

Resource Management in the Department of Defense

Defending America's Heritage

The articles in this issue of *CRM* illustrate how the Department of Defense is defending America's heritage, not just on the battlefield and overseas, but on the home front, through an impressive, proactive program of preservation and management. Given the military's own proud history, and concern for its past, this is perhaps not surprising. Its position and approach certainly serve as an example other federal and state agencies should follow. The diversity of topics covered in this issue demonstrates that heritage resource management is strongly integrated into and forms a well-considered part of the military mission. The content of these papers shows that the agency is leading the way in a host of areas. The many dedicated people in DoD working in heritage resource management deserve all of our thanks.

In my work with the National Park Service, I have been helping provide technical assistance and contract oversight at a number of military installations. I know that DoD puts its money where its responsibilities are with regard to identifying, evaluating, and protecting cultural resources. DoD is far ahead of all other federal agencies in this regard. The support provided by DoD for heritage resource management should serve as a model for federal agencies. Many installations are completely surveyed, allowing for effective resource management. The technical, communications, and management tools in support of these efforts, as Peter Boice noted, are varied and growing. Through the innovative Legacy program, discussed by Paula Massouh, furthermore, the results of installation-specific work are put into a broader perspective while important or unusual projects and initiatives receive support.

The military is also leading the way in ensuring that heritage management is solidly integrated into other management concerns, in support of the ongoing mission of the agency,

and in full compliance with existing laws and regulations. Integrated Cultural Resource Management Plans (ICRMPs) are effective means of ensuring this occurs, as Loechl and Whalley discuss. The ready availability of resources that support ICRMP development on the web is something of value to everyone concerned with heritage management, and not just people in DoD.

The curation program within DoD, as led by staff of the St. Louis District COE, and maintained by dedicated individuals on many installations, as Eugene Marino and Michael Trimble document, is indeed one of the best of any federal agency. The equal emphasis placed on artifacts and associated records is laudable, since without proper documentation, the artifacts themselves are greatly reduced in scientific and interpretive value. Anyone who has had to work with older collections, as I often have, realizes that curators and records managers are often the unsung heroes of the cultural resource management world.

Cheryl L. Huckerby's presentation of Fort Hood's outstanding CRM program highlights the diversity of activities that occur on individual DoD installations, including GIS-based predictive modeling, public outreach, archeological, architectural, and historical research and synthesis, archeological and architectural survey and evaluation, and the protection of sites from looting. Her paper offers a look at the specific procedures by which CRM is implemented on an active military installation. These programs show how it is possible to facilitate the ongoing Army mission while simultaneously doing an excellent job of preserving heritage resources. Most of my own work with the military has been on U.S. Army Forces Command (FORSCOM) installations, so I appreciated her overview of the larger FORSCOM program, which I think is exemplary even by DoD's high standards.

Many of the papers, including that by Newell Wright and his colleagues about Eglin Air Force Base, document the very fine networked GIS and web-based computer systems in use on DoD installations. The Eglin case shows how these systems are invaluable aides to research and management, facilitating communication and cooperation between personnel in many specialties and offices on an installation. As an aside, the Eglin, Fort Hood, Camp Pendleton, and Fort McCoy case studies discussed here illustrate how fieldwork conducted on DoD installations has produced some of the very best archeological survey data in the country. This information is typically in a GIS, and hence readily available for management purposes, as well as state of the art scientific studies of past settlement, land use patterning, and predictive modeling.

Stan Berryman's discussion of the NAGPRA consultation process, specifically as it relates to inadvertent discoveries of human remains at Camp Pendleton, is another fine demonstration of how the military takes a proactive role in managing heritage resources. The inadvertent discovery process is something all resource managers must know about. The best way is to learn from installations like this, where many such discoveries have occurred, specific procedures for dealing with them have been developed, and these procedures have been then formalized through cooperative agreements with tribal governments. Having specific details on how to proceed worked out as much as possible in advance, and incorporated in ICRMP documents, is crucial.

The case study from Fort McCoy, Wisconsin, presented by Andrew Sewell and his colleagues, again illustrates the importance of a well-supported GIS in both installation land use management and for the better understanding of the past. Over 1,200 buildings on the installation have been documented and evaluated by architectural historians, emphasizing the importance routinely given to standing structures by the military,

The papers discussed by David Anderson in this article, with the exception of those by Massouh, Osborn, Loechl and Whalley, and Webster, were derived from presentations made during a DoD symposium, "Keeping the Peace and Protecting our Heritage: Cultural Resource Management in the Department of Defense," that was held at the Society for American Archaeology meeting in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, April 5-9, 2000. David Anderson acted as the discussant at the symposium that was co-chaired by L. Peter Boice and Paula Massouh.

and another exemplary aspect of DoD's national preservation program. The Fort McCoy case also highlights the importance of strong interaction between cultural and natural resources personnel, as well as other installation specialists, in managing and interpreting cultural resources. The Fort McCoy predictive modeling effort is typical of the high quality, replicable analyses of this kind occurring on military installations around the country. Critical in all such studies, of course, is the development of probability zones that can be quickly and easily delimited on the ground by field teams, as was done here. Our predictive models change over time, of course, as more and better data are collected, and our understanding of land use in the past changes. We must be prepared to revisit our earlier efforts and refine them, and DoD is taking the lead in seeing that that happens.

The paper recounting rock art discoveries at the Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center in the Mojave Desert, by Marie Cottrell and her colleagues, effectively demonstrates how agencies can work to preserve and protect these sites, as well as learn from their contents. Protection from vandalism is a serious issue before land managers, and sites on military bases sometimes are afforded a rare measure of protection just by virtue of the way access is controlled. The paper also gave us an idea of what can be learned from such sites, and why their preservation is important.

Laurie Lucking's paper about the use of sacred places on Army lands in Hawaii, and the paper by Vicki Best and her colleagues on the use of similar kinds of sites on Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada, reminds us that military lands have value to many people, and that the perception of the landscape itself is culturally determined. Public outreach and partnerships programs directed to the protection and appropriate use of traditional cultural properties and sacred sites are an important aspect of DoD land management. The exemplary case studies from these installations serve as real world examples that other agencies can learn from. The use of Native American monitors during archeological fieldwork at Nellis, and the resulting development of truly collaborative interaction, is also a strong positive example of how to develop and maintain good relations, with benefits to all parties.

Webster and Cohen's paper deals with historic architecture, in this case military aircraft hangars, and demonstrates work that DoD excels in—the evaluation and maintenance of large

numbers of historic buildings. World War II-era temporary wooden buildings are perhaps the best known military structures to be evaluated collectively, rather than individually. This approach to standing architecture, looking at as many or all the existing examples of a class of buildings, and evaluating and managing them accordingly, is an approach that might work well in state and local historic preservation programs. It certainly would seem to make more sense than examining structures on a case-by-case basis. The study also illustrates the serendipitous and in some cases counter-intuitive results that can come from broad studies, in this case, that many early “temporary” hangars were made using steel rather than wood frame construction.



Printed on recycled paper

June Cleghorn’s presentation about repatriation efforts at the Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii Marine Corps Base, is another excellent real-world case study about how NAGPRA consultation should proceed. I routinely tell people in state and federal agencies, including my own, that military installations are the first place they should look to find excellent standard operating procedure (SOP) documents and procedures for implementing NAGPRA. As this case study shows, relationships built on mutual respect and willingness to talk and listen, and with sensitivity to the needs and concerns of all parties, are the way to proceed.

As an archeologist whose home is in South Carolina, I particularly appreciate the presentation by Conlin on the recovery of *Hunley*. Like many in my state and around the country, I have been following the conservation, analysis, and interpretation work on this historic submarine. The way many people are reacting to this discovery, partic-

ularly the possibility that human remains are almost certainly present within the ship, and their insistence that they be treated with respect, has given me (and no doubt many other people) a much better appreciation of the concerns of native peoples in such matters. This is a remarkable project, a landmark of underwater archeology. The effort associated with the recovery and ongoing analysis of *Hunley* shows us that having proper funding, personnel, and facilities in place, is crucial to the success of large, complex projects.

Osborn and Wallace’s paper on recent work at the Presidio illustrates how the rehabilitation and adaptive re-use of buildings can proceed given wide public and private support. The linkage between archeology and architecture is also impressive, particularly in a complex known primarily for the latter kind of resources. Large numbers of battlefields have become national parks, and as an NPS employee who has seen many excellent historic architectural districts on military bases, I fully expect more military cantonment areas to one day achieve this status.

DoD is a leading federal agency in both the funding and the doing of CRM on the ground, and the many fine examples of this work are becoming more and more widely available, as exemplified by the case studies in this issue. The dedicated heritage management professionals in DoD, who do so much to foster an appreciation for our nation’s cultural resources, deserve our admiration and respect.

David G. Anderson is an archeologist at the Southeast Archeological Center of the National Park Service in Tallahassee, Florida.



U.S. Department of the Interior
National Park Service
Cultural Resources (Suite 350NC)
1849 C Street, NW
Washington, DC 20240

OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE \$300

FIRST CLASS MAIL
Postage & Fees Paid
U. S. Department of the Interior
G-83