



Addressing Security

Executive Summary

Historic properties are living parts of every community. They provide many of the places where we work, live, go to school, worship, enjoy entertainment, and conduct business with our government. These often irreplaceable buildings and settings embody the investment of natural, economic and human resources. They inspire and teach us about our past. They also provide a crucial source of present and future economic vitality through heritage tourism.

Providing security for operations and personnel located in or near historic and archaeological sites presents unique and sometimes difficult challenges. In some cases, security measures implemented at historic and archaeological sites are obtrusive, lack design sensitivity, discourage public access and threaten the integrity of the resources they are designed to protect.

For security interventions in a historic setting, project planners must balance the historical and architectural character and integrity of a property with the use of the property, the identification and analysis of risk, and possible design and engineering solutions. Multi-disciplinary project teams and reviewers are best able to create security interventions that preserve the public's use and enjoyment of a historic resource for its intended or designed purpose.

The Addressing Security Expert Panel therefore recommends the following:

- **Keep public historic properties open to the public.**
- **Develop risk assessment methods appropriate for historic and archaeological properties.**
- **Incorporate security related provisions into national building codes.**
- **Design matters – sensitive security solutions must be selected to protect the property's historic integrity**
- **Provide information and training to help decision makers balance historic preservation with security needs.**

Expert Panel Focus and Methodology

The Addressing Security Panel is tasked with developing program and policy recommendations answering the principal question – How can we more effectively balance security concerns with the preservation and interpretation of historic properties? The Federal and non-Federal co-chairs, Mr. Philip Grone and Mr. James Malanaphy, respectively, coordinated the panel's efforts and organized the deliberations of the panel.

Mr. Grone and Mr. Malanaphy created a virtual workspace for the panel to facilitate group discussion and to be a repository for all panel documents. This secure website allowed panel members to have instant access to reference documents, to post documents and revisions, and to disseminate information from a centralized location. The workspace also housed the panel's working bibliography (Appendix A) which contained identified reference materials.

Panel members participated in weekly conference calls (Meeting Minutes at Appendix B). During these calls panel members refined a list of questions (Appendix C) related to security concerns at historic properties and divided themselves into subcommittees to address public access, standards and risk assessment issues. Additionally, select panel members drafted one-page documents detailing security issues from their professional perspectives (Appendix D).

On August 30, 2006, 14 members of the Addressing Security Expert Panel met at the historic U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland. The Meeting Book is contained in Appendix E. The Academy and the City of Annapolis presented a snapshot of a real world example of the balance between security and historic sites. Both the City and the U.S. Naval Academy are National Historic Landmarks, drawing four million and two million visitors a year respectively.

Mr. Grone and Mr. Malanaphy invited the Mayor of Annapolis, Ellen Moyer and Captain Mike Fierro, Commander, Naval Support Activity Annapolis, to discuss their successful approach to addressing security issues at the Naval Academy and the Academy's cooperation with the City of Annapolis. By examining the multifaceted approach and working partnership between the Academy and the City of Annapolis, the panel sought to develop a set of recommendations to improve the process for dealing with security issues at historic sites.

At the August 30th meeting, the panel divided into the three previously determined subcommittees to develop recommendations. The subcommittees engaged in sub-topic discussions, referring to the security questions and one-page documents addressing security issues from various professional perspectives. After the subcommittees drafted their recommendations, the entire panel reconvened to discuss and provide feedback. The subcommittees then took that feedback and met again to refine their recommendations. The Meeting Summary is contained in Appendix F.

The week following the panel meeting at the U.S. Naval Academy, the subcommittees held separate conference calls to further refine recommendations based on feedback from the full panel. The final recommendations and supporting text from each subcommittee were shared with the full panel on September 11, 2006. Panel members were encouraged to provide comments to other subcommittees for inclusion in their expanded recommendations.

In the remaining two weeks prior to submission of the panel recommendations to Preserve America Summit, the Expert Panel continued revising the security recommendations and the associated background text/findings. Meeting minutes are contained in Appendix G.

Participants

Co-Chairs:

Federal Agency

Philip W. Grone, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment, Department of Defense

Non-federal partner

James Malanaphy III, AIA, Chair, Historic Resources Committee, American Institute of Architects

Expert Panelists:

Curt Betts, PE, Structural Engineer, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Design Protective Center

Michael Chipley, PhD, Vice President, Geospatial Solutions and Strategic Development, Technology Associates International Corporation

Roger Courtenay, ASLA, Principal, EDAW, Inc.

Horace H. Foxall, Jr., Program Manager, Center of Expertise for Preservation of Historic Structures and Buildings, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Frank V. Giblin, AICP, Urban Development / Good Neighbor Program, General Services Administration

Melvina Heisch, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Oklahoma State Historic Preservation Office

Eve Hinman, PE, Principal Engineer, Hinman Consulting Engineers, Inc.

Bruce Judd, FAIA, Principal, Architectural Resources Group

Robert D. Loversidge, Jr., FAIA, President and CEO, Schooley Caldwell Associates

F. Joseph Moravec, Private Consultant

Barbara A. Nadel, FAIA, Principal, Barbara Nadel Architect

Barbaralee Diamonstein-Spielvogel, Chair, Historic Landmarks Preservation Center

Paul Westlake, Jr., FAIA, Managing Principal and Lead Designer, Westlake Reed Leskosky

Nancy Witherell, Federal Preservation Officer, National Capital Planning Commission

Facilitation Staff:

Maureen Sullivan, Department of Defense Federal Preservation Officer

Brian Michael Lione, Department of Defense Deputy Federal Preservation Officer

Ideas for Consideration

Idea 1: Keep public historic properties open to the public.

Design and implement security measures for a property of historic significance that preserves its integrity and continues to provide public access in a manner consistent with the property's historic purpose and current use. Respect the character and visibility of a historic public property and its importance to our nation's story.

For all historic properties, preservation of integrity is of paramount importance. The designation of historic public properties recognizes that these places are important and should be an active and accessible part of our culture and society. The consideration of new physical security designs and their implementation must recognize existing conditions, programs, context, and presence – all of which contribute to a property's significance and all of which can be affected by the need for increased levels of security. Security measures must provide for, and enhance wherever possible, public access. Public access must continue to be served in a manner consistent with the mission of the organization and with the property types.

Keep historic properties open to the public. This is consistent with the values of our country and the National Historic Preservation Act. Americans expect and deserve reasonable access to their public buildings. Although we now live with a greater awareness of risk and threat, we must protect our public institutions in a way that does not compromise access and openness in the public realm. Notwithstanding the necessity of constrained access to some buildings and sites, the visibility of public and governmental functions must continue to be the norm in our democratic society.

Historic public places and buildings are preserved precisely because they inspire, educate, and uplift. They are treasured examples of architecture, fine art, decorative art, and landscape that form part of our cultural and artistic heritage. Historic landscapes, viewsheds, approaches and entrances, and significant interior spaces contribute greatly to the public's experience and appreciation. Sensitive interventions that protect historic properties can maintain operational effectiveness of the property and preserve or even improve public access in a manner consistent with their historic use and the mission they house.

In designing security protocols and procedures for historic properties, the design should ensure that the "public" are included in public access. If a new use for a public historic building is deemed necessary, it should be a compatible and accessible use, consistent with the building's character. Although electronic information can be a worthwhile educational tool and can supplement a visit, it should be a substitute only where loss of access is unavoidable.

Idea 2: Develop risk assessment methods appropriate for historic and archaeological properties.

Develop an All-Hazards risk assessment methodology that recognizes special challenge of protecting historic and archeological properties from natural hazards and manmade threats. Utilize principles that encourage public/private partnerships, including community groups and local law enforcement to reduce exposure to natural hazards and manmade threats.

Historic and archeological properties are unique because they represent our country's cultural heritage, and are, at the same time, living places fulfilling contemporary purposes. Property owners, designers, architects, security experts, and community groups should collaborate to reduce exposure to natural hazards and manmade threats while preserving historic integrity. Security planning should be coordinated with other community planning issues and begin with a comprehensive security risk analysis and threat assessment. There are methods for sharing information about risk and planning without compromising security in order to enhance community participation.

Broad, communitywide security risk analysis does not always occur, but it is necessary for successful security solutions. In many instances, a community-wide risk analysis may reveal that the actual threat to historic sites may be low and physical security enhancements may not be necessary.

The All-Hazards approach – natural hazards and manmade threats (criminal, workplace violence, technological accident, terrorism) – deals with hazards in a more comprehensive manner.

All-Hazards risk assessment for historic and archaeological properties is not currently a defined process in codes or standards. Code and standard writing and administration organizations¹ should collaborate to develop All-Hazards risk assessment methods for historic and archaeological properties that recognize:

- The role of the National Park Service (NPS) as a leader in historic preservation standards
- The need for application of the assessment at earliest planning phase
- The need to include multi-disciplinary team of professionals
- The importance of community dialog
- The requirements of Public Access (Americans with Disabilities Act and Special Needs requirements)
- The behavior of ordinary people
- A hierarchical assessment will be based on hazard/threat likelihood, asset value, and vulnerability
- The need for Risk Acceptance criteria and Mitigation Options (operational as well as physical solutions) that are capable of being measured and monitored over time
- The need to include life-cycle and cost-benefit analyses that balance low hazard/threat-high probability and high hazard/threat low probability events with public access and safety
- The sensitive nature of security information (pertains to methodology output)
- The need for the development of an educational and outreach program to teach the practicing professionals, university students, public, and standards officials how to apply risk management based decisions to historic properties

Comprehensive security planning includes design, technology, and operations. Operational solutions may be better suited than hardening of historic properties for such situations. In addition, security planning must be revisited periodically to address changes in risk and ability to respond to the risks.

Security solutions should be reversible in order to respond to changing risk and changing technology to address those risks. In addition, security solutions should be revisited as the risk changes rather than simply layering additional security controls.

¹ Code and standard writing and administration organizations referred to here may include, but are not limited to, NFPA, ASIS, ICC, BOMA, IFMA, ASTM and NIST.

Idea 3: Incorporate security related provisions into national building codes.

Review existing security principles and technical facilities standards for the purpose of developing security related provisions for new construction, existing buildings and historic properties that will be incorporated into national building codes. Include provisions to address architectural, operational, structural, mechanical, electrical, plumbing and landscape design requirements.

There is currently no nationally recognized code for new or existing buildings that specifically addresses security issues. Such national standards should be developed first, with special provisions applicable to historic buildings developed subsequently.

Federal agencies and standard writing organizations should review existing security principles and technical facilities standards for the purpose of developing security related provisions for historic properties that will be incorporated into national building codes. New/revised standards should include provisions to address architectural, structural, mechanical, electrical, plumbing and landscape design requirements for historic properties. Any standards should be performance based, similar to safety standards.

Any standards should be viewed as a tool rather than a prescriptive solution. Local building codes may be more appropriate under specific circumstances.

Federal agencies should work cooperatively to evaluate existing building codes and standards² to evaluate how they address historic properties, identify consistencies/inconsistencies, and develop a coordinated solution. Historic properties, risk, and building use vary therefore the solutions must vary accordingly.

Smart security related decision making is extremely process dependant and site specific. Responsible risk reduction requires a balanced and pragmatic approach that brings a wide range of expertise and issues to the table early in the decision process.

Prior to adoption of modifications to national building codes, municipalities should review existing federal security principles and technical facilities standards, as appropriate, to mitigate risk. Reviewable material should include guidebooks and best practices. Consider incorporating principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) which encourages public/private partnerships with community groups and local law enforcement to reduce crime.

These ideas can apply to all historic properties, but will be most useful for non-Federal facilities, as Federal entities generally have developed their own standards and have the resources to implement them.

² Building codes and standards referred to here include, but are not limited to, the International Building Code / International Existing Building Code (IBC/IEBC), the Interagency Security Criteria (ISC), and Department of Defense Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC).

Idea 4: Design matters – sensitive security solutions must be selected to protect the property’s historic integrity

Historic buildings and sites meet a high standard to be determined significant and worthy of protection, including the qualities of their architecture and setting, their importance to historical events and people, and the information they embody about our past. The design and siting of necessary security interventions must be held to the same high standard.

Multi-disciplinary design teams – architects, landscape architects, interior designers, engineers, community planners, archaeologists, historians, and security experts – should be selected for their experience and expertise, ability to be collaborative, talent, and passion for creating lasting designs that meet the security requirements yet are compatible with a historic setting. Designers must strive to go beyond prescriptive solutions in order to find creative, historically and aesthetically appropriate solutions commensurate with the individual historic property – solutions that are specific to the property and that do not diminish or compromise its purpose or architectural character.

As a result of excellent design, successful security interventions will preserve:

- Uninterrupted visual and physical access to publicly accessible landscapes and sites;
- Continued freedom of movement through a building’s setting and approaches;
- Public access to significant interior spaces such as lobbies, main corridors, and principal and ceremonial rooms;
- Minimization of the effect of perimeter security for both pedestrians and motorists on freedom of movement in the public realm; and
- Preservation of the aesthetic sensibility and historic character of the resource.

Public-sector, Federal, state, and local, reviewers of security proposals should become well-versed in current practice so that the most successful achievements in security design can be modeled and adapted for specific buildings and settings.

When security measures must be implemented, they should protect all aspects of the property’s historic integrity – design, materials, workmanship, setting, feeling, association, and location. The entire site should be considered when seeking solutions. Whenever possible, operational means rather than physical interventions should be employed. Sensitive security design measures will preserve visual and physical access to publicly accessible landscapes and sites, and continued freedom of movement through a building’s approaches and significant interior public spaces. It is important for public entities to be mindful of the public’s concerns and perceptions about access to our historic public buildings. It is incumbent upon us to continue to allow our public buildings to inspire and teach future generations about our nation’s history.

Some federal agencies are taking the lead in developing guidelines that seek to balance risk with protection of the public realm and historic buildings and settings. The General Services Administration’s Design Excellence Program can serve as a model for both process and results. The Secretary of Interior’s Standards remain the authoritative source for the review of security design proposals at historic properties. The Department of Defense’s Unified Facilities Criteria for Minimum Antiterrorism Standards for Buildings, the National Capital Planning Commission’s Security Plan, and guidance from the Commission of Fine Arts can also provide excellent examples of how to balance security issues with historic properties.

Public consultation must be an important part of the decision-making process. Under some circumstances, public consultation may need to be confidential, but should be and can be accomplished consistent with the purposes of the National Historic Preservation Act. Sensitivity to public participation during planning and design are important considerations. In fact, they are part of the solution in the public debate over how to provide a secure environment while preserving our significant historic resources.

Idea 5: Provide information and training to guide decision makers.

Coordinate and disseminate administrative guidelines and technical information that encourages continued use of historic and archaeological properties and assists property owners to effectively assess exposure to risk and recognize and implement effective non-intrusive security measures.

The collaborative team – property owners, architects, landscape architects, interior designers, engineers, archaeologists, historians, and security experts, and community groups – working on security solutions for historic properties need the knowledge and tools to make full informed decisions. The historic preservation community – the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), Federal agencies, State Historic Preservation Officers, Tribal Historic Preservation Officers, architects, landscape architects, interior designers, engineers, archaeologists, historians, and security experts – must work together to expand the resources available to assist owners of historic properties.

The Secretary of Interior’s Standards allow for flexibility to respond to the full range of technical requirements, from energy efficiency and modern space needs, to security planning. Security concerns should not outweigh historic significance, but they must be addressed. Both historic significance and security concerns can be balanced through an approach based on the Secretary’s Standards and model construction techniques.

The National Park Service should continue to develop and issue technical information to guide analysis and sensitive introduction of countermeasures to vulnerable historic buildings. The Briefs should address the following key security issues:

- 1) analysis of vulnerability;
- 2) site/perimeter security measures;
- 3) avoiding progressive collapse;
- 4) blast resistant design strategies
- 5) egress systems
- 6) blast window systems and laminated glazing.

The ACHP and the National Park Service should coordinate and disseminate administrative guidelines and technical information that assist historic and archaeological property owners balance security needs with historic preservation goals and objectives.

The ACHP should develop a program to provide grant funding for demonstration projects, perhaps through the Preserve America program, that demonstrate best practices implementing security measures at historic and archaeological sites.

Professional design and planning associations are also educating and training their members in this important field of professional practice.

Government agencies at all levels have a responsibility to provide guidance and training in order to continue to meet their obligations to preserve the historic properties under their protection.

There is a need to create a clearinghouse for information exchange to highlight best practices, standards, tools, guidance, and new technologies.

Conclusions

Owners of historic properties are encouraged to provide the maximum public access possible, consistent with their respective missions and with property types. The buildings, sites, structures, districts, objects, and landscapes are owned by both public- and private-sector parties. Many of these historic properties are publicly accessible, and we encourage the owners to ensure that the American people continue to have appropriate access to them.

The historical and architectural character and integrity of a property must be retained, and the public use risk balanced with the value of the property and possible design solutions. Security interventions should preserve the public's use and enjoyment of a historic resource for its intended or designed purpose. Designers must go beyond prescriptive solutions to find appropriate solutions specific to the property and site that do not diminish its design functionality or architectural character.

The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the National Park Service can provide the leadership and technical guidance to balance security requirements and public access to historic properties. Dissemination of administrative guidance and technical information encouraging the continued use of historic and archaeological properties and helping property owners address security concerns is of critical importance.

Federal agency officials and preservation professionals at all levels of government should have access to training opportunities and to guidelines on the best professional practices in this fast-evolving field, to benefit from the knowledge and experience of others, and to ensure the appropriate and consistent application of standards and guidelines in the Section 106 review process.

The Advisory Council and the National Park Service – working closely with Federal Preservation Officers, the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, the National Association of Tribal Preservation Officers, the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and professional planning and design associations – can help ensure that all Americans continue to experience our authentic heritage in a secure environment.

Appendices

- A Bibliography
- B Meeting Minutes, August 2006
- C Panel Questions
- D One Page Documents
- E Meeting Information, U.S. Naval Academy, August 30, 2006
- F Meeting Summary, August 30, 2006
- G Meeting Minutes, September 2006
- H Acronyms

Table Of Contents

POLICY..... 2

FEDERAL SOURCES..... 2

 Advisory Council on Historic Preservation..... 2

 Department of Defense..... 2

 Department of Homeland Security..... 2

 Federal Emergency Management Agency..... 2

 General Services Administration (GSA)..... 3

 National Institute of Standards and Technology..... 3

NON-FEDERAL SOURCES 4

 New York City Department of Buildings..... 4

 The Infrastructure Security Partnership (TISP)..... 4

PRACTICE..... 4

FEDERAL SOURCES..... 4

 Department of Defense..... 4

 Department of Homeland Security..... 4

 Federal Emergency Management Agency..... 4

 Federal Real Property Council (FRPC)..... 5

 General Services Administration (GSA)..... 5

 National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC):..... 5

 National Park Service:..... 5

NON-FEDERAL SOURCES 7

 American Crime Prevention Institute..... 7

 American Institute of Architects (AIA)..... 7

 American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA)..... 7

 ASIS International 7

 Commonwealth of Virginia – Department of Criminal Justice Services 8

 National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 8

 The Infrastructure Security Partnership (TISP) 8

 Whole Building Design Guide (WBDG) 8

 Private Individuals/Firms 8

 Articles 8

PARTNERSHIPS 9

FEDERAL SOURCES..... 9

 National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC):..... 9

 National Park Service:..... 9

NON-FEDERAL SOURCES 9

 American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA)..... 9

PUBLIC ACCESS 9

FEDERAL SOURCES..... 9

 Department of Defense..... 9

 National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC):..... 9

Policy

Federal Sources

Advisory Council on Historic Preservation

- "Protection of Historic Properties" (36 CFR Part 800) (incorporates amendments effective Aug. 5, 2004) <http://www.achp.gov/regs-rev04.pdf>

Department of Defense

- Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) 4-010-01: DoD Minimum Antiterrorism Standards for Buildings, October 2003. https://pdc.usace.army.mil/library/ufc/4-010-01/ufc_4_010_01.pdf
 - Establishes minimum standards for how all inhabited DoD buildings will be built to protect DoD personnel against a minimum level of terrorist attack. Includes information on how to adapt standards for existing buildings as well as an entire section on Compliance with Historic Preservation Requirements. An update/revision of this UFC is in draft.
- All current UFC, included several related to Security and design, can be found at http://65.204.17.188/report/doc_ufc.html. The following relevant UFCs are For Official Use Only (FOUO) and are not available on the internet without permission.
 - UFC 4-020-01FA, Security Engineering: Project Development, Mar 2005
 - UFC 4-020-02FA, Security Engineering: Concept Design, March 2005
 - UFC 4-020-03FA, Security Engineering: Final Design, March 2005

Department of Homeland Security

- Homeland Security Advisory Council (HSAC) Critical Infrastructure Task Force (CITF) Report, January 2006. www.dhs.gov/dhspublic/interweb/assetlibrary/HSAC_CITF_Report_v2.pdf
 - The objective of this report by the Critical Infrastructure Task Force (CITF) is to advance national policies and strategies that will foster the development of more resilient critical infrastructures. The recommendations contained herein leverage the foundation built by prior and ongoing Critical Infrastructure Protection programs, but assert that a future focus on resilience would establish a more appropriate basis for risk-based decision making.
- Interim National Preparedness Goal, April 2005. See <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/odp/assessments/hspd8.htm> for more information.
 - In accordance with Homeland Security Presidential Directive 8 "National Preparedness" (HSPD-8), the Goal will guide federal departments and agencies, state, territorial, local and tribal officials, the private sector, non-government organizations and the public in determining how to most effectively and efficiently strengthen preparedness for terrorist attacks, major disasters, and other emergencies.
- Letter from Judge William Webster, Acting Chair, HSAC, to DHS Secretary Michael Chertoff, February 14, 2006. http://www.dhs.gov/interweb/assetlibrary/HSAC_CITF_SecretaryLtr.pdf
 - Concerning substance and findings of the CITF Report
- National Infrastructure Protection Plan (Revised Draft, v. 2.0), January 2006. <http://www.ni2ciel.org/NIPC/Revised-Draft-NIPP-v2.0.pdf>
 - The NIPP provides the coordinated approach that will be used to establish national priorities, goals, and requirements for critical infrastructures and key resources (CI/KR) protection so that Federal funding and resources are applied in the most effective manner to reduce vulnerability, deter threats, and minimize the consequences of attacks and other incidents.

Federal Emergency Management Agency

- FEMA 426 - Reference Manual to Mitigate Potential Terrorist Attacks Against Buildings, December 2003. <http://www.fema.gov/plan/prevent/rms/rmsp426.shtm>
 - This manual provides guidance to the building science community of architects and engineers, to reduce physical damage to buildings, related infrastructure, and people

caused by terrorist assaults. The first publication to integrate the DoD and ISC AT standards, and one of the most downloaded FEMA pubs ever

General Services Administration (GSA)

- “Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service.” March 2005. www.gsa.gov/P100.
 - The Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service establishes design standards and criteria for new buildings, major and minor alterations, and work in historic structures for the Public Buildings Service (PBS) of the General Services Administration (GSA). This document applies to all new facilities or alterations for GSA owned or lease construction, and contains policy and technical criteria to be used in the programming, design, and documentation of GSA buildings. References to historic properties throughout the document; specifically Chapter 8: “Security Design.”
- “ISC Security Design Criteria.” Interagency Security Committee. September 2004. FOUO, not available on line. More information available at <http://www.oca.gsa.gov/mainpage.php#>; click on “About ISC Security Design Criteria.”
 - The ISC developed these criteria to ensure that security becomes an integral part of the planning, design, and construction of new Federal office buildings and major modernization projects. The criteria consider security in all building systems and elements.
- “Implementation of the ISC Design Criteria Regarding Site Selection.” Memo from Mr J. Moravec, Commissioner, GSA Public Buildings Service. April 26, 2002. <http://www.oca.gsa.gov/ISC/ISCSecurityRelatedSiteSelection50ft.pdf>
 - Provides information on how to implement preferred security treatments above the required minimums stated in the ISC Security Design Criteria. Acknowledges that some project restrictions, such as high urban construction density and historic preservation issues, may require further consideration and balancing of security needs.
- “Protective Design and Security Implementation Guidelines.” No date. http://www.oca.gsa.gov/ALL/pdfs/PDSIG_TOC.pdf. NOTE: only the table of contents is available on line.
 - This guideline is intended to assist program managers, consultants, and engineers to better understand the requirements, the technologies and the issues associated with the advanced Building Security Technology Program that supports new security criteria. While this document is not intended to make the reader an expert in the field, it should help non-blast and non-security consultants to be more conversant in the subject and more confident in their dealings with project issues related to these subjects. Since this document is focused primarily on the GSA's requirements, the chapters and sections herein attempt to relate specific topics to the ISC Security Design Criteria.

National Institute of Standards and Technology

- Final Reports of the Federal Building and Fire Investigation of the World Trade Center Disaster. http://wtc.nist.gov/reports_october05.htm
 - This is the final report on the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) investigation of the collapse of the World Trade Center (WTC) towers, conducted under the National Construction Safety Team Act. This report describes how the aircraft impacts and subsequent fires led to the collapse of the towers after terrorists flew jet fuel laden commercial airliners into the buildings; whether the fatalities were low or high, including an evaluation of the building evacuation and emergency response procedures; what procedures and practices were used in the design, construction, operation, and maintenance of the towers; and areas in current building and fire codes, standards, and practices that warrant revision.
- NIST's Recommendations Following the Federal Building and Fire Investigation of the World Trade Center Disaster. <http://wtc.nist.gov/recommendations/index.htm>

Non-Federal Sources

New York City Department of Buildings

- Local Law 26 of 2004.
http://home2.nyc.gov/html/dob/downloads/bldgs_code/locallaw26of04.pdf
 - Relating to the retroactive installation of sprinklers, exit signs, and photo-luminescent marking in high rise office buildings and other prospective changes to the code relating to fire safety; effective October 22, 2004.

The Infrastructure Security Partnership (TISP)

- Regional Disaster Resilience Guide, TISP, June 2006. http://www.tisp.org/rdr_guide
 - The Guide provides key definitions and a set of common assumptions that underpin regional disaster resilience. Using a simple, practical “how to” approach, the Guide lists 12 categories of typical needs based on lessons learned from previous disasters, both natural and man-made. The Guide recommends short, medium, and long term activities to address these respective preparedness gaps. The aim is to provide users of the Guide with the ability to examine and leverage existing approaches, tools, and technologies and to foster standardization across interdependent infrastructures and regions.

Practice

Federal Sources

Department of Defense

- Antiterrorism Measures for Historic Properties (DoD Legacy Project 03-0176), August 2006.
https://www.denix.osd.mil/denix/Public/Library/NCR/Documents/RPT_03-176.pdf
- Study of Antiterrorism/Force Protection (ATFP) Base Entrance Improvements in a Historic District (DoD Legacy Project 03-0195), September 2003.
<https://www.denix.osd.mil/denix/Public/Library/NCR/Documents/ATFP-in-a-Historic-District-2003.pdf>
 - This report provides recommendations and cost estimates for the ATFP improvements of an entrance at two DoD sites. The recommendations are intended for use by the individual installations as well as to provide general information for use by other bases considering security upgrades to gates located in or adjacent to historic districts. Each installation received two proposed solutions, one of which is a minimal and lower-cost option.
- Protective Design Center (PDC), US Army Corps of Engineers. <https://pdc.usace.army.mil/>
 - The PDC is the Army's center of expertise for engineering services related to force protection and protective design. The PDC provides engineering design and support services to the Army for both permanent and expedient applications and to DoD and other Federal agencies to protect assets against criminal, terrorist, conventional, nuclear and special weapon threats.

Department of Homeland Security

- **Full citations under “Policy”**
 - Homeland Security Advisory Council (HSAC) Critical Infrastructure Task Force (CITF) Report, January 2006.
 - Interim National Preparedness Goal, April 2005.
 - National Infrastructure Protection Plan (Revised Draft, v. 2.0), January 2006.

Federal Emergency Management Agency

- FEMA Risk Mitigation series publications - <http://www.fema.gov/plan/prevent/rms/>
 - A series of fourteen pubs and primers (6 on Security, 8 on Natural Disasters) used throughout the nation.
- FEMA 426 - Reference Manual to Mitigate Potential Terrorist Attacks Against Buildings, December 2003; full citation under “Policy” section.

Federal Real Property Council (FRPC)

- “FRPC Security Resource Guide – A Guide to Federal Security.” GSA Office of Government-wide Policy; Office of Real Property. Spring 2003.
http://www.gsa.gov/gsa/cm_attachments/GSA_DOCUMENT/security_Pdf_R2R-d1-m_0Z5RDZ-i34K-pR.pdf
 - The FRPC identified security as its number one issue to address in 2002 and formed a work group of representatives from a cross section of Federal agencies, including the Departments of Agriculture, Justice, State, and Interior, as well as NASA, National Research Council, OPM, SBA, SSA and GSA.

General Services Administration (GSA)

- **Full citations under “Policy”**
 - “Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service.”
 - “Implementation of the ISC Design Criteria Regarding Site Selection
 - “Protective Design and Security Implementation Guidelines.”

National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC):

- “Security and Urban Design.” No date; http://www.ncpc.gov/planning_init/security/security.html
 - Overview of the NCPC Security and Urban Design Planning Initiative; includes a narrative of the NCPC program as well as links to several background documents.
- “Designing for Security in the Nation's Capital.” October 2001;
http://www.ncpc.gov/planning_init/security/DesigningSec.pdf
 - The NCPC began to address the issue of security design in March 2001. with an Interagency Task Force. This report recommends specific urban design strategies for improving aesthetic conditions and access to public space in Washington.
- “National Capital Urban Design and Security Plan.” October 2002 with 2004 and 2005 updates;
http://www.ncpc.gov/publications_press/NCUDSP.html
 - This plan was the primary recommendation of the 2001 Interagency Task Force report. Projects submitted to NCPC for review and permit approval must adhere to this plan. “Historic Character” is one of several components considered in designing Security Plans; NHPA and NEPA are referenced as procedural requirements to be fulfilled by the permit applicant. Plan **Objectives and Policies** are clarified in the 2005 update; the beginning of the #1 objective is to “...protect design principles inherent in D.C.’s historic plan and its historic resources...”. While the plan focuses on security solutions for Washington, D.C., the design philosophy can be adapted to almost any urban environment.
- “Surviving Security: Building Federal/Local Partnerships in the Region – Workshop Proceedings.” November 2004;
<http://www.ncpc.gov/publicationspress/udsp/SurvivingSecurityProceedings.pdf>

National Park Service:

- “Bibliography On Emergency Preparedness For Historical Sites.” 2002.
<http://fpi.historicpreservation.gov/{dyn.file}/e779a1967eed4697b2abfe1676033507/Bibliography%20on%20Emergency%20Preparedness%20for%20Historic%20Sites.pdf>
 - Compiled by David Look, Chief, Cultural Resources Team, Pacific Great Basin Support Office, NPS, in support of the 2002 FPI conferences.
- Federal Preservation Institute (FPI) Conferences on Public Safety at Historical Sites: “Balancing Public Safety and Protection of Historic Places.” January and July, 2002.
<http://fpi.historicpreservation.gov/TechnicalInfo/RiskPreparedness/Security.aspx>
 - In 2002, the FPI organized a pair of conferences dedicated to adjusting and adapting methods of cultural resource stewardship in order to better protect these resources from a variety of disasters ranging from the natural to the man-made, and, in particular, against acts of terrorism. These two conferences sought to emphasize that ensuring safety and seeking to preserve our cultural heritage are both attainable, and that fulfillment of one goal need not preclude the fulfillment of the other.

- Preservation Briefs. <http://www.cr.nps.gov/hps/TPS/briefs/presbhom.htm>.
 - This is a series of 44 publications which assist owners and developers of historic buildings in recognizing and resolving common preservation and repair problems prior to work. The publications cover professional methods and techniques for preserving, improving, restoring, and maintaining historic properties. These publications are especially useful in conducting work consistent with the Secretary's *Standards* (see below). The full list of Preservation Briefs:
 - 01: Assessing Cleaning and Water-Repellent Treatments for Historic Masonry Buildings
 - 02: Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Masonry Buildings
 - 03: Conserving Energy in Historic Buildings
 - 04: Roofing for Historic Buildings
 - 05: The Preservation of Historic Adobe Buildings
 - 06: Dangers of Abrasive Cleaning to Historic Buildings
 - 07: The Preservation of Historic Glazed Architectural Terra-Cotta
 - 08: Aluminum and Vinyl Siding on Historic Buildings: The Appropriateness of Substitute Materials for Resurfacing Historic Wood Frame Buildings
 - 09: The Repair of Historic Wooden Windows
 - 10: Exterior Paint Problems on Historic Woodwork
 - 11: Rehabilitating Historic Storefronts
 - 12: The Preservation of Historic Pigmented Structural Glass (Vitrolite and Carrara Glass)
 - 13: The Repair and Thermal Upgrading of Historic Steel Windows
 - 14: New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings: Preservation Concerns
 - 15: Preservation of Historic Concrete: Problems and General Approaches
 - 16: The Use of Substitute Materials on Historic Building Exteriors
 - 17: Architectural Character - Identifying the Visual Aspects of Historic Buildings as an Aid to Preserving Their Character
 - 18: Rehabilitating Interiors in Historic Buildings - Identifying Character-Defining Elements
 - 19: The Repair and Replacement of Historic Wooden Shingle Roofs
 - 20: The Preservation of Historic Barns
 - 21: Repairing Historic Flat Plaster - Walls and Ceilings
 - 22: The Preservation and Repair of Historic Stucco
 - 23: Preserving Historic Ornamental Plaster
 - 24: Heating, Ventilating, and Cooling Historic Buildings: Problems and Recommended Approaches
 - 25: The Preservation of Historic Signs
 - 26: The Preservation and Repair of Historic Log Buildings
 - 27: The Maintenance and Repair of Architectural Cast Iron
 - 28: Painting Historic Interiors
 - 29: The Repair, Replacement, and Maintenance of Historic Slate Roofs
 - 30: The Preservation and Repair of Historic Clay Tile Roofs
 - 31: Mothballing Historic Buildings
 - 32: Making Historic Properties Accessible
 - 33: The Preservation and Repair of Historic Stained and Leaded Glass
 - 34: Applied Decoration for Historic Interiors: Preserving Historic Composition Ornament
 - 35: Understanding Old Buildings: The Process of Architectural Investigation
 - 36: Protecting Cultural Landscapes: Planning, Treatment and Management of Historic Landscapes
 - 37: Appropriate Methods of Reducing Lead-Paint Hazards in Historic Housing
 - 38: Removing Graffiti from Historic Masonry
 - 39: Holding the Line: Controlling Unwanted Moisture in Historic Buildings
 - 40: Preserving Historic Ceramic Tile Floors

- 41: The Seismic Retrofit of Historic Buildings: Keeping Preservation in the Forefront
- 42: The Maintenance, Repair and Replacement of Historic Cast Stone
- 43: The Preparation and Use of Historic Structure Reports
- 44: The Use of Awnings on Historic Buildings: Repair, Replacement and New Design
- “Principles for Development of Security Measures for Historic Places.”
<http://fpi.historicpreservation.gov/TechnicalInfo/RiskPreparedness/Principles.aspx>
 - During the two FPI conferences in 2002, a set of Standards for security measures at cultural heritage sites were developed.
- The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings.
<http://www.cr.nps.gov/hps/tps/standguide/index.htm>
 - The *Standards* are neither technical nor prescriptive, but are intended to promote responsible preservation practices that help protect our Nation's irreplaceable cultural resources. For example, they cannot, in and of themselves, be used to make essential decisions about which features of the historic building should be saved and which can be changed. But once a treatment is selected, the Standards provide philosophical consistency to the work.

Non-Federal Sources

American Crime Prevention Institute

- Main page – <http://www.aegissecuritydesign.com/APG/acpi/Default.htm> - to get Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) certification
- “The Law Enforcement Officer's Complete Crime Prevention Manual”
http://www.aegissecuritydesign.com/APG/acpi/law_enforcement_officer.htm
- “The Complete Commercial and Retail Crime Prevention Manual”
<http://www.aegissecuritydesign.com/APG/acpi/RetailManual.htm>
- “The Complete School Safety and Security Manual”
<http://www.aegissecuritydesign.com/APG/acpi/school%20manual.htm>

American Institute of Architects (AIA)

- “Building Security through Design.” http://www.aia.org/sec_default/.
- “Historic Preservation.” http://www.aia.org/hrc_default.
 - The mission of the Historic Resources Committee (HRC) is to identify, understand, and preserve architectural heritage, both nationally and internationally.

American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA)

- “Security Design.” http://www.asla.org/members/publicaffairs/federal2_a.html.
 - Covers the ASLA program; includes resources on ASLA policies, advocacy links, and links/documents relevant to Security Design. A factsheet is available at http://www.asla.org/members/publicaffairs/pdf/ASLA_securitydesign04.06.pdf.
- “Safe Spaces: Designing For Security and Civic Values.” Abstracts from the 2004 ASLA Security Design Symposium in Chicago, IL. PDF document available from <http://www.asla.org/safespaces/pdf/securitydesignabstractfinal.pdf>.
 - Includes several presentations by Federal Agency representatives and private industry experts on security design in landscape architecture. Some historic preservation-centric issues and case studies included.

ASIS International

- Main page: <http://www.asisonline.org/> to get the Certified Security Professional/PSI/PSP certifications. ASIS Guidelines:
- Business Continuity Guideline <http://www.asisonline.org/guidelines/guidelinesbc.pdf>
- Chief Security Officer Guideline <http://www.asisonline.org/guidelines/guidelineschief.pdf>
- General Security Risk Assessment Guideline
<http://www.asisonline.org/guidelines/guidelinesgsra.pdf>

- Private Security Officer Guideline
<http://www.asisonline.org/guidelines/guidelinesprivatefinal.pdf>
- Threat Advisory System Response Guideline
<http://www.asisonline.org/guidelines/guidelinesthreat.pdf>
- Workplace Violence Prevention and Response Guideline
<http://www.asisonline.org/guidelines/guidelineswpvfinal.pdf>

Commonwealth of Virginia – Department of Criminal Justice Services

- Safety by Design: Creating a Safer Environment in Virginia (Fact Sheet).
- Safety by Design: Creating a Safer Environment in Virginia (Informational Brochure).
www.dcjs.virginia.gov/cple/documents/cpted.pdf

National Fire Protection Association (NFPA)

- NFPA 730: Guide for Premises Security
- NFPA 731 - Standard for the Installation of Electronic Premises Security Systems. 2006 Edition.
- NFPA 909: Code for the Protection of Cultural Resource Properties—Museums, Libraries, and Places of Worship, 2005 Edition
- NFPA 914: Code for Fire Protection in Historic Structures, 2007 Edition
- NFPA 1600 - Standard on Disaster/Emergency Management and Business Continuity Programs. 2004 Edition.

The Infrastructure Security Partnership (TISP)

- Regional Disaster Resilience Guide, June 2006; full citation under “Policy” section.

Whole Building Design Guide (WBDG)

- “Accommodate Life Safety and Security Needs.” WBDG Historic Preservation Subcommittee.
http://www.wbdg.org/design/accommodate_needs.php.
- “Blast Safety of the Building Envelope.” by Eve Hinman, PE, Hinman Consulting Engineers, Inc.. http://www.wbdg.org/design/env_blast.php.
- “Provide Security for Building Occupants and Assets.” WBDG Safe Committee.
http://www.wbdg.org/design/provide_security.php.
- “Threat/Vulnerability Assessments and Risk Analysis.” Nancy A. Renfroe, PSP and Joseph L. Smith, PSP, Applied Research Associates, Inc..
http://www.wbdg.org/design/riskanalysis.php?r=accommodate_needs.
- “UFC/ISC Security Design Criteria Overview and Comparison.” Joseph L. Smith, PSP and Dan E. Kelley, Applied Research Associates, Inc.. http://www.wbdg.org/design/ufc_isc.php.

Private Individuals/Firms

- *Building Security: Handbook for Architectural Planning and Design*. Barbara A. Nadel, FAIA. Published 2004 by McGraw Hill.
 - Considered the “definitive twenty-first century reference on security design, technology, building operations, and disaster planning” Includes a chapter on historic preservation.
- *Building Security: Strategies and Costs*. David D. Owen and RS Means, Published May 2003 by RS Means.
- *Risk Analysis and the Security Survey*. James F. Broder. Second Edition, published 2000 by Butterworth Heinemann.

Articles

- “Jury sends warning notice to NY Property Owners: Failure to Properly Secure Property Against Threat of Terrorism Could Prove Costly.” By Noelle Lilien, Esq. *Quarterly Review*, 2006 Volume 11, Number 1. Zetlin De Chiara, LLC, NYC.
- “Security and Terrorism: Lessons Learned from September 11.” By Barbara A. Nadel, FAIA. *Buildings.com Security Newsletter for Commercial Buildings*, September 2006 - Vol. 1, Issue 3.
<http://www.buildings.com/Newsletters/Security/>
- “New York’s Building Code Reflects High-Rise Concerns - Recommendations from 9/11 will be debated.” By Barbara A. Nadel, FAIA. *BUILDING FOR A SECURE FUTURE - A Special Report by ENR and Architectural Record Magazines*. May 31, 2004.
<http://www.enr.com/features/bizlabor/archives/040531b-1.asp>

- "Building Security: Balancing Openness and Public Safety" By Barbara A. Nadel, FAIA. *Homeland Security*. December 2004.
- "Securing Past and Protecting the Future is Landmark Task." By Barbara A. Nadel, FAIA. *Engineering News Record*. December 1, 2003.
- "Designing For Security - Security Has Become A Top Priority In Building Design. The Challenge Is To Mitigate Damage While Still Creating Friendly Environments." By Barbara A. Nadel, FAIA. *Architectural Record*. March 1998.
http://archrecord.construction.com/resources/conteduc/archives/research/3_98_1.asp

Partnerships

Federal Sources

National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC):

- **Full citations under "Practice"**
 - "Designing for Security in the Nation's Capital."
 - "National Capital Urban Design and Security Plan."
 - "Surviving Security: Building Federal/Local Partnerships in the Region – Workshop Proceedings."

National Park Service:

- **Full citations under "Practice"**
 - Federal Preservation Institute (FPI) Conferences on Public Safety at Historical Sites: "Balancing Public Safety and Protection of Historic Places."
 - "Principles for Development of Security Measures for Historic Places."

Non-Federal Sources

American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA)

- **Full citation under "Practice"**
 - "Safe Spaces: Designing For Security and Civic Values." Abstracts from the 2004 ASLA Security Design Symposium in Chicago, IL.

Public Access

Federal Sources

Department of Defense

- **Full citation under "Practice"**
 - Study of Antiterrorism/Force Protection (ATFP) Base Entrance Improvements in a Historic District

National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC):

- **Full citations under "Practice"**
 - "Security and Urban Design."
 - "Designing for Security in the Nation's Capital."
 - "National Capital Urban Design and Security Plan."
 - "Surviving Security: Building Federal/Local Partnerships in the Region – Workshop Proceedings."

Conference Call Minutes - August 2, 2006

Attendee	Organization	Attendee	Organization
Curt Betts	Protective Design Center	Melvena Heisch	Oklahoma SHPO
Col. Steve Bradshaw	ODUSD(I&E) (DoD technical advisor)	Eve Hinman	Hinman Consulting Engineers, Inc
Erika Folk	Booz Allen Hamilton (Staff support)	Brian Lione	ODUSD(I&E) (Staff support)
Horace Foxall	MCX Historic Preservation	Steve Lorenzetti	National Park Service
Frank Giblin	Office of the Chief Architect	James Malanaphy	American Institute of Architects (panel co-chair)
Philip Grone	ODUSD(I&E) (panel co-chair)	Barbara Nadel	Barbara Nadel Architect
Caroline Harrover	Booz Allen Hamilton (Staff support)	Maureen Sullivan	ODUSD(I&E) (Primary staff point of contact)

Introductions

Mr. Grone and Mr. Malanaphy welcomed participants to the first Preserve America, Addressing Security Expert Panel conference call and initiated introductions. Mr. Grone and Mr. Malanaphy expressed their appreciation to the panel members for their participation.

Background Information

Mr. Malanaphy and Mr. Grone reviewed the purpose and goals of the Preserve America Summit and specifically, the Addressing Security Expert Panel. The Summit goals are to review the major components of the national historic preservation program and make recommendations to advance historic preservation programs and policy. The Addressing Security Expert Panel will address the question “How can we more effectively balance security concerns with the preservation and interpretation of historic properties?” The work of the panel will be accomplished through a series of conference calls and one face-to-face meeting. Recommendations will be presented for consideration to the larger Preserve America Summit October 18th-19th in New Orleans. Recommendations should include the following:

1. Executive summary
2. Summary of key issues
3. Recommendations for consideration by the Summit (2-5 pages)

All documents and references, as well as meeting agendas and minutes will be posted on a password-protected Website to which panel members will have access. The Website location and password information will be provided in a separate communication.

A list of other panels participating in the Preserve America Summit was forwarded on August 3, 2006 and will be on the Website. Both Mr. Malanaphy and Mr. Grone believe the work of the panel will be relevant to work being done by other panels. As such, they would like to liaise with other panels so all recommendations are comprehensive.

While the goal of the panel is to produce security recommendations for the Preserve America Summit, both Mr. Malanaphy and Mr. Grone would like all documents and research produced by the panel to be

included as an appendix to the final recommendations so they may act as a toolset for addressing security needs at historic properties.

Action Items

Mr. Malanaphy and Mr. Grone have prepared a list of questions to lead panel discussions. The panel is asked to review the questions and their categories for content and applicability to addressing security concerns at historic sites. Comments should be forwarded to Maureen Sullivan (Maureen.Sullivan@osd.mil) and Brian Lione (Brian.lione@osd.mil) by mid-day Monday August 7th. The focus of the next conference call, August 8th, at 4:30pm EDT, will be on refining these questions.

Mr. Malanaphy and Mr. Grone suggested creating subcommittees to focus on specific topic areas. Panel members are asked to review both the list of questions and the bibliography to determine where their professional knowledge may be most effective.

Current question categories and groups for possible subcommittees:

1. Risk Assessment – Threat, Vulnerability, and Balance with Historic Preservation
2. Standards – Design, Engineering, Structural, etc
3. Public Access – In Person or Virtual

Administrative Matters

Mr. Malanaphy and Mr. Grone reviewed the logistics for future discussions.

The panel members were asked to participate in weekly conference calls. A schedule of conference calls is provided below (also see attached calendar):

Tuesday, August 8, 4:30-5:30 pm EDT
Monday, August 14, 4:30-5:30 pm EDT
Monday, August 21, 4:30-5:30 pm EDT
Wednesday, September 6, 4:30-5:30 pm EDT
Tuesday, September 12, 4:30-5:30 pm EDT
Tuesday, September 19, 4:30-5:30 pm EDT
Tuesday, September 26, 4:30-5:30 pm EDT

The panel members are also asked to participate in a face-to-face meeting, scheduled for August 30th at the U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis MD. Panel members are asked to arrive in Annapolis on 29 August. Caroline Harrover (703-412-7814, harrover_caroline@bah.com) will contact panel members individually to make travel arrangements. More information will be forthcoming on the Annapolis meeting as the schedule of events is finalized.

Conference Call Minutes, August 8, 2006

Attendee	Organization	Attendee	Organization
Curt Betts	Protective Design Center	Melvena Heisch	Oklahoma SHPO
Col. Steve Bradshaw	ODUSD(I&E) (DoD technical advisor)	Bruce Judd	Architectural Resources Group
Michael Chipley	Technology Associates International Corporation	Robert Loversidge	Schooley Caldwell Associates
Barbaralee Diamonstein-Spielvogel	Commission of Fine Arts	Brian Lione	ODUSD(I&E) (Staff support)
Erika Folk	Booz Allen Hamilton (Staff support)	James Malanaphy	American Institute of Architects (panel co-chair)
Horace Foxall	MCX Historic Preservation	Joseph Moravec	Consultant
Philip Grone	ODUSD(I&E) (panel co-chair)	Barbara Nadel	Barbara Nadel Architect
Caroline Harrover	Booz Allen Hamilton (Staff support)		

Introductions

Mr. Grone and Mr. Malanaphy welcomed panel members. Since many panel members were unable to attend the August 2, 2006 conference call, Mr. Grone reviewed the purpose and goals of the Preserve America Summit and the Addressing Security Panel. For more information on either topic, please refer to the August 2, 2006 Meeting Minutes.

Administrative Matters

Mr. Grone confirmed that the Addressing Security Panel Website will soon be active. This Website will be used to house all relevant panel documents. Participants should receive an email from the Defense Environmental Network Information Exchange (DENIX) support staff containing an individual user ID and password. Please contact Mr. Lione (Brian.lione@osd.mil) if you do not receive login information from DENIX support staff.

Mr. Grone and Ms. Harrover discussed travel and lodging arrangements for the Addressing Security Panel face-to-face meeting, scheduled for August 30, 2006. The Department of Defense will cover the costs associated with travel and lodging for this meeting. Ms. Harrover will contact panel members individually to provide assistance with travel arrangements.

Action Items

The Addressing Security Panel will discuss the question “How can we more effectively balance security concerns with the preservation and interpretation of historic properties?” Recommendations from the panel will be presented for consideration to the larger Preserve America Summit. Mr. Malanaphy and Mr. Grone have prepared a list of questions to frame panel discussions. Panel members are asked to review the questions and their categories for content and applicability to addressing security concerns at historic sites. To facilitate developing recommendations, Mr. Grone and Mr. Malanaphy propose dividing the panel into subgroups based on the three security areas: 1) Risk Assessment, 2) Standards, and 3) Public Access. The panel members are asked to indicate subgroup preference. Please forward

comments on the list of questions and proposed subgroups to Maureen Sullivan (Maureen.Sullivan@osd.mil) and Brian Lione (Brian.lione@osd.mil) by mid-day Friday, August 11, 2006.

Suggested subgroup activities:

- Hold additional weekly conference calls
- Assemble a bibliography
- Characterize best practices (previous recognition provided by the Preserve America Council may provide a good starting point)
- Develop an initial set of recommendations

Panel Discussion

Panel discussion centered on the list of questions prepared by Mr. Malanaphy and Mr. Grone relating to 1) Risk Assessment, 2) Standards, and 3) Public Access.

Panel members asked the panel chairs to define the audience for the final recommendations. Mr. Grone responded that the intended audience is the greater preservation community, including federal, state, and local historic area managers as well as managers of private historic sites. Federal agencies would likely consider these recommendations in their programmatic approaches and policy decisions. The larger preservation community would likely use the final recommendations and associated material developed by the panel as guidance. The panel could begin by examining current national policy on security at historic sites. Panel recommendations should attempt to strengthen federal policy concerning security of historic buildings and structures.

Mr. Grone reiterated that the panel recommendations should not be confined to federal or government owned assets but applicable to all historic preservation efforts, regardless of size or funding availability. Mr. Grone noted that while security concerns might be more acute to Federal facilities, historic sites such as the National Mall and Philadelphia's Independence Hall have general security issues pertaining to public access.

Panel members noted that different property classes are responding to security risks in very different ways. The healthcare industry and transportation networks are a few of the industry groups that are seriously addressing issues of security. Private industry may provide insight into best practices that can be applied to historic preservation.

All panel members acknowledge that each historic site has different risk factors and recommendations for federal facilities may not be appropriate to other historic sites. While every site may have a different risk profile, the risk components are similar for most historic sites. Panel recommendations should be sure to include different risk scenarios. Additionally, panel members want to ensure that recommendations do not sacrifice safety. Securing human life should always be the primary concern.

Panel members concluded discussion by asking whether the panel should focus on security from a public access perspective only or include response actions to disaster scenarios. Panel recommendations should focus on prevention rather than disaster response. The Dealing with the Unexpected Preserve America Panel will focus on responses to disaster scenarios, and Addressing Security Panel chairs will coordinate with this panel as necessary.

Conference Call Minutes, 14 August 2006

Attendee	Organization	Attendee	Organization
Curtis Betts	Protective Design Center	Melvena Heisch	Oklahoma SHPO
Col. Steve Bradshaw	ODUSD(I&E) staff	Eve Hinman	Hinman Consulting Engineers, Inc
Michael Chipley	Technology Associates International Corporation	Bruce Judd	Architectural Resource Group
Roger Courtenay	EDAW Inc	Brian Lione	ODUSD(I&E) staff
Barbaralee Diamonstein-Spielvogel	Historic Landmarks Preservation Center	Robert Loversidge	Schooley Caldwell Associates
Erika Folk	Booz Allen Hamilton staff	James Malanaphy	American Institute of Architects
Horace Foxall	MCX Historic Preservation	Barbara Nadel	Barbara Nadel Architect
Frank Giblin	Office of the Chief Architect	Maureen Sullivan	ODUSD(I&E) staff
Philip Grone	ODUSD(I&E)	Paul Westlake	Westlake Reed Leskosky
Caroline Harrover	Booz Allen Hamilton staff		

Introductions

Mr. Malanaphy welcomed participants to the Preserve America, Addressing Security Expert Panel conference call and initiated introductions.

Action Items

Panel members should complete the follow items in advance of the next conference call, scheduled for August 21:

- Finalize travel reservations for August 29-30 Security Panel Meeting
- Comment on draft agenda for August 29-30 Security Panel Meeting
- Collect documents to be provided in hard copy at the August 29-30 Security Panel Meeting
- Prepare one-page document on professional perspectives prior to the August 30 meeting (select panel members only)
- Participate in subcommittee activities

Administrative Matters

Ms. Sullivan discussed hotel and travel arrangements for the August 29-30 Security Panel Meeting. All panel members who are attending the meeting should have received a travel memo from Ms. Harrover detailing the instructions for making travel arrangements. Please contact Ms. Harrover (harrover_caroline@bah.com, 703-412-7814) with any travel-related questions.

Ms. Sullivan discussed the draft agenda for the August 29-30 Security Panel Meeting. Mr. Grone and Mr. Malanaphy will host a 6:30pm welcome reception and a 7:00pm dinner on Tuesday, August 29 at the Maryland Inn. Mr. Jim Cheevers, the Assistant Director and Curator of the Naval Academy Museum, will give a presentation on the history of the architecture of the U.S. Naval Academy during dinner.

On August 30, DoD has arranged transportation between the Maryland Inn to the Naval Academy Alumni Hall. Breakfast at Alumni Hall will begin at 7:30am and the Security Panel Meeting will begin at 8:00am. There will be a morning presentation from Captain Mike Fierro, Naval Support Activity Annapolis, on efforts to increase security while maintaining public access to the Naval Academy's National Historic Landmark District. The remainder of the day will be a working session for the panel, except for a brief break to watch the Naval Academy's noon formation. White boards, projection screens, and flip charts will be available to facilitate discussion during the working session and lunch will be provided. The meeting is scheduled to end at 5:30pm. Following the meeting, panel members are welcome to participate in a tour of the Naval Academy.

Open Discussion

Panel members agreed to divide into subcommittees based on the three security areas: 1) Risk Assessment, 2) Standards, and 3) Public Access. The subcommittee groups are as follows:

Risk Assessment

Curt Betts
Michael Chipley
Eve Hinman
Stephen Lorenzetti
Joe Moravec

Standards

Horace Foxall
Frank Giblin
Bruce Judd
Barbara Nadel
Nancy Witherell

Public Access

Roger Courtenay
Barbaralee Diamonstein-Spielvogel
Melvena Heisch
Bob Loversidge
Paul Westlake

Please note that Mr. Stephen Lorenzetti and Ms. Nancy Witherell are assigned to Risk Assessment and Standards, respectively, in their absence.

Suggested subcommittee activities include:

- Selecting a deputy subgroup lead;
- Holding additional weekly conference calls;
- Assembling a bibliography;
- Characterizing best practices (previous recognition provided by the Advisory Council may provide a good starting point);
- Developing an initial set of questions and recommendations; and
- Drafting answers to questions outlining how the functional community addresses these questions.

Mr. Grone and Mr. Malanaphy requested that select panel members draft a one-page document detailing security questions from their professional perspective. For example, what are the kinds of things a State Historic Preservation Officer or a landscape architect would consider in relation to the three

subcommittee areas. The subcommittee work and the one-page documents will form the basis of future teleconferences and the August 30 in-person discussions.

Mr. Grone will share the Addressing Security framework of 1) Risk Assessment, 2) Standards, and 3) Public Access with the other Preserve America panels to encourage cross-panel dialogue. Mr. Grone will share any responses received from other panels. Mr. Grone will also ensure subcommittee folders are placed on the panel website to facilitate dissemination of material.

Panel Discussion

Panel members are reminded that their focus should be on historic (existing) buildings, and any security recommendations should consider aesthetics of historic buildings as well as applicability across many different types of buildings or structures.

Risk Assessment:

Panel members noted that a cost/benefit analysis for security measures has not been developed for historic buildings. A cost/benefit analysis tool might provide insight on what security mitigation measures are appropriate at specific facilities and facilitate economic decision-making. Cost/benefit equations may also be incorporated into existing standards. Panel members expressed concern that a cost/benefit analysis might focus on affordability of securing historic buildings and negatively affect decision-making. Panel members agree that cost/benefit analysis best serves historic preservation as a tool to compare various security options and to select actual investments in security measures. Mr. Don Rypkema was suggested as a resource for case studies on cost/benefit analysis. Ms. Sullivan will contact Mr. Rypkema and ask for information on security cost/benefit analysis.

Standards:

Preliminary suggestions from the standards subcommittee members included a need to develop a uniform standard for historic buildings. The National Fire Protection Association (NFPA)'s *1600 Standard on Disaster/Emergency Management and Business Continuity Programs* and *730 Guide for Premises Security* are examples of standards addressing security issues. One panel recommendation may be to modify these standards to address historic buildings. [Note – these standards are available in the Bibliography folder on the web site.

The panel also discussed developing recommendations to amend the National Historic Preservation Act to address balancing historic preservation with security issues. The General Services Administration's guidelines on "first impressions" may provide another opportunity for the panel to expand on an existing standard.

Public Access:

Subcommittee discussion on public access will center on the following questions:

- How requirements for public access differ at public landmarks versus government buildings?
- What should the public be allowed to see?
- What buildings need what kind of security?

Conference Call Minutes, 21 August 2006

Attendee	Organization	Attendee	Organization
Curtis Betts	Protective Design Center	Bruce Judd	Architectural Resource Group
Col. Bradshaw	ODUSD(I&E) staff	Brian Lione	ODUSD(I&E) staff
Michael Chipley	Technology Associates International Corporation	Robert Loversidge	Schooley Caldwell Associates
Erika Folk	Booz Allen Hamilton staff	James Malanaphy	American Institute of Architects
Horace Foxall	MCX Historic Preservation	Joe Moravec	Consultant
Frank Giblin	Office of the Chief Architect	Barbara Nadel	Barbara Nadel Architect
Caroline Harrover	Booz Allen Hamilton staff	Maureen Sullivan	ODUSD(I&E) staff
Melvina Heisch	Oklahoma SHPO	Paul Westlake	Westlake Reed Leskosky
Eve Hinman	Hinman Consulting Engineers, Inc	Nancy Witherell	National Capital Planning Commission

Introductions

Mr. Malanaphy welcomed participants to the Preserve America, Addressing Security Expert Panel conference call and initiated introductions.

Action Items

Panel members are asked to complete the following items by Thursday, August 24:

- Comment on the One-Pager Perspectives Summary

Panel members are asked to complete the follow items in advance of the Security Panel Meeting on August 30:

- Participate in subcommittee activities

Administrative Matters

Ms. Sullivan recently attended the quarterly meeting of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, where Chairman Nau requested the Preserve America expert panels to consider a wide scope in developing recommendations. Chairman Nau advised panel members that their recommendations should include efficiency improvements to current regulations but not change current law.

The Council is still finalizing the agenda and invitee list for the Preserve America Summit in New Orleans. Currently, no travel information is available. Ms. Sullivan reminded panel members that the Council will pay for non-federal employee travel to the Summit.

Ms. Sullivan reviewed the agenda and logistics for the face-to-face Addressing Security Panel Meeting on August 30. Shuttle service will be available to transport panel members to and from the hotel and the Academy prior to and after the August 30 meeting. If panel members wish to drive to the meeting at Alumni Hall, please send Ms. Sullivan your vehicle information (car type, model, and license plate number) so you can be cleared to enter the Naval Academy.

On August 30, breakfast at Alumni Hall will be provided at 7:30am and the meeting will start at 8:00am. There will be a morning presentation from Captain Mike Fierro, Commander, Naval Support Activity Annapolis, on efforts to increase security while maintaining public access to the Naval Academy's National Historic Landmark District. After a review of goals and directions, the panel will divide into subcommittees for the morning working session. The panel will break to watch the Naval Academy's noon formation, followed by a working lunch at Alumni Hall. After lunch, the subcommittees will present results of their morning discussions and the entire panel will generate consensus on recommendations. At the end of the day, the panel will decide on steps forward or additional assignments as needed.

Mr. Malanaphy requested that panel members wishing to bring other presentation material email the items to Ms. Sullivan. All documents and presentations are due by Thursday, August 24.

Subcommittee Status

Mr. Malanaphy noted that all panel members have been assigned to subcommittees but there has not been much activity in the DENIX discussion boards. He encouraged subcommittees to reach out to their members via email and phone prior to the August 30 meeting. Ms. Nancy Witherell agreed to move to the Public Access subcommittee since two members of this subcommittee are not able to attend the August 30 meeting.

One-Page Document Discussion

Mr. Grone and Mr. Malanaphy had requested select panel members draft a one-page document detailing security questions from their professional perspective. Mr. Malanaphy thanked those panel members for their efforts. Mr. Lione reviewed the one-page documents and identified common themes to develop a perspectives summary addressing general security issues, risk assessment, standards, and public access. Mr. Malanaphy urged the panel members to review the perspectives summary and send any questions or comments to Mr. Lione by Thursday, August 24.

General Security Issues

Mr. Malanaphy initiated discussion on the general security issues listed in the perspectives summary. The panel agreed that the issues raised in this section could be molded into a preamble before a series of recommendations. Panel members suggested ordering the panel recommendations in the following order: public access, standards, and risk assessment. All recommendations should support historic properties that "first welcome then challenge."

Risk Assessment

Risk can be categorized as having three factors: target attractiveness, asset value, and vulnerability. Diverse risks need to be considered in a risk assessment including workplace violence, terrorism, insider threats, theft, and natural threats. The *National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 1600*, for example, contains instructions on how to conduct a hazard threat rating and asset value rating. Other standards may contain similar guidance. The panel can examine these standards and consider recommending the various councils/organizations modify these standards to encompass a historic building context.

It is often very difficult and costly to improve historic structures to meet criteria for progressive collapse and blast. The panel discussed assigning uses to these structures that invite a lower threat, unless the site itself may be developed to mitigate the risk. Many security features that can be applied to historic buildings are operational rather than mechanical in nature. A panel recommendation could focus on developing guiding principles for the approach to risk assessment, synthesized to historic preservation practice. This recommendation could be a historic site security design guide, with many of the principles being process oriented.

The panel discussed the difficulties in having architects, rather than security personnel, responsible for making security decisions. Security personnel should assess risk with input from architectural and historical perspectives. In addition, many security personnel do not want to publicize their risk. The panel discussed the sensitive nature of releasing security information to the public.

Standards

Many historic facilities, such as capital or courthouse buildings, are public venues where the threat of terrorism has high consequences but low probability. These sites are more likely to have security issues like workplace violence or criminal activity and most security master plans address these, more common, security issues. Not many of these security master plans address terrorism. Security personnel should develop risk assessments with designers, who collectively decide on mitigating risk factors. A panel recommendation could consider synthesizing various standards and adding consideration for historic facilities or developing a historic facility standard.

Public Access

Some federal buildings are opting out of historic district areas due to their inability to meet security standards. Panel members should consider addressing security issues for all buildings in a historic district to preserve the vitality of the district.

How can we more effectively balance security concerns with the preservation and interpretation of historic properties?

Three areas to consider:

1. Risk Assessment – Threat, Vulnerability, and All Hazards Risk - Balance with Historic Preservation
2. Standards – design, engineering, structural, etc
3. Public Access – in person or virtual

Risk Assessment:

- Does the definition of risk differ for Federal Agencies, and for the public?
- How do we achieve a balance between acceptable risk and catastrophic loss?
- How do we consult to achieve the balance?
- Should we develop standards/ guidance to do the risk assessment?
- How do we weigh historic preservation in the risk assessment process (including public access)?
- Should the elements of risk be the same for the public and private sectors with room for liberal application and interpretation of the results to allow direct comparisons among projects?
- How does cost enter this process?

Standards:

- Should All-Hazards standards be developed for historic buildings?
 - Natural
 - Criminal
 - Technological Accident
 - Terrorism
- Should we examine the effectiveness of current efforts to “harden” historic buildings against explosives while not compromising their historic character?
- How do we plan for response efforts that minimize damage to historic properties?
- Are there treatment protocols for combining security issues with historic properties?
- Are there means to share/disseminate best practices?
- Are there means to examine evolving security methods and technologies as they relate to historic properties?
- How to balance between passive (structural) vs. active (observation) to address threats?
- Is there a need to compare the DoD Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection (AT/FP) standards to Interagency Security Committee standards for the other Federal Agencies to determine how they address historic preservation?
- What is the role of NFPA and ICC standards and codes?
- How do we balance seismic requirements (up & down) with pressure wave (blast) when hardening facilities?
- How do we balance hurricane/tornado wind loadings with pressure wave?
- Should historic buildings be subject to the same design standards and performance levels as other buildings?

Public Access

- How do we define public access?
- How do we balance security threats with public access?
- What is the role of landscape design?
- What is the role of virtual heritage tours? How to encourage virtual heritage tours?
- Does restricted access to properties and information constrain the documentation of historic properties and planning for their management? If so, how to overcome?
- How to strike an appropriate balance between security needs and public involvement during environmental review of projects affecting historic properties?

Architect Perspective -- Bob Loversidge, Jr., FAIA

Change is inevitable. If we are to design changes to improve the physical security of historic buildings, we will have to accept the fact that the altered building will not be a true “restoration” back to a specific period or style. This is NOT a bad thing; nor should we be afraid of it – just a starting point for this discussion. Most of the historic buildings we are considering are public buildings (owned by a unit of government, or an institution or a business) and “open” to the public. As architects we must ensure that security enhancements are both design sensitive (i.e., follow the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards) and, to the degree possible, reversible (since threats, standards, appropriate design responses, technologies and even the use of the building might change in the future).

Risk Assessment

Historic public buildings run the gamut from small house museums (that may not have much security risk), to highly sensitive government installations like military bases and US Embassies overseas. In between are museums, courthouses, city halls, churches, cultural centers, libraries, schools, capitols, and, of course, privately owned businesses, office buildings and the like. All are vulnerable, to some degree, but how vulnerable and to what threats? Presumably, the risks are not equal. As architects we generally have to rely on others to assess the risk.

Standards and Preservation Design

As with many aspects of historic preservation design, we must be wary of any type of one-size-fits-all standards. As designers, we must be able to understand the rationale behind a standard or requirement, so we can apply it (or develop a reasonable alternative) in a way that is consistent with preservation good practice. The design process for security may be similar to the application of life safety codes or alterations to enhance access for people with disabilities. The key is to design the new features in such a way that they do not “hit you in the face” before you fully appreciate the historic resource. One tool that can help is the establishment of “Preservation Zones,” setting design guidelines appropriate to the relative significance of each space.

Public Access

Locked doors and annoying entry procedures take the “public” out of Public Access. I have a 1906 newspaper with a letter from a man who was upset because he had traveled for many hours on a Sunday – his only day off – to see his state capitol, only to find that it was locked down for the weekend. People expect and deserve reasonable access to their public facilities, but freedom of access must be weighed against the risk (during the Civil War, the general public could walk through the White House and ask to see President Lincoln!). Security features added to an historic building should not diminish the experience (at least any more than is necessary). While the “risk assessors” need to keep this in mind, so too do the architects, who need to assess the significance of spaces and try to allow maximum public interaction with the most important rooms. Often the interior spaces are symbolic or representational and contribute greatly to the experience, whether it is the background to conduct business or part of a cultural experience.

Change is inevitable, but with historic structures, that change should be very carefully managed.

Design Standards / Engineer’s Perspective -- Curt P. Betts, P.E.

There are a myriad of ways to approach a given engineering problem, and there is a wide range in how particular systems will respond to loadings or other internal and external factors. If left up to individual design teams to establish all of the design criteria, there would be little consistency in design, potentially resulting in solutions that are less safe than might be acceptable to the public as a whole. In fact, because safer structures and systems inherently are more expensive, it is highly likely that owners would pressure designers to reduce safety to save money...up to a point. It is because that point is difficult to define that we have design standards. Nearly everything engineers design is designed using one more standards. Standards, which are commonly developed by panels of experts, ensure there is a reasonable level of safety in design and a level of consistency in the approaches to design and analysis.

Most design standards are developed for application to new construction, for which they commonly work quite well. Most design standards are assumed to apply to existing buildings and systems, including historical ones, similarly to new buildings and systems; therefore, engineers consider the same issues when addressing security in historical buildings as they do in designing new buildings. Those considerations vary with the threat that the design is required to mitigate. Some of the major such considerations are standoff distance and access control coupled with building hardening to resist the effects of weapons, explosives, and tools.

In designing a new building, there are usually at least some opportunities through the site design to enable access control and establish standoff distance. There may also be opportunities to use natural or man-made shielding to mitigate some weapons and explosives attacks. Those opportunities are rarer in historic buildings because the site and building design are commonly set. That often leaves building modification as the only option for mitigating security threats. The major factor to consider in approaching such problems is to design a solution that has minimal impact on the appearance and other historic aspects of the historic building. The other significant factors are more technical. They include dealing with the potential for deterioration of existing building systems and for having to deal with a large number of unknowns.

The tools and information resources that are available to assist in decision making are limited. Especially in the area of weapons and explosives resistance, the behavior of newly constructed building materials and systems are not understood or documented well in most cases. How existing building materials and systems behave is known even less, which points to a major gap. That leads to the use of one particular tool, testing, as one of the few tools engineers can use to fully understand these systems, and testing is expensive and time consuming.

One of the major challenges to working on historical buildings and other structures is in understanding how those structures were built and the design standards that were used to build them. While old design codes can usually be found (where codes even were available) and construction practices can often be determined, those codes and practices were not always followed and maintenance and modifications may have made the original construction less relevant. Therefore, trying to balance requirements for mitigating threats with minimizing the impact on historic structures that may not be able to be understood is the crux of the challenge.

What the engineering community has done thus far in addressing the challenges above has primarily been focused on research, testing, and innovation. That is likely to remain the focus due to the complexity of the issue and the high cost and uncertainty of developing codes for existing buildings.

Landscape Architect Perspective -- Roger Courtenay, ASLA

1. The principal questions for perimeter security in sensitive environments:

What should SHPO look for?

- Accept the inevitability of change, which comes with any intervention
- Consider whether the level of intervention is supported by the risk
- Is there a precinct-wide and ‘regional’ acceptability and contextual sensitivity/continuity?
- Has the impact on the cultural landscape been evaluated and addressed, with mitigation if necessary – has what constitutes significance change/acceptable change been analyzed and reported with recommendations?
- Have new interventions been sensitively integrated for historic continuity: landscape/architecture/site elements/style/design character?
- Has there been recognition of building/facility setting as an integral and equally valuable component of the entire historic entourage?

What should approval agencies, federal or otherwise, look for?

- Preservation of freedom of movement
- Preservation of sense and perception of public access and freedom of environment
- Degree of impact on public realm viewsheds and corridors
- Degree of individual visual access to the ground plane
- Recognition of difference in motorist and pedestrian experience and perception of perimeter security
- Aesthetic sensibility, fit, and appropriateness to context
- Public attitudes, response, concerns, and acceptance – integration of public consultation should be mandatory for this kind of public space design in the future, whether the project is in public or ‘privileged’ (secure or not accessible) space

Approvals – the nit-picking details

- Mock-ups may be important earlier rather than later
- Early design studies which are presented will inevitably be expected to be presented at a high level of finish and resolution – precisely because aesthetics are important and integral to approval and acceptance
- A utility and infrastructure understanding and approach is key to promoting a comprehensive and therefore acceptable design

Technology transfer and experience

- Identify and share actual maintenance and operational characteristics and histories of various moving equipment (in particular, vehicular barriers)
- Bollard and structural advances – website clearinghouse for new and novel
- Reluctance of federal agencies to create/undertake comprehensive shared testing

Shaping Annapolis meeting:

- Large scale of public realm at risk – is the solution similarly large scale (urban precinct definition for controls) at the scale of pedestrian environment intervention, or a combination of both?
- Does physical design implementation make sense in a world much advanced from 1996’s cutting edge car bomb to today’s bio/chem/nuke/explosive threats carried by individuals with no concern for their own lives (or the next generations beyond that)? (Is the interdiction/diplomacy/information triad, which has protected us without domestic incident that

we are aware of since 9/11, the more appropriate way forward? What role do we as planners and designers have in advocating the political and policing solutions?)

2. Annapolis Workshop

Suggestion for workshop agenda:

First Session

- Establish ground rules (use break-out groups)
- Identify issues and concerns along certain pre-identified categories (full assembly)
- Develop a set of preliminary recommendations (use break-out groups)
- Second Session
- Re-visit and summarize progress to date (all)
- Push discussion forward (use break out groups)
- Report back, consolidate findings (all)
- Third Session
- Share recommendations for discussion (all)
- Generate consensus set of recommendations:
 - Break out groups tackle categories
 - Full assembly reconvenes to agree

3. Suggested Additional References

Suggested additional resources, if not already available:

- NCPC Urban Design Security Master Plan (2002/3)
- Smithsonian Institution Mall Security Master Plan (2003/4)
- Embassy of the Future (National Research Council) (1986, or later edition if available)
- GSA Draft Design Guide (now under construction)

Federal Agency Perspective -- Frank Giblin

The following presents an informal overview of a ‘federal agency perspective,’ regarding security issues in historic buildings.

Assessments:

- Required protection levels lack nuance. Most civilian facilities above a certain size are treated as DOJ Level IV (comp. to ISC ‘moderate’). This includes a broad range of sizes, occupancies, agencies, contexts, and construction types. Intuitively, they do not present the same likelihood/vulnerability/consequences regarding attack, yet, as a starting point, they are treated the same, with significant implications for historic buildings
- Risk acceptance is poorly understood. The need to accept risk in order to make well-balanced decisions is not well understood, especially by non-security experts. Although ISC criteria allow decision makers to deviate where appropriate, this is an extremely difficult (and unrewarded) choice for a federal official to make. The result is inflexibility.
- Difficult to prioritize risk based on true probabilities. At present, there is no quantification of risk (threat/vulnerability/probability/consequences) that suggests to federal decision makers how they might make more informed decisions. Quantification is not possible, perhaps, but the principle would help to bring balance.
- Blast performance of historic buildings systems not well understood. Informal analysis suggests structures may be more robust than currently assumed in planning.

Standards:

- Anti-terror standards differ from one agency to another. This presents complexities (GSA follows ISC, DOD follows UFC, US courts follow ISC plus USMS etc.) but standardization to one extreme would be more problematic. E.g., ISC allows for exceptions based upon cost and appropriateness of countermeasure, while UFC does not.
- Important to allow and encourage flexibility, where appropriate. Flexibility in decision making is important, generally, but crucial to adaptive reuse. Important to understand that design criteria is based on set design basis tactics, which may not represent the actual event.
- Smart security decisions are extremely process dependant. Application of security standards should follow an inclusive process, which includes consideration of historic and off site impacts.

Public Access:

- Important to keep historic resources in the public realm. GSA managers over 400 historic buildings, many with significant public spaces. We need to find better ways to provide public access to these buildings – if possible, without the ‘airport treatment.’
- Countermeasures may diminish experience of historic interiors. GSA/designers are aware of this issue and are designing to it. Still missing is appropriate risk acceptance.
- Loss of ability for adaptive reuse. Strict application of security standards limits the ability of historic buildings to meet modern needs of federal agencies, alone or in conjunction with new construction. This limits design solutions and results in demolition rather than reuse.
- Affects on historic districts. Security design standards drive federal new construction away from established downtowns and adjacent historic districts, making both less viable. Physical countermeasures also have significant impacts on the character of the district.

Risk Assessment -- Paul Westlake Jr. FAIA

Historic structures within the inventory of the Federal Government are an important tool for conveying Dignity and Legacy of government and its programs and processes. Principles of “access” and “openness” and the preservation and public enjoyment of landmarks must be balanced with practical security concerns meant to protect the structures and their occupants.

It is obvious that it is easier to design and construct new facilities to mitigate higher risks and threats than to adapt landmarks and older structures designed prior to current criteria for security.

It is thus logical that development of a matrix that would match threats (risks), programs (functions) of governmental agencies/entities and structures would match lower threats and programs of lesser vulnerability to historic structures; conversely, higher threats associated with programs of higher vulnerability would be matched with new structures that may be designed to current and emerging security criteria. An exception would be for landmarks of high symbolic significance such as monuments, where the security risk is less for occupants than for the preservation of an icon related to national identity, and where the “use program” cannot be transferred or assigned to a structure of greater risk accommodation.

Landmarks may stimulate greater interest in access and visitation by the general public, and may be important to cultural and historic tourism and related economic development objectives. Because of the desire for public access, it may be logical that landmarks be adapted for uses that pose lower risks to the structure and its occupants.

The known characteristics of landmark structures and properties provide an understanding of achievable setbacks and security barriers. An assessment of practical and achievable setbacks will indicate the threat that the building and its use may tolerate without major modification; this will guide the logic of programmatic assignment.

A key to avoiding expensive structural modification to an historic structure for security reasons, or to avoiding aesthetic modifications inconsistent with the Secretary’s Standards, will be the assignment of uses or programs to the landmark that are commensurate with the risk tolerance of the structure.

It should be recognized that it is often very difficult and costly to improve historic structures to meet criteria for Progressive Collapse and Blast, and therefore these structures should be assigned uses or programs that might be classified as inviting a lower threat, unless the site itself may be developed to mitigate the risk or threat.

SHPO Perspective -- Melvena Heisch

The State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) acts for the State in matters pertaining to the national historic preservation program. Each SHPO has flexibility in its implementation of the program, but each SHPO must carry out the same basic responsibilities in accordance with federal regulations, standards, and guidelines.

SHPOs interact with owners of historic properties in three basic ways. These include (1) the review of federal undertakings pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act [and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's implementing regulations 36 CFR Part 800], (2) the review of rehabilitation work proposed for the federal investment tax credits, and (3) the provision of technical assistance to nonprofit organizations, the general public and government agencies. Regardless of the reason for SHPO involvement in project review, there is the potential for security issues to be a consideration. Since the SHPO is not the property owner, the SHPO does not determine the use of/public access to any property and does not determine the needs of the owner (such as those determined in risk assessment). The SHPO's primary focus is on how a project under review may impact the character of the specific property.

The SHPO relies on the Secretary of the Interior's Treatment Standards for Historic Properties to determine the appropriateness of project work. Other materials, such as the Preservation Briefs series, offer additional guidance. The property owner's mission and goals determine which treatment (restoration, rehabilitation, etc.) is appropriate. SHPO's consider the current condition of the historic property and details included in National Register nominations and other documentation as they apply the relevant standards and make recommendations.

Challenges that confront SHPO's in balancing security needs and historic preservation are similar to those related to any other work items under review. Property owners are almost always faced with funding constraints and short timetables. Far too often owners simply do not understand why a particular property is significant, why the SHPO is involved in their projects, and what compliance with the Secretary's Standards will mean for their bottom line.

SHPO's strive to encourage the adaptive reuse of historic properties and to demonstrate how they are really community assets. Good stewardship of historic properties does not mean that those using the property are settling for inferior or unsafe places to work, live, and enjoy leisure activities. It just means that the first idea about how to address a problem related to access or some other issue may not be the only solution.

Explosive Risk Perspective -- Barbara A. Nadel, FAIA

Assessment

When addressing historic properties and blast, it's important to evaluate the significance of the historic resource, and perform a risk assessment and vulnerability analysis. Factors to consider include how the building or asset is used, occupancies, level of iconic symbolism, whether it has been or could be a terrorism target, adjacent structures or icons which could also be targets that could result in collateral damage, how critical this asset is to the national or local image, ability to deliver critical services, and the impact if this asset were to be damaged, closed for any length of time, or destroyed.

Factors for protecting building occupants and historic properties from blast damage include:

- Developing appropriate standoff distance and setbacks where possible
- Utilizing landscape design, street furniture and public art elements to enhance setback zones and prohibit straight runs by vehicles to buildings
- Designing or reinforcing structural systems to prevent progressive collapse
- Reinforcing building envelope materials as needed
- Designing or modifying windows and glazing types to limit and reduce flying debris and shattered glass, such as use of blast windows and laminated glass
- Ensuring egress systems allow direct access to the outside when exiting from upper floors, not through other spaces, should the building be in danger of collapse.
- Creating secured screening areas and carefully designed lobbies
- Limiting contaminant airborne infiltration through ventilating systems
- Developing and regularly testing public address and notification systems
- Ensuring that emergency generators, power and HVAC equipment can operate for several days at mission critical facilities and areas, not just a few hours when power is lost

Standards

Depending on the building type, agency, occupancies, and location, different standards may apply. For Federal buildings, many agencies have their own building guidelines and standards, such as GSA and the National Park Service. While not a mandate by any means, the NIST report, completed in 2005, may provide some guidance, along with some provisions of NYC Dept of Buildings Local Law 26, developed in response to the events of 9/11 at the World Trade Center, especially regarding egress systems and exiting from high rise buildings.

Public Access: Transparent Security

Transparent security consists of various architectural, landscaping, engineering, and interior planning and design elements that are not visible to the public eye but incorporate important security design features. Creative approaches to standoff areas allow generous use of landscaping elements, street furniture, and public art to provide pleasant public spaces which exemplify transparent security.

Other techniques to minimize the risk of direct vehicular approaches to buildings, where applicable and possible, include creating troughs, trenches and grade changes, covered by grass and planting that would cause a speeding vehicle to slow down and possibly stop, when heading towards a building.

Protection Of Historic Properties Against The Threat Of A Terrorist Bombing -- Eve Hinman

Major historic properties have significant symbolic value, increasing their target attractiveness and therefore the risk of terrorist attack. Because of their historic value, the appearance and experience of visiting these properties is a major part of their significance and is critical to maintain for future generations. This often limits the amount of protection that can be provided.

In addition to the potential for structural damage, there is also the risk of injuries and potentially fatalities, because these properties are often major tourist attractions that hundreds or thousands of people, including many school children, may visit during a single day. There is also a desire to keep the properties open to the public consistent with the values of our country. These constraints are at odds with physical security which can limit access within the structure and tends to limit the amount of protection that can be provided because the threat could be anywhere on the property.

Depending on the age and construction of a historic structure, it may be quite fragile structurally. Wood structures or log cabins would be examples of particularly fragile structures. Brick or stone structures have some resistance due to their weight, but they may not be able to sustain major damage without collapsing and causing massive casualties. Examples of this type of structure include the piers of the Brooklyn Bridge or the monumental federal buildings built during the 1930's in Washington DC. Steel or metal structures designed prior to World War II may have significant resistance due to over-design due to the need to perform hand calculations, and a lack of understanding of how structures behave. The main concern for these structures is the potentially high population within these large structures. Examples include the Empire State Building, the Golden Gate Bridge and the Statue of Liberty. For structures with large spans between walls there is also the danger of massive casualties if the roof fails. This concern would apply for instance to the Grand Central Station in New York and many airport terminals.

Windows are another major concern due to the large number of injuries that have occurred in past bombings due to flying glass shards. Some of the features which are particularly dangerous include wood frames because they are so weak. Fortunately, for historic buildings, the windows tend to be smaller than contemporary buildings, limiting the surface area of glass relative to the wall and somewhat mitigates the hazard.

Finally, because of the desire to maintain the look and feel of historic properties, keeping vehicles as far from the structure(s) as possible is by far the most effective tool because explosive pressures decay very rapidly with distance. Ideally, the standoff alone may be used as protection so that the fabric of the structure does not need to be touched at all. The more accessible the structure is to vehicles the more invasive the mitigation features may need to be to provide significant protection. This is a major challenge for many historic properties, particularly those in urban areas.

Preserve America Summit – Addressing Security Expert Panel Meeting - Agenda

August 29th Reception, Calvert House, Annapolis

6:30 - 7:00 Cocktails
7:00 - 9:00 Dinner and Speaker – Mr. Jim Cheevers, Associate Director and Senior Curator,
U.S. Naval Academy Museum

August 30th Alumni Hall, U.S. Naval Academy

07:15 Shuttle bus departs Calvert House to Alumni Hall
07:30 – 08:00 Breakfast
08:00 – 08:15 Welcome and Opening Remarks
(James Malanaphy and Philip Grone)
Introductions (all Participants)
08:15 – 09:00 Overview of Annapolis and U.S. Naval Academy –
Presentation: *Nexus of Security and Heritage Tourism*
(Mayor Ellen Moyer, City of Annapolis [Mr. Bob Agee, City Administrator] and
CAPT Mike Fierro, Commander, Naval Support Activity Annapolis)
09:00 – 09:30 Break - Media and guests leave
(Speakers and Panel chairs available for media)
09:30 – 11:30 Panel Discussions – Subcommittees Meet
11:30 - 12:30 Watch Noon Formation
12:30 – 1:30 Working Lunch – Continued Subcommittee Discussions
1:30 – 2:15 Subcommittees present results (15 minutes each)
2:15 – 3:00 Panel Discussions
3:00 – 3:30 Break
3:30 - 5:00 Panel Discussions
5:00 – 5:30 Closing Remarks
5:30 Shuttle Bus returns to Calvert House for those not on tour
5:30 - 6:30 Naval Academy Tour – Optional
6:30 Shuttle Bus returns to Calvert House

Preserve America Summit – Addressing Security Expert Panel Meeting

Meeting Attendees

Bob	Agee	City of Annapolis
Susan	Barnes	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Dave	Berwick	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Curt	Betts	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Protective Design Center
Col. Steve	Bradshaw	Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations & Environment)
Lou Ann	Broad	U.S. Naval Academy
Michael	Chiple	Technology Associates International Corporation
CAPT	Cook	Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Installations & Environment)
Rick		
CAPT	Fierro	Naval Support Activity Annapolis
Mike		
Erika	Folk	Booz Allen Hamilton
Horace	Foxall	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Center of Expertise for Preservation of Historic Buildings and Structures
Frank	Giblin	Urban Development/ Good Neighbor Program, General Services Administration
Phil	Grone	Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations & Environment)
Caroline	Harrover	Booz Allen Hamilton
Melvena	Heisch	Deputy State Historic Preservation Office, Oklahoma
Eve	Hinman	Hinman Consulting Engineers, Inc
Bruce	Judd	Architectural Resources Group
Brian	Lione	Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations & Environment)
Steve	Lorenzetti	National Mall and Memorial Parks, National Park Service
Robert	Loversidge	Schooley Caldwell Associates
James	Malanaphy	Historic Resources Committee, American Institute of Architects
Joe	Moravec	Consultant
Barbara	Nadel	Barbara Nadel Architect
VADM	Rempt	U.S. Naval Academy Superintendent
Rodney		
Joe	Rubino	U.S. Naval Academy External Affairs
Don	Schregardus	Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Environment)
Maureen	Sullivan	Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations & Environment)
Jay	Thomas	Headquarters, NAVFAC
Paul	Westlake	Westlake Reed Leskosky
Nancy	Witherell	National Capital Planning Commission

Panel Report, September 5, 2006

PRESERVE AMERICA, ADDRESSING SECURITY EXPERT PANEL FACE-TO-FACE MEETING

Summary:

On August 30, fourteen members of the Preserve America Summit panel on Addressing Security met at the National Historic Landmark US Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland. Led by co-chairs James Malanaphy, Chair of the Historic Resources Committee, American Institute of Architects and Philip Grone, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment, the panelists drafted several recommendations concerning the nexus of security issues and historic properties. The recommendations center on issues of public access, standards, and risk assessment. Panel members will solicit input on recommendations, and consider and incorporate input into their final report for the *Preserve America* Summit.

Background:

Prior to arriving in Annapolis, panel members participated in five conference calls to address the question: “How can we more effectively balance security concerns with the preservation and interpretation of historic properties?” During these calls panel members refined a list of questions related to security concerns at historic properties and divided themselves into subcommittees to address issues of public access, standards, and risk assessment. Documents relevant to the discussions were collected and compiled into a bibliography covering security issues and historic preservation. Additionally, select panel members drafted one-page documents detailing security issues from their professional perspectives.

Annapolis Panel Meeting:

In Annapolis, panel members were informally introduced over dinner Tuesday evening, August 29. Mr. Jim Cheevers, Associate Director and Senior Curator of the Naval Academy Museum, provided an illustrated overview of the Academy’s 161 years of history, highlighting four main periods of development and construction.

Following formal introductions and a brief welcome by the co-chairs, The Honorable Ellen Moyer, Mayor of Annapolis, and Captain Mike Fierro, Commander, Naval Support Activity Annapolis opened the August 30 meeting. Their collaborative briefing outlined how the city and the Navy work together to achieve a balance of historic preservation and security issues at the Naval Academy. The City of Annapolis and the Naval Academy are both National Historic Landmark districts that have together fostered an extensive and open cooperative relationship to address security needs while welcoming heritage tourism. Annapolis receives approximately four million visitors a year; of that number, approximately two million visit the Naval Academy.

The panel then broke into three previously determined subcommittees to develop recommendations. Subcommittees engaged in lively discussion, referring to the security questions and one-page documents addressing security issues from various professional perspectives. The Panel members witnessed the daily Noon Formation – the simultaneous assembly of all 4200 Naval Academy midshipmen – prior to a working lunch. The Noon Formation is a daily tradition that is also open to the general public – a fine example of how the Academy works with the City to balance security concerns with heritage tourism.

After lunch, the Panel members reconvened to discuss and provide feedback on draft recommendations. Subcommittees met again to refine recommendations based on panel comments and again, presented draft recommendations to the entire panel for discussion.

The meeting concluded with continued discussion and the development of a schedule to finalize recommendations in advance of the September 22 deadline. Immediately following the meeting, several Panel members received an in-depth tour of the historic Naval Academy grounds and buildings, including the Chapel, the Crypt of John Paul Jones and Bancroft Hall.

Next Steps:

The three subcommittees are scheduled to convene independently by conference call on September 6. These calls will allow subcommittees to refine recommendations based on feedback from the full panel. The final recommendations and supporting text from each subcommittee will be shared with the full panel by September 11. Panel members are encouraged to provide comments to other subcommittees for inclusion in their expanded recommendations. The next conference call with the full panel is scheduled for September 12.

Meeting Attendance:

Co-Chairs:

Philip Grone, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations & Environment)
James Malanaphy, Historic Resources Committee, American Institute of Architects

Panel Members:

Curt Betts, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Protective Design Center
Michael Chipley, Technology Associates International Corporation
Horace Foxall, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Center of Expertise for Preservation of Historic Buildings and Structures
Frank Giblin, Urban Development/ Good Neighbor Program, General Services Administration
Melvena Heisch, Oklahoma State Historic Preservation Office
Eve Hinman, Hinman Consulting Engineers, Inc
Bruce Judd, Architectural Resources Group
Robert Loversidge, Schooley Caldwell Associates
Joe Moravec, Private Consultant
Barbara Nadel, Barbara Nadel Architect
Paul Westlake, Westlake Reed Leskosky
Nancy Witherell, National Capital Planning Commission

Invited guests:

Mayor Ellen Moyer, City of Annapolis
Bob Agee, City of Annapolis
Susan Barnes, Vice Chair, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Dave Berwick, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
Col. Steve Bradshaw, Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations & Environment)
Lou Ann Broad, U.S. Naval Academy
CAPT Rick Cook, Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations & Environment)
CAPT Mike Fierro, Naval Support Activity Annapolis
Joe Rubino, U.S. Naval Academy External Affairs
Don Schregardus, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Environment)
Jay Thomas, Headquarters NAVFAC

Conference Call Minutes, September 12, 2006

Attendee	Organization	Attendee	Organization
Curtis Betts	Protective Design Center	Eve Hinman	Hinman Consulting Engineers, Inc
Roger Courtenay	EDAW Inc	Bruce Judd	Architectural Resource Group
Erika Folk	Booz Allen Hamilton staff	Brian Lione	ODUSD(I&E) staff
Horace Foxall	MCX Historic Preservation	Robert Loversidge	Schooley Caldwell Associates
Frank Giblin	Office of the Chief Architect	James Malanaphy	American Institute of Architects
Caroline Harrover	Booz Allen Hamilton staff	Barbara Nadel	Barbara Nadel Architect
Joe Moravec	Consultant	Maureen Sullivan	ODUSD(I&E) staff
Melvena Heisch	Oklahoma SHPO	Nancy Witherell	National Capitol Planning Commission

Introductions

Mr. Malanaphy welcomed participants to the Preserve America, Addressing Security Expert Panel conference call and initiated introductions. He reminded panel members that the combined draft panel recommendations (file name: Panel_Draft_Recommendations_11SEP06.doc) were posted to the group Web site and that the purpose of this call is to review and revise these recommendations. The Panel has one additional conference call, scheduled for September 19, before the recommendations are due to the Preserve America Summit on September 22.

Action Items

Revisions to the draft recommendations are due noon on Friday, September 15. The following individuals volunteered to revise recommendations:

- Recommendation 1: Public Access – Ms. Witherell and Mr. Courtenay
- Recommendation 2: Risk – Staff
- Recommendation 3: Standards – Staff
- Recommendation 4: Design – Mr. Loversidge and Mr. Judd
- Recommendation 5: Education – Staff

Comments on Draft Recommendations

Executive Summary

Mr. Malanaphy stated that the executive summary was extrapolated from each subcommittee submission and is open to revision. Panel members recommended this section be revised to include a powerful statement explaining the importance of security at historic sites as well as a summary of all final recommendations. Panel members suggested naming each final recommendation to facilitate referencing their one-page supporting text. Panel members also recommended adding a discussion of the audience for these recommendations (private institutions or state/federal properties) and expanding the training recommendations to include training for non-federal employees. Finally, the panel discussed including the nature of the security threats that these recommendations are designed to address.

Recommendation #1

“Design and implement security measures for historic and archaeological properties which preserve their historical integrity and continue to provide for public access in a manner consistent with the property’s historic use and sensitive to the operational needs imposed by the property’s current use.”

This recommendation was created from the Public Access subcommittee’s first and second recommendations. Panel members suggested that “authenticity” be discussed in relation to this recommendation and agreed it could be addressed in the one-page supporting text for this recommendation. The panel agreed that this recommendation needed to be stronger, shorter, and more declarative. Ms. Witherell and Mr. Courtenay will work together to refine the recommendation.

Recommendation #2

“Develop an All-Hazards risk assessment methodology that recognizes special challenge of protecting historic and archeological properties from natural and manmade hazards. Recognize that often, the most effective hazard mitigation strategies are community-wide inter-agency collaborative risk and hazard management planning and response programs that maximize scarce resources to protect community assets. Utilize principles that encourage public/private partnerships with community groups and local law enforcement to reduce exposure to hazards.”

The panel members agreed that the first and third sentences were clear, but recommended removing the second sentence as it only reiterates the community inclusive concept from the first sentence. In response to a comment about defining “all-hazard risk assessment,” panel members agreed that all required definitions and explanations can be incorporated in the one-page supporting text for this recommendation.

Recommendation #3

“Review existing security principles and technical facilities standards for the purpose of developing security related provisions for new construction, existing buildings, and historic structures that will be incorporated into national building codes. Include provisions to address structural, mechanical, electrical, plumbing, architectural, and landscape design requirements.”

Recommendation #4 and #5

“Author and publish administrative guidelines and technical information briefs to guide risk and hazard assessment - and mitigation methodologies - especially related to historic and archaeological properties.”

“Coordinate and disseminate administrative guidelines and technical information that encourages continued use of historic and archaeological properties and assists property owners to effectively assess exposure to risk and recognize and implement effective non-intrusive security measures.”

Ms. Nadel requested adding “egress systems” to the list of key security issues on page 8, recommendation 4 and 5 one-page supporting text.

General Comments

Panel members agreed that recommendations be reordered and refocused on the following five topics.

1. Public Access – Representing the current recommendation #1
2. Risk Assessment – Defining risk assessment and providing guidance on how one should be completed for a historic site
3. Standards – Developing security standards for historic sites
4. Design – Addressing security design requirements
5. Education - Combining current recommendation #4 and #5

Panel members expressed their desire that all recommendations be considered together to address security concerns at the Preserve America Summit. The individual recommendations address varying aspects of security issues at historic sites and the panel's final recommendation is a combination of all five recommendations.

New Orleans Preserve America Summit

Ms. Sullivan will send out an email with information on the New Orleans Summit later this week. The invitations were scheduled to be sent this week and Ms. Sullivan will investigate their status.

Conference Call Minutes, September 19, 2006

Attendee	Organization	Attendee	Organization
Curtis Betts	Protective Design Center	Melvena Heisch	Oklahoma SHPO
Michael Chipley	Technology Associates International Corporation	Eve Hinman	Hinman Consulting Engineers, Inc
Barbaralee Diamonstein-Spielvogel	Historic Landmarks Preservation Center	Brian Lione	ODUSD(I&E) staff
Erika Folk	Booz Allen Hamilton staff	Robert Loversidge	Schooley Caldwell Associates
Horace Foxall	MCX Historic Preservation	James Malanaphy	American Institute of Architects
Frank Giblin	Office of the Chief Architect	Barbara Nadel	Barbara Nadel Architect
Philip Grone	ODUSD(I&E)	Maureen Sullivan	ODUSD(I&E) staff
Caroline Harrover	Booz Allen Hamilton staff	Nancy Witherell	National Capitol Planning Commission

Introductions

Mr. Grone welcomed participants to the Preserve America, Addressing Security Expert Panel conference call and initiated introductions. He noted that the latest draft recommendations (file name: Addressing_Security_Draft_Report_Sept_18_2006.doc) were posted to the group Web site and that the purpose of this call was to review and revise these recommendations. Mr. Grone reminded the group of the importance of reaching consensus on these recommendations. Recommendations are due to the Preserve America Summit on September 22 but Mr. Grone stated he remains flexible on this date if the recommendations require further revision.

Ms. Witherell and Mr. Courtenay have made edits to the executive summary and other sections of these draft recommendations that have not been incorporated in the current draft. These and any additional edits will be distributed after the call.

Executive Summary

The panel agreed that the Executive Summary language should mirror the sequential steps outlined by all five recommendations. The five-step logic is as follows:

- Keep sites open;
- Assess risk;
- Write performance-based codes to match identified risks;
- Design protective measures well; and
- Educate others.

Idea 1: Keep public historic properties open to the public.

Design and implement security measures for historic and archaeological properties which preserve their historical integrity and continue to provide for public access in a manner consistent with the property’s historic use and sensitive to the operational needs imposed by the property’s current use.

While this recommendation may seem self-evident, panel members agree that its content is critical. Ms. Witherell and Mr. Courtenay edited the supporting text for this recommendation by moving the paragraph about confidentially earlier in the text and expanding the discussion on design and consultation with the public. Additional edits suggested include revising language concerning the importance of public access to government functions and removing the word archeological since some archaeological properties are

currently not open to the public, such as burial grounds and other culturally sensitive sites. The bullets at the bottom of the recommendation are to be replaced with a summary, in paragraph form, and the bullets themselves will be moved to Idea #4.

Mr. Grone wants to ensure all recommendations have practical effects and requested all supporting text indicate if the idea is a goal or a best practice. The panel discussed recommendation 1 being a “best practice” and to support this categorization, agreed to add discussion of the importance of adaptive reuse to the supporting text.

Idea 2: Develop risk assessment methods appropriate for historic and archaeological properties.
Develop an All-Hazards risk assessment methodology that recognizes the special challenge of protecting historic and archeological properties from natural and manmade hazards. Utilize principles that encourage public/private partnerships with community groups and local law enforcement to reduce exposure to hazards.

Mr. Grone asked for clarification on to whom this recommendation is being directed. Ms. Nadel suggested moving up the definition of “All-Hazards” to earlier in the supporting text. Other suggestions included editing the language to present a sequential set of steps.

Idea 3: Incorporate security related provisions into national building codes.
Develop security related provisions for new construction, existing buildings and historic structures and incorporate them into national building codes. Include provisions to address structural, mechanical, electrical, plumbing, architectural, and landscape design requirements.

The panel discussed the site-specific requirements of designing security measures for historic sites and agreed that any security codes should be non-prescriptive performance codes to address these requirements. The panel recommended adding “performance standards/codes” language to the supporting text for this recommendation.

The panel agreed to revise the supporting text for this section so it clearly links recommendations 2 and 3. The risk assessment outlined in recommendation 2 determines the exact type of risk while recommendation 3 describes how to use performance codes to mitigate these risks.

Specific supporting text changes recommended include moving the second paragraph to before the first and beginning the list of provisions with “architectural” design requirements. The panel agreed that the supporting text focused too heavily on Federal agencies and the panel recommended removing the statement, “*These ideas can apply to all historic buildings, but will be most useful for non-Federal facilities, as Federal entities generally have developed their own standards and have the resources to implement them.*” Finally, the panel noted that only renovations or additions to existing sites would be considered “new” construction and that this language should be revised.

Idea 4: Design matters – sensitive security solutions must be selected to protect the property’s historical integrity.
Designated historic buildings and sites have been chosen for many reasons, including quality of the original design, significance, integrity, etc. It is essential that the quality of design of necessary security interventions be held to the same high standard.

The panel discussed GSA’s design excellence as an example design model for this recommendation. All agree that the recommendation is to use high quality design to go beyond codes and standards and should provide performance, not prescriptive, standards. The recommendation and supporting text should

discuss the process where risks are identified, codes are used as resource, and design solutions are developed that focus on particular site characteristics.

Idea 5: Provide information and training to guide decision makers.

Research and develop administrative guidelines and technical information briefs to guide risk and hazard assessment and mitigation methodologies especially related to historic and archaeological properties. Provide broad public access to information and training that will assist property owners to accurately assess exposure to risk and recognize and implement sensitive and effective security measures.

The panel suggested removing the extra language on the point # 6 to match the other items in the list.

Conclusions

Panel members agree that the conclusion to the recommendations, when written, will discuss problem areas for future attention and include definitions of standards and risk process. The conclusion will also note that security related conditions change very rapidly while development or modification of codes can be a slow process. Future criminal or terrorist related actions could change security concerns rapidly and all recommendations should allow flexibility for quick response.

Any additional comments on the draft recommendations should be sent to Ms. Sullivan by COB Thursday. Ms. Witherell will update her edited version based on today's conversation and post for all to review ASAP. Another draft will be distributed to the group on Friday, September 22.

New Orleans Summit Logistics

Emails containing invitations and logistical information for New Orleans Preserve America October meeting were distributed on September 17. Ms. Sullivan will follow up with the panel members to ensure everyone received and invitation. Hotel reservations can be made at the New Orleans Marriott and registration for both rooms and Summit attendance is open until September 29.

Conference Call Minutes, September 28, 2006

Attendee	Organization	Attendee	Organization
Michael Chipley	Technology Associates International Corporation	Brian Lione	ODUSD(I&E) staff
Rodger Courtney	EDAW Inc	Bruce Judd	Architectural Resource Group
Barbaralee Diamonstein-Spielvogel	Historic Landmarks Preservation Center	James Malanaphy	American Institute of Architects
Erika Folk	Booz Allen Hamilton staff	Joe Moravec	Consultant
Horace Foxall	MCX Historic Preservation	Barbara Nadel	Barbara Nadel Architect
Philip Grone	ODUSD(I&E)	Maureen Sullivan	ODUSD(I&E) staff
Caroline Harrover	Booz Allen Hamilton staff	Nancy Witherell	National Capitol Planning Commission
Melvena Heisch	Oklahoma SHPO		

Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Malanaphy and Mr. Grone welcomed participants to the Preserve America, Addressing Security Expert Panel conference call and initiated introductions. He noted that the latest draft recommendations (file name: Addressing_Security_Draft_Report_Sept_27_2006.doc) and accompanying slides (file name: Addressing_Security_Presentation_as_of_Sept-28-2006.ppt) were posted to the group web site. The purpose of this call was to review and revise these recommendations and accompanying slides.

Final Revised Recommendations

Power Point Presentation Comments

- **Slide #2** – Currently, the slide describes the subcommittees used to develop security recommendations at the August 30 face-to-face meeting. Panel members recommended adding “Design” and “Education” to the areas listed on this slide. While these two topics were not part of the original subcommittee structure, they more correctly capture the final recommendation areas.

- **Slide #4** – Add the words “threats” to the end of the second bullet so it is consistent with the previous bullet.

- **Slide #5** – The second bullet lists requirements to be considered when amending current building codes. Panel members recommend moving “architectural” to the beginning of this list to be more consistent with standard practices.

Executive Summary Comments

Mr. Grone asked for clarification on the term “embody the investment” used in paragraph one. The panel responded that investment refers to human capital, physical assets, public services, etc. that are captured by historic properties.

Idea 1: Keep public historic properties open to the public.

Design and implement security measures for a property of historic significance that preserves its integrity and continues to provide public access in a manner consistent with the property’s historic purpose and current use. Respect the character and visibility of a historic public property and its importance to our nation’s story.

1. The panel recommended changing “protected” to “preserve” in line one of paragraph three.
2. The panel discussed the terms “inadequate facility” and “inappropriate protocol” stated in the first line of paragraph four. The panel agreed to refrain from the using these generalizations and suggested capturing the idea of maintaining public access to historic properties with more positive language.
3. Panel members stressed that the three central ideas of this recommendation (developing security measures that are as complete as possible; developing new property uses as necessary, and resorting to virtual access only as a last resort) need to be captured in the concluding paragraph.

Idea 2: Develop risk assessment methods appropriate for historic and archaeological properties.

Develop an All-Hazards risk assessment methodology that recognizes special challenge of protecting historic and archeological properties from natural hazards and manmade threats. Utilize principles that encourage public/private partnerships with community groups and local law enforcement to reduce exposure to hazards.

1. Panel members recommend replacing “with” to “including” in the second sentence of the recommendation text. The panel agreed that this change would make the recommendation more expansive.
2. Panel members approved adding non-governmental organizations and units of government to the list of groups who should collaborate, outlined in paragraph one.
3. Mr. Grone asked if this recommendation was tasking the National Park Service (NPS) with some specific action in paragraph three. The panel agreed that they would like to refrain from specific NPS tasking since there are many avenues NPS could take as a leader in historic preservation.
4. Mr. Grone asked for clarification on the meaning of “the behavior of ordinary people” listed in paragraph four. The panel intended this language to refer to designing risk assessment measures that are realistic in anticipating the behaviors of public visitors.
5. In paragraph three, panel members request deleting the extra N in NNFPFA.

Idea 3: Incorporate security related provisions into national building codes.

Review existing security principles and technical facilities standards for the purpose of developing security related provisions for new construction, existing buildings and historic structures that will be incorporated into national building codes. Include provisions to address operational, structural, mechanical, electrical, plumbing, architectural, and landscape design requirements.

1. Panel members suggested moving “architectural” to the beginning of the list of provisions addressed in both the recommendation text and the second paragraph. This change is more consistent with standard practices.
2. Panel members discussed possible conflict between recommending a national security code in paragraph one and stating that there is no possible standardized solution to all security issues in paragraph three. The panel did not believe these two ideas conflict but wanted to ensure that the standard suggested in paragraph three refers specifically to a performance-based standard to avoid any perceived conflict.

Idea 4: Design matters – sensitive security solutions must be selected to protect the property’s historical integrity.

Historic buildings and sites meet a high standard to be determined significant and worthy of protection, including the qualities of their architecture and setting, their importance to historical events and people, and the information they embody about our past. The design and siting of necessary security interventions must be held to the same high standard.

1. The panel suggested rewriting paragraph two to clarify that the importance of preserving public access to certain areas does not imply controlled access to historic properties.
2. Panel members requested that paragraph two, bullet four be rewritten to indicate that successful security designs allow for freedom of movement in the public realm.
3. Panel members recommend including achievements of the Department of Defense, National Capitol Planning Commission, and Commission of Fine Arts in paragraph five’s discussion of success stories.

Idea 5: Provide information and training to guide decision makers.

Coordinate and disseminate administrative guidelines and technical information that encourages continued use of historic and archaeological properties and assists property owners to effectively assess exposure to risk and recognize and implement effective non-intrusive security measures.

The panel had no comments on idea 5.

Ms. Sullivan will make the requested changes to the recommendations and supporting PowerPoint slides. Ms. Sullivan will post the revised recommendations to the DENIX Web site and submit the final recommendations to the Preserve America Summit.

New Orleans Summit Meeting –Addressing Security Panel Presentations

Ms. Sullivan requested that all panel members register for the New Orleans Summit. Mr. Malanaphy and Mr. Grone request a few panel members be present at each of the Addressing Security Panel meetings and attend any other sessions of interest. Panel members will receive a package of recommendations from all Preserve America panels prior to the Summit. Ms. Sullivan assured panel members that staff will disseminated all material related to the Summit to avoid any information gaps.

Conclusion / Final Comments

This is the last conference call of the Addressing Security Panel unless further need arises prior to the Preserve America Summit. Mr. Grone and Mr. Malanaphy appreciate the extraordinary efforts of all panel members and look forward to seeing everyone in New Orleans.

Acronym List

ADA – Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990

AIA – American Institute of Architects

AICP – American Institute of Certified Planners

ASIS – Formerly “American Society for Industrial Security,” now ASIS International

ASLA – American Society of Landscape Architects

ASTM – Formerly “American Society for Testing and Materials,” now ASTM International

BOMA – Formerly “National Association of Building Owners and Managers,” now BOMA International

CPTED - Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design

DoD – Department of Defense

FAIA – Fellow of the American Institute of Architects

GSA – General Services Administration

IBC – International Building Code

ICC – International Code Council

IEBC – International Existing Building Code

IFMA – International Facility Management Association

ISC – Interagency Security Committee

NFPA – National Fire Protection Association

NHPA – National Historic Preservation Act

NIST - National Institute of Standards and Technology

NPS – National Park Service

PE – Professional Engineer

SHPO – State Historic Preservation Officer

THPO – Tribal Historic Preservation Officer

UFC – (Department of Defense) Unified Facilities Criteria