

ON-SITE INTEGRATION OF CULTURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES AND MILITARY LAND USE

Susan Harding Alvarez, M.A.
Cultural Resources Manager
Headquarters
ATTN: AFRC-FMH-ENV (Bldg. 196)
Fort Hunter Liggett, California 92938-5000

ABSTRACT

The U.S. Army's objective at Fort Hunter Liggett (FHL) is to provide the best possible site for soldier training and equipment testing and experimentation. Within this undeveloped area, FHL's cultural heritage is rich and diverse. Coordination between the FHL Cultural Resources Manager and military personnel and those who maintain the installation facilitates undertakings within the context of historic properties protection. FHL's Historic Preservation Plan involves ongoing inventory and site assessment, management programs, and continuing consultation with interested parties including the Salinan Indians.

Introduction

Rather than an anecdotal summary of onsite cultural resources management, this paper presents an onsite cultural resource manager's perspective of Department of Defense (DOD) and U.S. Army objectives, as well as Fort Hunter Liggett's efforts to integrate historic preservation mandates into land use goals. Briefly, it examines land user perceptions of constraints arising when the military mission encounters cultural resource concerns and summarizes a thoughtful view for management challenges toward resolving conflicts between historic preservation integration and land use situations.

Land use history within an isolated portion of the rugged Santa Lucia Mountains west of the Salinas River, presently known as Fort Hunter Liggett Military Installation, has continuity dating back many thousands of years. Within 165,000 acres, the environment varies from steep, chaparral covered, shale and sandstone ridges to oak woodlands and grass covered rolling hills; elongate valleys cut by the Nacimiento and San Antonio Rivers are predominate landscape features. Military use of the area commenced during the 1940s buildup of U.S. armed forces for WWII involvement. Over the following 5.5 decades and into the present, FHL land use activities focused on defense training and testing equipment for soldiers' use in WWII, Korea, Vietnam, Panama, the Persian Gulf, and future operations. With the exception of a Hokan speaking group, known since the ethnographic period as Salinan, U.S. Army residency is as long or longer than that of any former settlers using this land: Spanish exploration and mission period 1769-1822; Mexican regime (c. 1822 to 1850); Early American settlement (1850-1880; Consolidation (1880-1920s); William Randolph Hearst Era 1920s-1940.

Historic Properties Management and the Military Mission

In addition to meeting training needs for personnel from all branches of the armed forces, the Army at FHL is responsible for highly visible historic properties, easily related to by military personnel, post civilian employees, and the larger community—lifelong local residents and other special interest groups. The Gil Adobe, built c. 1865, was a family home prior to Army use as officers' quarters and is scheduled for restoration; the Hearst Ranch Hacienda, designed by Julia Morgan about 10 years prior to Army purchase of Hearst land, is in use as a restaurant/lounge, visitors' quarters, and the Post Commander's residence. Both structures are National Register properties, and receive a great deal of attention. "La Cueva Pintada," a rockshelter containing polychrome paintings, bedrock mortars, and a well-developed midden, likewise, is a well-known local landmark listed on the National Register. There are also many easily identified complex prehistoric sites and historic structural remains. Based on National Register criteria and other values, 40 of these are assessed at a high level of significance, are clearly marked for avoidance, and conscientiously protected from land use impacts. Mission San Antonio is within an 85-acre private inholding that attracts visitors throughout the year. Mission proximity to the small, developed portion of FHL presents additional Army obligations; during project planning phases, consideration is given to potential for action impacts on the Mission's viewshed, audio tolerance, and light pollution concerns.

The Army also is responsible for a large number of prehistoric sites—approximately 50% of the nearly 500 archeological resources recorded on FHL—characterized as sparse lithic flaking debris scatters and, nearly as frequent, isolate bedrock mortars; site types with limited data potential, even for science. Furthermore, not only are these ephemeral sites on or near road corridors requiring annual maintenance, more importantly, within the military land use context, they commonly occur on

knolls or ridges that are strategic defense positions in various training exercises. (Clearly, a link exists between ancient projectile crafting sites overlooking flats, waterways, or former wetlands where game undoubtedly gathered and contemporary, ideal vantage points marked by excavated depressions and brass projectile debris.)

The FHL mission is to train those who choose to be prepared to defend the United States' interests and to test equipment for use by soldiers in real world field situations. All operations and maintenance, for example, annual roads and fire-break repair, are intended to provide for a safe, healthy environment and soldiers' well-being. There is nothing covert about this mission, no hidden agenda. Emphasis is on life saving training and testing objectives; soldiers have a right to the best training and equipment available. Military activities toward meeting these objectives may involve excavations large enough to hide a tracked vehicle; training or testing commonly require use of tracked vehicles, explosives, and large numbers of people concentrated in relatively small areas. These activities are complicated by summer and autumn aridity creating a fire-prone environment, and heavy winter or spring rains that reduce training areas to glutinous mire. Wild fire suppression and tanks or trucks stuck on the range require use of heavy equipment, raising the potential for scarring the landscape further.

Archeologists and others value the nearly 200 or so sparse flake scatters or isolate bedrock mortars for the possible limited scientific and cultural information they may contain. Thus, by virtue of data potential, these sites are assumed eligible for National Register listing. The Army as well as FHL civilian employees who support the military mission, however, are perplexed by the need to abandon specific actions due to resource preservation goals that remain unclear. Archeological programs toward clearance of cultural sites are cost and time prohibitive. It is unlikely that, at the rate of 10 or 20 sites tested annually, information potential will be realized soon or, more specific to military needs, the near future will see an appreciable number of nearly invisible sites cleared to accommodate training scenarios requiring digging, use of tracked vehicles, or concentrations of personnel.

Policies, Mandates, and Fiscal Reality

The DOD philosophy considers that cultural resources under DOD control are assets and that proper management can benefit and meet mission needs, while enhancing the quality of our living and working environments. Philosophy and dollars seldom match. According to the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, \$4.65 billion, the majority of the DOD 1994 Environmental Security budget, was committed to catchup compliance, cold war cleanup costs, and Base Realignment And Closure. In 1994, less than \$1.5 Million were devoted to conservation on DOD lands, the majority committed to natural resource expenditures. Conservation for Fiscal Years 1996-2001, however, calls for completion of installation cultural resource inventories and development of plans for material curation in compliance with 36 CFR 79. In a declining budget

environment, DOD anticipations are proactive—40 % of the U.S. armed forces bases and installations will have Cultural Resources Management Plans but only 20 % will realize full historic properties inventories (Vest 1994:1-4).

The Army's Environmental Vision states that, "The Army will be a national leader in environmental and natural resources stewardship for present and future generations as an integral part of our mission" (U.S. Army 1992:1). The Army's strategy for the 21st Century includes meeting environmental stewardship goals as the Army moves beyond compliance to leadership in preservation and conservation. Toward this end, the expectation is that everyone on all installations automatically will include considerations for environmental impacts in their planning processes (U.S. Army 1992). Meanwhile, although cold war threats are minimized, global hot spots demand the presence of trained soldiers. Simultaneously, as reflected in DOD environmental budget constraints, Army funding toward compliance is severely limited.

The 1994 formation of the FHL Environmental Division accelerated the installation's integration of resource stewardship goals and mission objectives. In August 1994, the FHL Historic Preservation Plan (HPP) was implemented with a Programmatic Agreement to provide a simplified Section 106 process for categories of regular undertakings as well as for Salinan involvement in regards to FHL cultural concerns. The HPP uses clear language for straightforward, intelligent approaches toward integration of historic preservation mandates into most FHL activities. Military personnel and civilian employees are learning to recognize the value of FHL's rich cultural heritage; training unit commanders are becoming proactive in integrating preservation laws into training activities. The present installation command supports outreach activities that include detailed presentations of our integrative programs to the public, and is involved in contemporary Salinan issues including complexities of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA).

Frequently, however, common questions are asked; questions usually focusing on the number of sparse flake scatters FHL must protect: "How many of these sites do we need? How significant can they be? When will they be cleared? Are sites more significant than FHL's mission—*training soldiers to stay alive?*"

Summary

Fort Hunter Liggett is an ideal setting for examining questions relevant to fitting historic preservation issues into the narrowly identified "military worldview," which applies to all branches of the armed forces. Furthermore, the complex cultural heritage of FHL, situated in an amazing and relatively undisturbed landscape, affords researchers opportunities for scholarly endeavor and management opportunities to demonstrate how preservation mandates are integrated into FHL's mission.

It is inappropriate, however, to offer only brief answers to inquiries described above; answering any one question seems

thoughtlessly in *extreme* conflict with the final question. What rationale is there for preserving sites deemed necessary solely on *potential* for addressing settlement or exchange-related topics when the implication may be construed as—"YES, this knowledge is more important than the Military Mission?" Current DOD fiscal limitations and funding diversions from the mission to "cold war" cleanup environmental compliance also aggravate this issue.

As anthropologists, cultural resource managers for the military should critically examine the adversarial relationship

between historic properties and land use. *Does* a sense of inherent correctness in mandated processes and a perceived wrongness in military land use exist? *Are these* views inadvertently sustained through lack of creative, realistic procedures toward integrating historic preservation compliance into military land use? Fort Hunter Liggett demonstrates the necessity for a comprehensive management plan; continual coordination between land users and the cultural resource manager; and frequent consultation, via the cultural resources manager, between the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) or the Salinan people and the installation commander.

REFERENCES CITED

United States Army

- 1992 *U.S. Army Environmental Strategy into the 21st Century: Army Mission, Environmental Stewardship*. Army Environmental Policy Institute, Champaign, Illinois.

Vest, Gary D.

- 1994 *Excerpts from Fiscal Year 1996-2001 Defense Planning Guide*. Principal Assistant Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Environmental Security), Department of Defense Biennial Cultural Resources Workshop June 5-10, 1994, Naval Air Station Pensacola, Florida.