drafts or hearing specific suggestions for that objective. Perhaps the Climate Change Task Force could suggest draft language. Ms. Null also remembered extensive conversation on the cross-cutting objective but thinks it will be easier this time given the current Administration's focus on increased tribal engagement.

Ms. Slick suggested looking back at recent ACHP Task Forces and their products to add or strengthen ideas. Regarding climate change, she proposed the plan should reflect not just the impact of climate change on historic resources, but also the importance of retaining and stewarding resources to deter climate change.

Ms. Bartos brought up the future of the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) and stable funding for State and Tribal Historic Preservation Offices. Perhaps under-resourced SHPOs/THPOs should be referenced at IV.D. She also suggested that the plan should reflect the ACHP role in the America 250 activities. Ms. Null mentioned that suggestion also came up in the PI Committee. She explained the strategic plan has another layer not shown in the annotated document, which is a work plan for achieving the strategic objectives. America 250 is in that, but she is starting to hear that maybe it should also be in the plan itself. Mr. Nelson said staff had gone back and forth about where the initiative should be referenced specifically. If members think it should be elevated, that can be done. He also commented on SHPO/THPO funding by saying that the ACHP could address that by going back to revisit the 2015 Action Plan to Support SHPOs/THPOs. It may already propose answers or need to be updated. Finally, Ms. Bartos referenced a recent discussion at NCSHPO about how the HPF funding source could decrease as fossil fuel reliance is reduced and looking toward other funding streams.

In response to a question about how federal agency policy and program priorities are reflected in the plan,

Jen Hass (DHS) commented that the plan should acknowledge agency priorities as well as their missions, which are sometimes not specific enough. Ms. Slick said housing is another infrastructure priority for this Administration that could be added to II.D.

Section 106 and the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act Update

Chairman Vogt noted that the committee had discussed the potential results of forthcoming infrastructure legislation in July. Now that the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) has been signed by the President, he is revisiting the topic with a more specific focus on how Section 106 reviews may be affected.

Ms. Loichinger said the paper in the meeting book provides an overview and is broken down into four areas (transportation, energy, broadband, and other sectors). Transportation is the sector most covered by existing program alternatives. These approaches are fairly comprehensive but might need to be addressed further. Energy programs are also covered by the new law, and DOI and the Department of Energy (DOE) got a fair amount of funding. DOE has a prototype Programmatic Agreement that is still effective. It came out of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) and is one of the most successful prototype PAs in place. All states and territories have a PA in place using the prototype; in 2020 alone, 37,000 undertakings were reviewed under its provisions, with more to come as a result of the additional funding. Broadband projects are covered by two Federal Communications Commission nationwide PAs and several Program Comments. USDA-Rural Development has a PA for sequencing Section 106 review to get broadband funds out the door quickly.

Chairman Vogt moved to a series of questions, four of which were listed in the meeting book paper. First, what do ACHP members think are the greatest challenges in implementing the IIJA? Mr. Nelson added it would be helpful to hear whether agencies have challenges in common. The ACHP can offer the best help where it might assist multiple agencies with cross-cutting programs.

Ms. Henry said DOI had a meeting of all bureau FPOs last week where a common concern across bureaus with diverse missions was capacity in field and bureau offices and at SHPOs and THPOs. Program alternatives were also discussed, though no one activity emerged as a prime candidate. DOI bureaus agree there is an opportunity for the ACHP to help develop program alternatives. Other concerns shared by the bureaus included the extent to which Section 106 compliance will or will not be handled at the federal level for block grants and pass-through grants coming out of the legislation. Not all bureaus are accustomed to working with grant programs.

Vice Chairman Tannenbaum said a lot of what is needed is education across the board. He wondered what strategy CEQ is coming up with for the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Boiler plate solutions will be really important. The sooner the ACHP can make training and webinars available, the better.

Katherine Zeringue (FRA) said her agency's budget will quadruple, so they are anticipating staffing challenges and are trying to address the organizational structure to get ready. The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) is also thinking about how to streamline Section 106 through PAs and to handle reviews in bulk rather than one by one. They are not yet sure how grants will be distributed but suspect it will involve working with a lot of folks who do not know Section 106. So, education should be stressed for project sponsors. She noted the usefulness of the ACHP's *Citizen's Guide to Section 106 Review* and said something similar and/or training is needed to help consulting parties understand their roles.

Mr. Nelson acknowledged he is hearing about staffing concerns across the board as well as concerns that everyone is trying to hire when there are not enough qualified staff out there. He is aware that a team for recruiting for special expertise has been established by the Office of Personnel Management. The ACHP

may reach out to that group on how to identify well-qualified cultural resource staff. He also asked federal agencies to take stock of the program alternatives they already have available and think creatively about what new ones could be needed. The ACHP could invite FPOs to a forum early in the new year to talk about shared concerns and responsibilities and perhaps convene similar conversations with SHPOs and THPOs.

Colleen Vaughn (DOT) seconded preceding comments and said the IJA has created a number of new programs, resulting in a very large task for which there are limited resources. There is more work than there are people to do it. She said it would be a good idea to have the FPOs come together to find common points and areas of overlap. For instance, the Department of Transportation (DOT) is developing categorical exclusions for electric vehicle charging stations, so expanding that into a program alternative would be useful. DOT just signed an MOU with DOE that might also generate program alternatives. There are lots of opportunities for interagency coordination. She expressed a desire for more input from the ACHP to the Federal Permitting Improvement Steering Council on tribal outreach from its member agencies as well as education about what happens in federal environmental review processes. DOT is creating handbooks for different audiences on electric vehicle charging stations, for example.

Ms. Vaughn also offered one correction to the meeting book paper. Regarding the One Federal Decision policy, DOT is not required to propose a rulemaking. The rulemaking requirement is regarding adoption of certain categorical exclusions by specific agencies.

Members suggested agencies should be looking at program alternatives other agencies have to see if they can sign on to use them. A triage team could be established at the ACHP for incoming projects to separate those that might take more time. Ms. Slick asked what the ACHP needs in terms of resources to respond to the anticipated workload challenges. Mr. Nelson noted the difficulty in defining needs since agencies are still discovering what the IJA will mean for them. While OFAP is in a good position to read trends, a concern is whether the office could be working with multiple program alternatives all at the same time by this time next year. Program Comments are a heavy staff lift, so if agencies can coordinate requests before coming to the ACHP, it will help.

Sarah Koeppel, DHS, posted in the chat that DHS is working to propose a program alternative on both electric vehicle and sustainable and resilient federal facilities if any other FPOs are interested in joining the discussion.

Ms. Bartos asked whether the ACHP has compiled exclusions or exempted activities from all past PAs. She also said applicants, especially those receiving grants like CDBG, are in need of training and education to pull the information together needed for a review. Pre-planning by federal agencies helps them know what historic properties they have, and she worries that the infrastructure bill will place agencies in response mode instead. We should figure out how to put more funding towards pre-planning.

Chairman Vogt asked about what resources are needed to help states and tribes. Members discussed the value of planning funding, particularly that which might be found outside of the HPF rather than in supplementing the HPF. Mr. Hein added that it is not always program alternatives that make the review process more efficient. Lack of adequate information at early stages of review can generate delays if upfront work is lacking to make a project go smoothly. Investments in identifying properties in advance can be more useful than some program alternative development. Dr. Gaughen added that tribes do not like program alternatives because tribal perspectives are so diverse that an alternative cannot capture all those perspectives and the different types of affected resources. They can be time consuming, and it might be more efficient to focus on good ground work for regular review. The federal trust responsibility should include helping tribes hold up their end of the review process.

Ms. Bartos noted in the chat that criticism of Section 106 is already starting in the context of historic properties identified for infrastructure improvements, such as in this article published this week: <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-12-13/hang-on-preservationists-want-to-save-penn-station-now>.

Vice Chairman Tannenbaum said this may offer another opportunity to revisit the NEPA substitution process at 36 CFR 800.8(c).

Updates on Program Alternatives and Training

Mr. Koepfel reported on the December 6 execution of the Forest Service Phasing PA. As part of the stipulations, the ACHP and the Forest Service will develop training quickly because the Forest Service is concerned with using the PA for upcoming large land development projects. The US Postal Service is also starting to explore a Program Comment, and a 30-day comment period on the Army Vietnam War-era Housing Program Comment ends tomorrow. Betsy Merritt (NTHP) subsequently clarified in the chat that the comment period is for the Program Comment plan, not the full Program Comment itself.

Ms. Loichinger referenced the chat message from DHS, acknowledging that the ACHP has had preliminary conversations with DHS about program alternatives focused on electric vehicle facilities and improving climate change resiliency for historic properties.

Regarding training, members heard that the 2022 virtual classroom training schedule is now open for registration, and that a new webinar series is planned in the spring with topics to be announced in the new year. Mr. Nelson observed that he had heard a lot of good ideas linking infrastructure and training needs, so the staff will look at prioritizing modules for the next year. While the ACHP does not have a compilation of all exempted activities in current program alternatives, the sample stipulations in the ACHP's Guidance on Agreement Documents provide useful references.

COMMUNICATIONS, EDUCATION, AND OUTREACH COMMITTEE

Committee Chairman Luke Nichter called the meeting to order December 14 and had participants introduce themselves on the screen. He called on Lynne Richmond to report on the webinar programs.

Webinars

Ms. Richmond reminded members that earlier this year was the inaugural webinar series for students and others affiliated with Historically Black Colleges and Universities. This coming winter, the ACHP will host a new series, and it is being aided by Jonathan Gloria, a student intern through the State Department's Virtual Student Federal Service program. Mr. Gloria talked about his research of topics and diverse historic sites as well as his plan for effectively marketing the programs from his unique perspective as a college student. Ms. Richmond added that she hoped members would help publicize the series once it is announced.

Ms. Slick suggested the students at Salish Kootenai College would be a good audience. Also, topics surrounding burial places, traditional knowledge, and land grant universities' history would be good. Turkiya Lowe (NPS) suggested reaching out to student groups rather than the administrators at universities: such as black student unions, sororities and fraternities; Barbara Little (NPS) suggested contacts at the National Council on Preservation Education. Vice Chairman Jordan Tannenbaum suggested environmental studies programs at law schools could be a good audience; other ideas included student councils and the American Institute of Architects internship programs.

C-SPAN

Vice Chairman Tannenbaum gave an overview of his interview last week with C-SPAN anchor Peter Slen. He said it was a wide-ranging interview, and he was able to give a good description of the ACHP and highlighted its work through Section 106 success stories. He said it was a good first step to get the agency national attention on the network and hopes this will lead to a partnership in the future where C-SPAN producers will look to the ACHP for experts on any number of topics. Chairman Nichter said C-SPAN always needs content during holidays and congressional break periods, and the ACHP can be a good story to fill in those times. He was glad to know the ACHP is on C-SPAN's radar now. He suggested members offer ideas for other topics like C-SPAN's live call-in shows and other content for anniversaries of historic events and more. Ms. Slick suggested thinking through what Chairman-Nominee Sara Bronin may be interested in and good places for her to feature in a show.

Awards

Patricia Knoll gave an overview of the ACHP/National Trust award that was presented virtually in November during the annual conference. It was given to the Army for Fort Leonard Wood's renovation of the historic black officers club on the base. The ACHP and HUD will also present their joint award at the business meeting tomorrow. Chairman Nichter commented at how complex putting together these awards programs is, and he commended the staff and jury members.

Strategic Planning

Members looked at several notations in the current ACHP strategic plan where staff had noted edits could be made to enhance language for current priorities. Members agreed with staff suggestions regarding elevating points about social justice and equity; climate change; and including the ACHP's new task force. Also, recognition programs were discussed, deciding what kind of awards are best suited to current Administration and ACHP priorities. This led to the topic of generally raising awareness about the ACHP and historic preservation.

Forest Service Program

Office of Communications, Education, and Outreach Director Susan Glimcher talked about the new partnership the ACHP has with the Forest Service to host students from Lincoln University, a Historically Black College or University in Pennsylvania, for a summer program including hands-on work at Forest Service properties and time in Washington, D.C. with ACHP staff.